MINUTES OF MEETING Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Thursday, 11th November, 2021, 6.30 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Scott Emery, Julia Ogiehor, Gideon Bull and Dana Carlin

ALSO ATTENDING: Ian Sygrave

103. 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'.

104. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Culverwell and Cllr Amin.

Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Bull.

105. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

106. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

107. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

108. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting on 13th September were agreed as a correct record.

109. NORTH LONDON HEAT AND POWER PROJECT - NLWA

The Panel received a presentation from the North London Waste Authority regarding the North London Heat & Power Project. The NLWA were asked to come and speak

to the Panel following the last meeting during which there was a deputation around the proposed replacement of the waste incinerator at Edmonton. The presentation was introduced by Martin Capstick, Managing Director of the NLWA as set out in the agenda pack at page 11. David Cullen, Programme Director of the North London Heat & Power Project was also present. The following arose in discussion of the presentation:

a. The Panel noted that the Heat and Power Project proposals supported increased levels of recycling alongside provision of the cleanest energy recovery system in the country for waste that could not be recycled.
b. The NLWA emphasised that the facility was capable of dealing with forecasted increased levels of waste and that the facility was predicated on the expectation of dealing with between 500k – 700k tonnes of waste per year by 2050. The NLWA emphasised that they needed to be able to provide an appropriate infrastructure to deal with waste for the coming decades, at a time when population numbers were also due to increase.
c. The Panel noted that the NLWA recently became the first authority to have the facility to recycle polystyrene packing.
d. The Chair commented that a lot of the concerns expressed by the community were around the proposed size and scale of the facility. The Chair questioned whether in light of other facilities across London closing down, whether the NLWA was considering having waste from other facilities directed to the new facility in Edmonton. In response, the NLWA advised that they were a few months from beginning the process of building the facility and that the focus was very much on the waste processing needs of North London only. The Panel was advised that, in simple terms, if NLWA did not build the facility then North London would not be able to deal with its own waste.
e. The Panel raised concerns about the location of the new facility and the fact that it was in deprived area with existing health and air pollution concerns. In response, the NLWA advised that the facility was being built within an existing waste management site and that the new facility would be the cleanest in the country. The NLWA set out that emissions from the site would be largely undetectable, and that detectable emissions would only be present for no more than a few days of the year.
f. In response to concerns raised, the NLWA advised that air pollution would improve as a result of the new facility. Under the industrial emissions directive the safe level of emissions was 200 units, the site was licenced from the Environment Agency at 80 units and the expected emissions from the facility were between 10-15 units. The NLWA advised that a simple assumption that the site was going to be a source of significant pollution was wrong.

Clerk's note 18:56 – Cllr Bull entered the room at this point.

g. The Panel sought clarification around the fact that there was no safe limit for particular matter. The NLWA confirmed that this was the case but highlighted that emissions from the facility would be very low, to the extent that they would be effectively zero.
h. The Panel queried whether the NLWA saw a future where the UK no longer needed waste incineration. In response, the Panel was advised that energy from waste was expected to remain as the biggest source of carbon output for the next 40 plus years. The importance of carbon capture was highlighted in this context. The new facility would not have carbon capture but it would be compatible if this was required in the future. The NLWA commented that they

believed that the need for processing waste along current lines would remain for some time to come.

i. In regards to a questions around the economies of scale and whether there were cost implications from running the facility at a reduced scale, the NLWA reiterated that there was a significant amount of flexibility built into the site and that it could easily operate at a levels of 500 tonnes per year, which was significantly below current waste levels. The NLWA acknowledged that operating on reduced scale would be less cost effective in terms of costs per ton, but that there was very little difference in overall costs from operating at 500k tonnes to 700k tonnes. The NLWA considered a range of different sizes and outputs when drawing up proposals. The Panel was advised that it made sense to build the facility at the proposed size, with a capacity to scale this up if required.

j. In relation to a follow up question around whether a 10% reduction in waste would equate to a 10% reduction in costs, the NLWA advised that having a smaller facility would not achieve equivalent savings but that it was important to consider that a smaller facility would run the risk of not being able to meet future waste output in North London.

k. Cllr Bull noted that he had been sent some fairly detailed questions on the site from the Haringey Climate Action group and it was agreed to send these to NLWA for a response in writing. **(Action: Martin Capstick - NLWA).**

RESOLVED

Noted

110. PRIORITIES FOR THE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

The Panel received an update on the priorities for the Community Safety Partnership for the year. The Panel heard from the Borough Commander as well as the Leader of the Council, as joint Chairs of the Community Safety Partnership. The Police tabled a set of slides, which were subsequently emailed round to the Members. Simon Crick, Borough Commander introduced the slides. Also present from the Police were; Supt. Chris Jones, DI Paul Ridley and D-Supt. Seb Adjei-Addoh. The key highlights from the presentation were noted as:

- Total Notifiable Offences were down 11% in 2021 compared to 2019.
- Violence with Injury was down 10% in 2021 compared to 2019.
- Total Knife Crime was down 43% in 2021 compared to 2019.
- Personal Robbery was down 49% in 2021 compared to 2019.
- Residential Burglary was down 26% in 2021 compared to 2019.
- Hate Crime had risen by 31% in 2021 compared to 2019. The Police commented that they saw having a high detection rate for this crime to be a positive outcome.
- In relation to Turnpike Lane/Ducketts Common: Arson and Criminal Damage was up 100%; Burglary up 120%; all robberies up 217%; all sexual offences up 150%; burglaries down 41% and Violence with Injury down 41%. (Figures related to period of Sept 19 – Aug 20 compared to Sept 20 to Aug 21).

- The Wood Green Town Centre team was due to be operational on 6th December. This comprised of 1 inspector, 3 sergeants and 21 constables who were an additional resource to the neighbourhood teams.

The Leader of the Council gave a verbal introduction and set out the key priorities in relation to community Safety from a Council perspective. The key points raised were:

- The Leader noted that less than 24 hours after becoming Leader, there was a murder in Turnpike Lane and that she had made Turnpike Lane an absolute priority for her administration. There was a lot of joint working taking place with police and other partners around Turnpike Lane. However, the Leader also commented that they couldn't seek to just try and police their way out of a particular problem and so a Turnpike Lane Strategy forum was being set up with traders and a range of other partners. This forum was in addition to the police led partnership group for that area.
- The Council was working on an anti-discrimination campaign and meetings with specific community groups had been taking place over the last six months.
- The Leader identified women and safety as a key issue and advised that the Council had received 2000 responses to a survey around women's safety. In addition to the police led initiatives, it was identified that the Council would be prioritising improving the public realm and improving street lighting as part of the process of trying to address this issue.
- The Leader also set out the importance of community engagement in relation to Turnpike Lane and commented that there were particular groups that were not adequately engaged with. The Leader and partners had met with representatives of the Somali community the day before, particularly in light of two of the three murder victims in Turnpike Lane being Somali.
- The Leader identified the importance of early intervention work, particularly in relation to the issue of gangs and knife crime.

The following arose from the discussion of this agenda item:

a. The Panel sought reassurance around what was being done to tackle Violence Against Women & Girls (VAWG). In response the Leader advised that she was a co-signatory to a letter sent to the Metropolitan Police commissioner setting out ten key points to be addressed in relation to VAWG. The Police commented that sexism/VAWG was a societal issue and required a multi-agency response. Operation Heartsholme was highlighted, which was comprised of a 15 strong team dedicated to tackling VAWG and sexual offences. These officers had been working hard to proactively apprehend outstanding sexual offence suspects. The Panel was advised that the BCU had developed its own VAWG Action Plan, which was in addition to the Met-wide VAWG action plan announced by the Commissioner.
b. The Panel also sought assurances around what was being done to redesign crime hotspot locations across the borough in order to deter crime. In response, officers advised a £4m investment in CCTV upgrade had been made which would be focused around hotspot locations. Officers also advised that they had a problem solving partnership group with the Police were designing out criminal behaviour at hotspot locations was discussed. The Police advised that they had team that undertook work around designing out crime. The example of

Holcombe Road Market was given; the team had made a series of short, medium and long-term recommendations in this area which were being implemented. These included fencing, CCTV, cutting back hedges and shrubs.

c. In relation to hate crime, the Panel sought assurances around what was being done to continue with cross-party briefing sessions that were promised. One session had been held around the far-right, but the Panel sought reassurances that other sessions would also be held, including on anti-Semitism, for example.
d. The Panel sought clarification around additional funding from the Mayor to tackle hate crime and how this was delivered to police colleagues. In response, officers advised that there had been increased funding streams in a number of areas around hate crime, this included funding to pay for officers working overtime to tackle this issue.
e. The Panel welcomed the additional high visibility police presence in and around Harringay ward in recent months and drew comparisons with earlier in the year. The Panel questioned the extent to which abstraction was a key issue, with SNT officers being reallocated to other central Met operations. In response, the Borough Commander advised that he shared the concerns raised about neighbourhood officers being taken away but that there was little he could do about it as he was required to provide additional support to cover large scale policing events in central London. The Borough Commander advised that at peak times he was losing up to 98 officers a day, but that he and his management team would continue to try and do everything they could to try and minimise the impact of abstractions. The Borough Commander advised the Panel that did not underestimate the role that dedicated ward officers played in local policing.
f. The Panel sought reassurances around what was being done to reach out and engage with hard to reach groups. The Leader responded that one of the points she took away from the meeting with the Somali community was that they did not appreciate being referred as hard to reach, as they felt they were visible and the Council could easily contact them. One of the key concerns was around feeling discriminated against and that their concerns and needs around housing, health, education etcetera were not taken onboard.
g. In relation to ward panels and variable attendance levels, the Panel sought assurances around to what extent those panels were being utilised. The Leader acknowledged that different ward panels had different attendance and engagement levels, depending in local factors. Police colleagues noted that there was a ward panel improvement plan in place. Chris Jones advised that it was his expectation that the ward sergeant would attend the ward panel meeting to give the required level of seniority.
h. Cllr Bull raised the alleyway near Tesco Express near Turnpike Lane as a hotspot area that would benefit from having some work done to design out crime. Officers advised that this location would form part of the wider multi-partnership response to Ducketts Common and Turnpike Lane.
i. The Panel requested further information around what was being done to tackle empty buildings and shop fronts from contributing to crime and ASB particularly in relation to making an area appear run down and neglected. The Leader

advised that Cllr Gordon and Regen officers would be able to provide a written response on this. **(Action: Cllr Gordon).**

j. In response to further concerns around hotspot locations, officers advised that there was a big partnership focus around hotspots at Turnpike Lane, Tottenham Hale and Northumberland Park. Officers agreed to write to Cllr Ogiehor with information around what was being done to redesign crime hotspots. **(Action: Eubert Malcolm).**

k. In response to concerns about the extent to which a reduction in drug offences related to under reporting of crime, police colleagues suggested that it was fair to say that there was a trust and confidence issue around drugs. The Panel was advised that Members should see an uptick drug prosecutions as specific resources were being deployed to that area.

l. The Panel questioned what the statistic were for bringing rape offences to trial. In response, the Police advised that this crime type would be treated with the same severity as a murder case and that it could take 6-12 months to build a case. The current sanction detection rate was identified as 1.8% in Haringey for the current year, against a national average of 3%. The Borough Commander noted the Sapphire Team for North Area was pretty much at full strength and he was hopeful that investments in this resource would see an uptick in the number of cases going to trial.

m. In response to concerns around preventing dispersal of crime from hotspot locations, the Panel was advised that crimes were tracked at ward level and below and that there was not much evidence to suggest that significant displacement of crime took place from the main hotspot locations. The Police added that this crime data was monitored daily and that investigating teams would follow any crime problems from one area to another if it was displaced, to ensure a level of continuity in the response.

RESOLVED

Noted

111. HARINGEY CRIME AND ASB HOTSPOTS

The Panel received a presentation which provided an update on crime and ASB hotspots, including what the process was identifying and monitoring those hotspots. The presentation was included in the agenda pack at pages 25-31. The following arose as part of the discussion of this item:

a. In response to a question around enforcement tools and the need to stop people from fly tipping in the first place, officers acknowledged that there was an element of broken window syndrome. Officers set out that the actions taken in response a particular hotspot was dependent upon what the issue was. Officers used the example of a targeted response that had been used at a location at block of flats at Northumberland Park, where a relocatable CCTV was put in place, an ‘A’ board was put up in the location, a wall of shame

picture gallery was put up along with very visible signage and every resident in that block had been visited by officers. This had resulted in a notable improvement in the situation. Officers also outlined the importance of holding landlords to task for HMO's.

b. The Panel requested that the email address for reporting ASB be more widely publicised through different communication channels. **(Action: Eubert).**

RESOLVED

Noted

112. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

Following and extensive questions as part of agenda Item 8, there were no further questions put to the Leader.

113. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

RESOLVED

The Panel noted the Work Programme and agreed any amendments contained therein.

114. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

115. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

14th December
3rd March

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair ……..

Date ……