

# **MINUTES OF MEETING Full Council HELD ON Monday, 16th November, 2020, 7.30pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Sheila Peacock, Dana Carlin, Gina Adamou, Charles Adje, Peray Ahmet, Kaushika Amin, Dawn Barnes, Dhiren Basu, Patrick Berryman, John Bevan, Barbara Blake, Mark Blake, Zena Brabazon, Gideon Bull, Vincent Carroll, Nick da Costa, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Seema Chandwani, Sakina Chenot, James Chiriyankandath, Pippa Connor, Eldridge Culverwell, Julie Davies, Mahir Demir, Paul Dennison, Isidoros Diakides, Josh Dixon, Erdal Dogan, Joseph Ejiofor, Scott Emery, Ruth Gordon, Makbule Gunes, Mike Hakata, Bob Hare, Kirsten Hearn, Emine Ibrahim, Sarah James, Adam Jogie (Mayor), Peter Mitchell, Liz Morris, Khaled Moyeed, Lucia das Neves, Felicia Opoku, Tammy Palmer, Reg Rice, Viv Ross, Alessandra Rossetti, Yvonne Say, Anne Stennett, Daniel Stone, Preston Tabois, Elin Weston, Noah Tucker, Sarah Williams, Matt White and Julia Ogiehor**

## **30. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Mayor referred to the notice of meetings, section of the agenda and Members noted this information.

## **31. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were apologies for absence from Cllr Hinchcliffe and apologies for lateness from Cllr Stone who did join the meeting at the start at 7.30pm.

## **32. TO ASK THE MAYOR TO CONSIDER THE ADMISSION OF ANY LATE ITEMS OF BUSINESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 100B OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**

The Chief Executive outlined the following:

There were 2 late items of business, which could not be available earlier, and which would need to be dealt with at this meeting.

Item 12- Questions and Written Answers

The reason for lateness was that notice of questions is not requested until 8 clear days before the meeting, following which the matters raised have to be researched and replies prepared to be given at the meeting.

Item 13 - Motions

The amendments to motions were not requested until 10am on the day of the Council meeting and the amendment to Motion B had been received and had been published and distributed today as a supplementary pack.

**33. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Ibrahim declared a personal interest in item 10. She clarified that this was not a prejudicial interest nor a disclosable pecuniary interest. Her personal interest was due to her parent being affected by the Pod Replacement Programme in Noel Park.

**34. TO APPROVE AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 1 OCTOBER 2020**

**RESOLVED**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 01 October 2020 as a correct record of the meeting.

**35. TO RECEIVE SUCH COMMUNICATIONS AS THE MAYOR MAY LAY BEFORE THE COUNCIL**

The Mayor advised that he had attended 34 engagements in 12 of the 19 wards in the borough, and was aiming to complete engagements in the remaining 7 wards before the Christmas break.

The Mayor outlined a few of the engagements that he had attended and spoke of his honour in leading the Remembrance Sunday commemorations.

The Mayor had also taken forward socially distanced Green flag raising in some parks in the borough.

The Mayor spoke of the sad passing of former Councillor Liz Murphy who served as a Labour councillor on the Council from May 1971 to May 1974, representing the former Town Hall ward. The Mayor noted that in the local election of 1974 she lost the seat that she was contesting in Stroud Green and Hornsey ward and was made Alderman, leaving the Council in 1978 when the office of Alderman was abolished.

The Mayor called on Cllr Peacock to pay tribute to Liz Murphy. Cllr Peacock outlined the many roles that Liz Murphy had held in the borough including being part of a nucleus of 3 formidable women in the local Labour Party – herself, Nicky Harrison who pushed for comprehensive education in Haringey – which they were successful in achieving.

On the Council, she had roles as Vice Chair of the Education Committee and Chair of the Planning Committee.

It was noted that Liz Murphy was a strong advocate for early year's education and was heavily involved in the National Campaign for Nursery Education – lobbying parliament and pushing for 4-year-olds to have access to early years' education.

She was also Chair of Governors of the then William Forster School (now The Langham School) in the late 1970's and early 1980's.

She was involved in the setting up and what then was the Co-ordinator at Stroud Green Pre School Centre from 1982 to 1988. It was noted that his was a very innovative project in its day being jointly funded and managed by the L.B Haringey Education and Social Services Departments.

Member noted that in 1988 she left to be the Head Teacher at Rowland Hill Nursery School. she had been involved in the setting up of the facility. She was there until she retired in 1997 aged 64.

It was noted that Liz Murphy was also instrumental in setting up the Haringey Branch of the Socialist Education Association (SEA) along with Max Morris. She was treasurer there until a few years ago.

The Mayor expressed the Council's warmest condolences to Liz Murphy's family and led the Council in a one minute's silence.

*Liz Murphy's family thanked the Council for its fitting tribute and minute's silence.*

### **36. TO RECEIVE THE REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

The Chief Executive had no matters to report.

### **37. TO RECEIVE THE REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER AND HEAD OF LEGAL SERVICES**

The Deputy Monitoring Officer had no matters to report.

### **38. TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM THE FOLLOWING BODIES**

The Chair of Regulatory Committee introduced the report which sought agreement to the Statement of Licensing Policy 2021- 26.

In moving the recommendations, the Chair of Regulatory Committee highlighted a further required change to the updated Statement of Licensing Policy 2021- 26 at appendix 4. Referring to wording at page 123, paragraph 3.10, Regulatory Committee members proposed adding *in: that International data suggests that one in three women experience violence in their lives. Although the figures do not show whether alcohol was a factor, this can often be the case.* The Chair of the Regulatory Committee moved that the Council agree the recommendations at page 11 of the Council pack, 3.1 and 3.2 subject to this change.

Cllr Adamou, Vice of Regulatory Committee, seconded the amendment.

## **RESOLVED**

To approve the Statement of Licensing Policy 2021 - 26 as set out at appendix 4, taking into account the amendment outlined above.

### **39. TO CONSIDER REQUESTS TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS AND/OR PETITIONS AND, IF APPROVED, TO RECEIVE THEM**

The Mayor had received a petition with 374 signatures and deputation from Parkside Malvern Resident's Association calling for a full assessment of the need for traffic-calming and an evidence-based examination of the case for a vehicle weight reduction on Hornsey Park Road, N8.

The Mayor invited Marcus Ballard and Vincent Egger to make their representations on behalf of the Resident's Association.

The deputation outlined that, following the reconfiguration of roads in Wood green 50 years ago, Hornsey Park Road became a bypass road for Wood Green High Road. A new link road in 1996 was considered, as at this time, but not taken forward. Hornsey Park Road was carrying the same level of heavy traffic as the High Road which was an A road. There was a need for a better link to the Heartlands area which was not severed by this bypass road. The Council's 1996 documents described the congestion and pollution and unpleasant environment for residents as the road was designed as a residential road and these conditions remained in place to this day for residents.

The deputation continued to set out the previous decision making concerning this part of Wood Green. This included the narrowing of the High Road, and meant less space for traffic on the High Road, yet no remedial works had been carried out on Hornsey Park Road. This needed repair and traffic calming to make it a better environment for residents.

The deputation advised that there were many accidents that were unrecorded as these did not result in injuries. The Mary Neuner road promised to redistribute traffic, sharing it equally with Hornsey Park Road and the New Road . However, this did not happen, and this particular road had been closed for the past 14 months. In 2009 the residents group petitioned the Council and continued to speak locally about the need for traffic diversion.

The deputation commented that they did not see heavy duty traffic in other parts of the borough and the issues in Hornsey Park Road seemed unnoticed.

The deputation referred to the Area Action Plan and Site Allocations Plan which included the densification of the Wood Green area, around Hornsey Park Road and yet the highways and strategic transport planning did not seem to be being considered for this area. There had also been recently an opening of the local children's park in the area and consultation on the African Cultural centre with promise of improvements to access points.

In conclusion, the deputation sought a new approach for the area for traffic management. The Residents Association were seeking the Council's support from the

top level, down to the operation levels of both regeneration and transport teams to deliver improved living environment for residents.

In response to questions from Councillors, the deputation provided the following responses:

- There was a need for a fair distribution of traffic between the three roads, including Alexandra Palace Way, and for residents to see HDV traffic off Hornsey Park Road as the road was not designed to fit heavy vehicles. This was a residential road, and this volume of traffic had an impact on the housing on this road,
- The threat of increased traffic was a threat across all boroughs and between boroughs. Haringey Heartlands had low car ownership area with rail links and bus network. However, there was still more traffic serving London's economy and neighbouring boroughs. The deputation commented that there may be desire for people outside the area to drive to Wood Green. Locally, the Council were felt to be doing the right thing and the main need was to reduce traffic in the area.
- The deputation added that a lot of the heavy construction vehicles destined for the regeneration works at Heartland site were using Hornsey Park Road. The average was an HDV vehicle every 1 to 2 minutes, making the homes on Hornsey Park road rattle. The road was built in the early 1900's and not designed for this type of traffic. When collecting signatures for the petition, there were many reports of residents that were not able to sleep well due to the noise.
- The key action to make a difference to residents' lives, would be a weight restriction on vehicles passing through this road and traffic calming measures.

The Mayor invited the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Planning to respond to the deputation.

The Cabinet Member thanked the deputation for making their representations, outlining that he shared the views of the deputation and was also speaking as a resident on the Harringay Ladder for many years. He was fully aware of the overly used traffic routes and agreed that something needed to be done. It was noted that the Cabinet Member was new to this particular portfolio area and was meeting groups of residents and offered a meeting with both the Residents groups. The Cabinet Member had responsibility for Planning which was a key decision-making element of the proposals put forward. The Cabinet Member offered to meet in the coming week with the group and on the street, in a socially distanced way, considering what could be done within the current restrictions. With regards to the asks in the petition and deputation for a crossing, the Cabinet Member understood this was part of an in-principle agreement with the developer and would be achieved by amending the section 278 agreement. The developer had submitted drawings which were for comment on by the Council. Following this consideration, the plan was for the Council officers and the developer to work with the Residents groups to implement the

separate crossing. This would be funded from the savings from the section 278 deposit bond.

In reference to the regeneration plans for the area, the Council had just recently got funding to complete the second phase and the Cabinet Member would seek to obtain details of this, to be shared with the group when meeting. The road design and street space proposals could also be shared which concerned Wightman road and which were intending to have a beneficial impact. The Cabinet Member looked forward to meeting the resident's group soon, in the coming week.

The Mayor thanked the deputation for their representations.

The Mayor invited the second deputation to address the Council meeting.

Ms Sarah Klymkiw put forward a deputation, on behalf of leaseholders on Gladstone Avenue and raised the following issues.

On the 22nd of September, Ms Klymkiw along with other leaseholders on Gladstone Avenue, had received a Section 20 Notice from Haringey Council of the intention to carry out decent homes related major works on her home. She had received a bill for £108,450. These were estimated and inflated costs and Ms Klymkiw would need to wait several years to fully know the impact, as and when, a final bill was issued. There was no guarantee that this bill would not be even higher in the future.

Ms Klymkiw was shocked to receive this Section 20 notice and she expressed that all the leaseholders were very alarmed by these bills and now lived-in constant fear that they would lose their homes or have a lifetime of debt, trying to pay off the cost to these works. She highlighted that the leaseholders were ordinary people and mostly with fragile financial circumstances, impacted by the pandemic, which was causing current employment issues and uncertainty for future employment opportunities.

The leaseholders were opposed to the major works and argued that the costs put forward were wholly unreasonable. The major works were concerning the replacement of prefabricated Pods. These were temporary toilet and bathing facilities installed in the 1970's with a projected life of 15 years. The Pods had not been replaced at the expiry of their lifespan and now had damp and required special works for asbestos removal. The solution was to replace the Pods with a new Pod which the deputation contended would not be value for money nor sustainable. The deputation felt that there should be alternative solutions explored.

Ms Klymkiw outlined the delayed decision making with the replacement Pods, spanning over the last 30 years in particular:

- An early estimation for the cost of the removal and replacement of the Pods was £12.5k
- In 2015, this was £50k.
- In September 2020 this was over £50k

Ms Klymkiw advised that the estimates were not based on individual surveys and yet the proposals involved replacing whole roofs, windows, external doors in addition to the Pod replacement. Homes for Haringey had not responded to advise leaseholders

why all these works were needed now and how they had arrived at the proposed figures, causing increased anxiety.

The deputation questioned the likely contractor for delivery of these works and their record for delivery of previous Council contracts. The deputation contended that the cost of these works would likely be high and in the long term be borne by leaseholders and tenants who paid into the HRA.

The deputation outlined that the contract decision for taking forward these major works was previously due in October 2020, but this would have been before the consultation with leaseholders was completed. This reflected, to leaseholders, that Homes for Haringey did not intend to consider the views to be expressed in the consultation.

The deputation outlined that the Cabinet were now due to consider this decision on the 8th of December and questioned the incentive for the contractor lowering any costs and the likelihood for the surveys on the homes to be as independent as possible.

It was acknowledged that there was a solution needed for both leaseholders and tenants to have decent homes. The leaseholders recognised that they needed to contribute to the cost of the decent homes works but this had to be reasonable. As the homes were part of the Council's Housing stock, the leaseholders were asking the Council to contribute and explore funding opportunities to enable this.

The response from the Council, so far, was a cancelled meeting exploring payment plans but this would not address the key issue that the costs were too high. Ultimately, if the costs were too high, this debt would be carried by the leaseholders for several years. Therefore, it was felt that only a significant reduction in cost would save the leaseholders from financial ruin.

The deputation considered that there were three options available:

1. To pause the decision on the contract for the decent works programme in Noel Park and the Council urgently endeavour to bring down the costs of the works, remove the additional works and focus only on replacing the Pods.
2. To withdraw the proposal to replace the existing Pods with other Pods and examine alternative viable options.
3. Development of separate programmes or blocks of works containing leaseholder properties that have full consultation with leaseholders to ensure value for money.

The deputation emphasised that the stress of this situation was having an unbearable impact on the mental health of leaseholders. In some cases, the prospect of financial hardship was forcing the leaseholders to have no choice but to sell their properties. However, the potential debt that could be attached to the home also made this an invidious choice.

The deputation, on behalf of leaseholders, asked the Council to engage with them to deter them becoming homeless or bankrupt, in turn having a significant impact on families and life chances.

The Mayor thanked the deputation for their representations and invited questions from Councillors.

In response to questions from Councillors: Cawley- Harrison, Ahmet and Brabazon, the deputation provided the following information:

- With regards to the engagement with leaseholders so far, and the opportunity to explore individual solutions for properties enabling leaseholders to contract these works themselves, the deputation expressed that there had not been meaningful consultation, at this point in time. The first formal contact point on these works was in September 2020 when the section 20 notices were received. The leaseholders believed that there were alternatives. Ms Klymkiw advised that she had been trying, over the last 5 years, to engage with the Council on an alternative solution for the Pods. When purchasing the property in 2015, she advised that the cost of the work was going to be £12.5k and this went up to £25k. Ms Klymkiw approached Homes for Haringey about opting out of having a Pod and installing this instead in the existing brick structure. Ms Klymkiw advised that other leaseholders were also trying to engage with Homes for Haringey on a way forward. It was felt that Homes for Haringey were using a long-term contract agreement which bypassed any meaningful consultation, hence the reluctance for engagement. This agreement meant that leaseholders were realistically not able to offer up any estimates or alternatives and it was felt that the leaseholders had no choice with the costs put forward. The costs were so high, and it was felt that under this agreement leaseholders were not able to put forward alternative quotes.
- Further issues were raised about the long-term contract agreements for major works and the deputation contended that the leaseholders would find it difficult to navigate these complex rules to propose their own contractors and understand the works that were being covered which was also not clear at this stage. When the agreements with the contractor were entered, leaseholders would not know what further works maybe involved, later in the process, so this also made it difficult to suggest alternatives as well.
- It was known that Homes for Haringey had investigated alternatives to the Pods for the last 10 years and none of these plans had been shared with leaseholders. It was also known that brick-built extensions had been investigated 10 years ago and it was known that leaseholders and tenants would still like this solution.
- In terms of meetings with Homes for Haringey, it was noted that there had been a meeting in July with them and with the contractor, where the deputation noted that the name of the Pods had been changed to a 'precision engineered extension'. At this meeting, it was relayed to leaseholders that there would be additional works to their homes as well. At this stage, the cost of the Pod replacement and additional works was not advised. Then in September 2020, the section 20 notice of the cost of the works was received. This caused alarm due the significant sums enclosed in the notice and contact with local Councillors with a visit from the managing director, Cabinet Member, and housing officer. At this stage it was realised by the leaseholders that the only



consultation being pursued was the payment option and payment plan offers, potential ownership of flats, or offering 25 years to pay back the loan which was essentially another mortgage. Following this meeting, the leaseholders put forward their observations as part of a legal document process where the leaseholders were able to ask questions. At this point, there was yet to be a Council/ Homes for Haringey response received.

- There had been a meeting with the Leader of the Council and Managing Director for Homes for Haringey where similar information on payment plans was provided, and no discussion on alternative options or the opportunity to be asked if leaseholders felt that the work needed to be done. The leaseholders felt that the additional works were not needed and did not agree with the replacement Pod solution offered.
- An email was received advising a delay to the legal letter with observations/ questions and the leaseholders were, at this stage, not aware of any additional meetings, or dialogue to continue to explore this issue further. The deputation further clarified that Homes for Haringey had advised that the response to the legal letter would be 10 days late, but this meant that the response was due to be received 2 weeks before the Cabinet decision. Therefore, if a response were received from Homes for Haringey, it would leave little time to discussion and any meaningful dialogue.
- Overall, the leaseholders were concerned about the communications process with Homes for Haringey and highlighted the number of questions put forward in the legal letter which reflected how little information the leaseholders had before such significant decision was to be taken affecting their futures.
- The deputation confirmed that they were not objecting to the principles of a leaseholder's duty to contributing to their share of the major works required, but the concerns remained with regards to the consultation and how the costs of the works had been arrived at.

The Leader of the Council responded to the deputation as follows:

There were many learning points from this process, including how leaseholders and tenants had been communicated with, and there it was important to do things better and differently in the future.

The section 20 notices had been read by the Leader and he empathised and understood the shock and concern felt by leaseholders. The Leader apologised for this and noted that there had been a letter sent back out to leaseholders which sought to provide clarification to this initial letter that had been sent.

The Leader apologised for the delay in the leaseholders receiving a response to the observations/ questions/ legal letter and was not aware that there had been a delay and would seek to facilitate a response.

In relation to the additional works spoken about, the Leader highlighted that every property in the estate was unique, and it was made clear that each property needed to

have a bespoke survey completed and whatever work that needs to be done will be completed. Unnecessary works will not be taken forward as reiterated previously. It generally made sense to complete the required works to a property at the same time.

The new proposed replacement Pods had a life expectancy of 60 years, this solution enabled the Pods to be replaced in a day and mean less disruption. If brick-built extensions were opted for, this would mean no access to a toilet and bathroom for three months.

There was acknowledgement and understanding of concerns about the payment plans and it was hoped that there was understanding of the Council's position of a solution that works. The Council could not subsidise the repairs to leaseholder properties by using money from tenant's rents. The Council were looking at other options and alternatives, but the objective was not to move anybody out of their homes and the issue of how this was paid for was not fully resolved. There would be a decision at Cabinet and the Council were engaging with all the leaseholders and seeking understanding of their circumstances. If the Council could find a way to seek money from the government or from another source to supplement the costs, it would do this. At this stage, the Council could not promise that this was doable or deliverable. It was hoped that before the decision was considered at Cabinet there would be a conversation with leaseholders and appropriate officers to obtain a greater understanding of what the concerns were.

The Leader concluded that the decision on the Decent Homes works in Noel Park was a decision that should have been taken many years ago. The need to take these works forward now was due to the Pods reaching the end of their useful life and there being no time for delay as safety concerns would arise.

Assurance was provided of the higher quality of the replacement Pods and the Council would be consulting further with leaseholders in the coming weeks.

#### **40. HARINGEY DEBATE: MENTAL HEALTH DURING AND AFTER THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC**

Councillor Connor introduced the debate on mental health during and after the Covid-19 pandemic. Councillor Connor highlighted the rising mental health issues and stresses faced by local residents, from all communities within the borough. Organisations had been working so hard within local communities to really address the needs of the community, focusing on both physical and mental health of residents.

Councillor Connor provided a brief introduction to each of the speakers and the organisations they represented, then allowed each of them to introduce themselves and the work that they do.

Vas Hirani was the Community Development Manager for Health, Mental Health and Wellbeing for the Bridge Renewal Trust. The Trust worked with various organisations and sectors including housing associations, faith-based organisations, Haringey Wellbeing network, Barnet/Enfield/Haringey mental health services and Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs). The work undertaken included capacity building, training, fundraising and asset development management. The work also leads to

sustainable approaches, joined up projects and partnership working. During the lockdown voluntary and community organisations had worked together to mobilise local resources and provide support to grass root community groups, which was an asset going forward. The Trust had helped around 50 organisations with capacity building over the last 11 months.

Sonja Cantlebury spoke on behalf of 4U2 Sewn Together. Ms Cantlebury worked on the For you too news community magazine, which provided a platform to promote local events/organisations/communities etc. across Haringey. The community project 'Zone Together' began 12 months ago and helped to empower creative communities for women within the BAME (Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic) community. The project offered various activities and had currently helped over 90 women, who were experiencing various difficulties. However, 46% of those participants did not have access to the necessary IT equipment. It was recognised that the risk of mental health issues was higher for everyone at this current time and the project would like the ability to provide an accessible and tailored counselling service at a local level. Ms Cantlebury stated that the project would also like to get a programme together for individuals to donate any IT equipment that they could to help as many people as possible to get digitally engaged.

Vas Hirani stated that the representative from the Dalmar organisation was unfortunately unable to attend the meeting, she would therefore introduce this organisation. They were a Somali cultural organisation which supported children and families. The organisation worked with over 120 people per week, including some of the most isolated and excluded residents within the community. The organisation was based at the Selby Centre and covered a broad cross section of the community, providing support on matters such as capacity building, skills and training, autism, safeguarding and various mental health issues. The organisation also worked on projects such as PPE sewing skills, enterprise skills, bringing communities together virtually.

The biggest challenges faced by the Dalmar organisation were surrounding the day-to-day operational costs and staff and resourcing issues. There had also been an impact on access to services for children with disabilities, which resulted in a lack of opportunity for respite for carers of those children. It was noted that the organisation was very active on social media, which was an asset, in terms of sharing health messages.

Raj Gupta spoke on behalf of the Community Hub, previously known as the Asian Centre. The Community Hub provided a range of services and activities to all communities within the borough, targeted to the South Asian communities. It currently had 1,400 members as service users. The day care service was currently used by 15 service users; however, they had a capacity for 25 users. The Community Hub had received £33,000 of funding to improve their services and expand on the work surrounding raising awareness of dementia within the Asian communities. The Community Hub had successfully managed an online conference of 62 people, in person with various organisations and the Council and had now started a virtual singing group.

Mr Gupta stated that they currently had 13 of their members as 'dementia friends', with a target to increase this to 100, as well as seeking additional funding for their ageing population and those with dementia. He added that early intervention was vitally important to those people and that the voluntary sector was key to help with their quality of life.

Martin Finegan spoke on behalf of the Christian Fellowship. Mr Finegan stated that there were countless stories about the use of food banks by all communities. There had been large queues outside the church during lockdown for food and the Christian Fellowship had responded to this by mobilising volunteers, utilising services such as minibuses, diversifying food sources through the Haringey food network and securing vital funding through the Bridge Renewal Trust. The Christian Fellowship was also looking to increase partnership working and co-production, as well as providing a befriending and listening service and promoting mental health and wellbeing by various activities.

The Mayor then moved to the debate of the item and invited contributions from Councillors. Councillors Das Neves, Palmer, Brabazon and da Costa all contributed to the debate. They provided moving personal experiences of mental health struggles and highlighted the importance of speaking about any mental health issues, stating that it was ok not to be ok, especially during these challenging times. Reference was also made to a survey undertaken by Mind which identified that 1/2 of adults and 2/3 of young people's mental health was worse than before the first lockdown started.

Those Members stated that Councillors had a responsibility to lobby the Government to provide the necessary funding to ensure that community groups had the ability to support those within the community that were most at need, as well as focusing on mental health and providing a path of holistic recovery. It was important for the Council to look at what it could do to contribute to and support the physical and mental wellbeing of its constituents.

Councillor James, Cabinet Member for Adults and Health responded to the debate. Councillor James also thanked everyone that had contributed to the debate and highlighted the problems surrounding mental health. Covid had highlighted the stark inequalities in the borough, from health to economic issues, and it was not surprising to see that the levels of people suffering from mental health issues had increased because of the pandemic. The Council had been working with the voluntary sector and health partners, connected communities, community engagement groups, food network, wellbeing network to help get the right support to those residents that needed it. Reference was also made to a digital offer Kooth, which had provided a popular way to engage for those young people under 25, with half of those from the BAME community. NHS Go and Thrive London were also highlighted as providing valuable support.

Councillor James stated that these services had responded in creative ways. A new borough primary care service was also being provided, which focused on physical health improvement for adults with mental health issues. The Council was also working with Mind, the Bridge Renewal Trust and NHS providers on a borough mental health action plan. Work was also taking place on the provision of a dedicated mental health service for rough sleepers, as well as a North Central London bereavement

service. It was important to continue to work with providers to promote community resilience. Councillor James believed that communities would reconsider the way they lived and their priorities because of the pandemic and it was important to understand the implications for everyone going forward.

Councillor Connor also thanked all the speakers for their contribution to the powerful and meaningful debate. Councillor Connor felt that the representatives from the various community groups showed that there was a real opportunity to help each individual if we acted and addressed the practical problems highlighted by those organisations. A new community mental health model was being introduced, in liaison with various partners, which allowed a joint community to offer to be developed. Councillor Connor recommended that Members receive an update on the new community mental health model in a special briefing.

The Mayor thanked everyone who had contributed to the debate, especially those Councillors that had been brave enough to speak about their personal struggles with mental health.

**41. TO ANSWER QUESTIONS, IF ANY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE NOS. 9 & 10**

In view of the need to finish the meeting at 10pm and following consultation and approval of both party-political Chief Whips, it was agreed that second supplementary questions would not be taken forward.

The Mayor accepted the admission of responses to written questions as late items of business, as the answers to questions had needed to be researched and prepared after the summons had been dispatched.

Oral questions one to six were then asked and responded to.

**42. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING MOTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE NO. 13**

Motion A - Urgent government interventions to protect Haringey residents from the effects of the coronavirus second wave.

The Leader moved the motion which was seeking continuation of the lockdown and asking the government to provide all Councils with the full funding needed to spend to protect residents. The Leader outlined the Council were continuing to support residents, including providing new services whilst they suffer from further loss of income. The Leader highlighted the key areas where there would likely be loss of income for the Council. This would impact on the Council budget and there were eight specific asks outlined in the motion to mitigate this.

He further referred to the Council's enforcement role in ensuring businesses kept to the legal requirements of the lockdown. This was an example of the Council being given responsibilities by the government without the funding to accompany this. The Leader of the Council concluded by emphasising that all councillors must use their influence to press national and regional politicians to provide the fair funding needed.

Councillor Amin, Deputy Leader, seconded the motion, expressing that the government response to the pandemic had seen a catalogue of errors coupled with a lack of leadership. The Deputy Leader referred to the government's: unwillingness to take forward an urgent circuit break lockdown, the failure of track and trace, refusing to support free school meals, endangering the lives and livelihoods of residents. The Deputy Leader highlighted the support of local groups and mutual aid groups and their extraordinary efforts to support local initiatives. The motion was important to be fully supported and ensure the government took forward its responsibility for supporting local residents.

Cllr Cawley – Harrison expressed that, due to the lack of time remaining, the Liberal Democratic group would not be making speeches, but his group were whole heartedly supporting the motion. Cllr Cawley- Harrison was more than happy to add his name to the proposed letter in the motion or the group could also take forward their own letter.

Cllr Mitchell, spoke in favour of the motion, and outlined how local authorities were performing a vital role in supporting communities, which contrasted with the government. Cllr Mitchell expressed his thanks to staff and local volunteers for their significant efforts. Cllr Mitchell outlined that the government had not kept to its word on fully refunding the spend of Councils on the pandemic. He noted that London Councils had called for an additional £1.4 billion to compensate them for the financial impact of the pandemic. Cllr Mitchell commented that funding for the private sector for the track and trace system, which did not work, was more forthcoming without a competitive tender process. He concluded that there was an urgent need to: address demand pressures on key services, tackle homelessness, rebuild local economies and allow local authorities to take the lead in addressing the stark inequalities that the pandemic had exposed.

Councillor Rice, Chief Whip moved that the question be put and for Council to move to the vote on this motion. This was seconded by Councillor Cawley- Harrison.

The Mayor paused and there was no indication of objection to the procedural motion.

The Mayor clarified that there was no amendment put forward to the motion.

The Mayor called on the Chief Whips of the political groups to indicate their member's vote on the motion as amended. He also asked the independent member to indicate her vote.

The Labour Group Chief Whip indicated to the Mayor that the Labour members attending the meeting were in favour of the motion.

The Liberal Democrat Chief Whip indicated that the Liberal Democrat Members attending the meeting were in favour of the motion.

Councillor Barbara Blake, Independent Member, indicated that she was in favour of the motion.

Motion A as set out below was AGREED unanimously.

## **Motion A**

### **Urgent government interventions to protect Haringey residents from the effects of the coronavirus second wave.**

The government's response to the Covid-19 crisis has been characterised by incompetence and a lack of leadership.

Boris Johnson's government has overseen a catalogue of errors. From going against the advice of their own scientific advisors and refusing to implement an urgent circuit breaker lockdown, to their failure to deliver effective testing and tracing and refusing to extend Free School Meals, the government endangered the lives and livelihoods of every Haringey resident.

People in Haringey and across the country have played their part in helping to control the spread of Covid-19 and gone to extraordinary lengths to help those in need their communities. It's unacceptable that residents have made such tremendous sacrifices while the government has been willing to do so little – not even ensuring that the lockdown restrictions apply to its own advisers.

National government's inaction, their failure to learn from the first wave, and their failure to listen to the needs of citizens has forced less well equipped and less well funded organisations, institutions, and individuals to step up. We've all been let down badly, and the time for the government to step up and take responsibility is well overdue.

In order to mitigate the effects of a second wave, this council endorses the Leader of the Council writing a letter to the Prime Minister and Secretary of State to demand that they take the following actions:

1. Extra support for the most vulnerable.
  - A winter support package to address immediate need including food poverty, mental health services, and extra support for communities disproportionately impacted in the first wave.
  - A shielding support package to allow local authorities to support those most in need.
  - A £20 increase to Universal Credit and other legacy benefits to combat fuel poverty, and an extension of Free School Meals to cover the Christmas, February half term and Easter holidays.
  - An immediate suspension of benefit sanctions to prevent the punitive removal of benefits which are essential to keeping families and children out of poverty.
  
2. Financial certainty for local authorities in 2020/21 and 2021/22. Many Councils are going into this second wave with large budget deficits from first wave. Johnson, Sunak and Enrick must keep to their word, and the government must deliver full funding for Haringey and, indeed, all local authorities, including reimbursement of lost income, so we can fully fund all of these essential requests, continue to support our residents and confidently deliver the key and vital services that our residents rely on. Furthermore, the government should ensure full and fair funding of Transport for London, so that the implications of

- lower fair income due to this pandemic are not passed on to Haringey's Council Tax payers.
3. Safe and secure housing.
    - Extension of the ban on evictions, and a return to 'Everyone In' rough sleeping policy to at least the end of March 2021.
    - Suspend No Recourse to Public Funds so all those facing hardship have the support they need.
  4. Protect incomes and employment.
    - Ensure that, with the recent extension of the furlough scheme until March 2021, no-one's income will fall below the national minimum wage.
    - Introduce a new duty on employers to ensure they can't prevent employees from following the advice to self-isolate: no worker should have to choose between their job and their health.
    - Provide clear and unambiguous guidance for those at risk of contracting Coronavirus about their employment rights.
  5. Take urgent and immediate action to improve and localise Test and Trace. There should be a staged transfer of Test and Trace funding and responsibility to local government, with local councils able to direct testing in their area including rapid expansion of testing for key workers.
  6. Fully fund an emergency support package for hardest hit sectors including culture, leisure, arts, sport and hospitality, with a particular consideration of the Small business sector. Furthermore, the government must provide the funds to fully reimburse employers for the full pay of any worker who must self-isolate due to covid-19.
  7. A commitment to work with all Councils as leaders in our communities.
    - Regular and open communication with all Council leaders and local Council Associations like London Councils.
    - Transparency on the criteria by which future decisions on restrictions will be made, including how we de-escalate from these restrictions and determine the Tiers into which Local Authorities are placed at the end of this lockdown period, and who will make that decision.
  8. Greater support for local authorities' enforcement role, with stronger and easier to use powers to tackle premises that do not operate safely. Fund more police capacity to support local authorities with enforcement action.

### **Motion B - Widening participation in Cycling**

Councillor Bob Hare proposed the motion, describing how every urban area in London and worldwide was using cycling to achieve mobility and spoke about the massive costs caused by the dominance of vehicles. He referred to the walking and cycling commission report which set out the benefits that cycling brings to health and independence, encouraging cycling for all generations and improving the quality of life. In Cllr Hare's view, the borough's current cycling facilities were not felt to be safe



and this deterred their use. He spoke about the increasing traffic in the borough and poor facilities leading to safety concerns and referred to local performance data to support this view. There was a demand for cycling noted in the first lockdown and this had decreased as the lockdown came to an end and traffic levels increased.

Cllr Hare spoke about the cycling routes in neighbouring boroughs stopping at the borough boundaries and comments from a local resident that the travel funding for cycling in Haringey could have been better spent. There were further comments on the benefit of cycling for low-income families and better outcomes for the environment. Cllr Hare concluded by referring to the 3 main components of the motion and in particular, the cycling infrastructure not meeting the standards set by government.

Councillor Viv Ross, formally seconded the motion, emphasising the public health reason for promoting cycling which also frees up capacity on the public transport system and reduces pollution. He spoke about the Council's responsibility for advocating a cycling culture. He referred to the Netherlands, which prioritises people who choose to cycle. This model had been developed over 50 years with pedestrians prioritised, then cyclists, public transport, small vehicles and finally lorries. He felt that this transport system should be a focus for the Council, and he supported the motion unamended.

The Mayor had received an amendment to the motion and called on Cllr White to move the amendment.

Cllr White thanked the Liberal Democrat group for putting forward the motion on this important subject and agreed that there was a huge amount to do. He referred to the Borough Plan which set out what the administration were committed to achieving in relation to cycling. Cllr White advised that the amendment to the motion was required to set out what the administration had already done and were already doing. Also, the motion committed the Council to a number of actions that it was not currently resourced to do. The Council were entirely reliant on external funding and what external funders wanted to fund. However, the Council were moving to change this situation and there were proposals in the capital programme being considered related to investing money in infrastructure.

Cllr Stone, seconded the motion, adding that the Council were severely constrained by external funders criteria and had to be realistic when organising the budget for this area.

Cllr Morris, spoke of her personal experience of cycling and replacing her car journeys. She described the biggest barrier to cycling as safety and described her experience of motorist behaviours which showed a disregard for cyclists. She spoke about the increase in cycle deaths in Haringey of 17% and how important it was to make cycling safe for all cyclists, regardless of their age. She added that there was a need to make all cycling journey's safe whether for commuting, working, or pleasure by segregating all cycle routes that joined together. There was a need to be ambitious and the Liberal Democrat motion was proposing increasing segregated cycle highways by 30 % in 30 years. Cllr Morris contended that the amendments did not provide a strong message that Haringey was ambitious about cycling and urged Council Members to support the motion unamended.

Councillor Hare, as the mover of the motion, responded to the amendment, contending the significant funding that Haringey had received and poor results of spending of this money. Cllr Hare accepted that the motion was detailed but some of the proposed amendments did not have to be put forward. He felt that the Council needed to do better and get good quality cycling from the north of the borough to the south and to facilitate internal residents having a 15-minute journey to the London's city centre.

The Mayor called on the Chief Whips of the political groups to indicate their member's vote on the amendment. He also asked the independent member to indicate her vote.

The Labour Group Chief Whip, indicated to the Mayor, that the Labour members attending the meeting were in favour of the amendment.

The Liberal Democrat Chief Whip indicated that the Liberal Democrat Members attending the meeting were against the amendment.

Councillor Barbara Blake, Independent Member, indicated that she was in favour of the amendment.

The Amendment to the Motion was AGREED.

The Mayor outlined the Motion as amended, in accordance with CSO 15.8(e)

The Mayor called on the Chief Whips of the political groups to indicate their member's vote on the motion as amended. He also asked the independent member to indicate her vote.

The Labour Group Chief whip indicated to the Mayor that the Labour members attending the meeting were in favour of the motion as amended.

The Liberal Democrat Chief Whip indicated that the Liberal Democrat Members attending the meeting were in favour of the motion as amended.

Councillor Barbara Blake, Independent Member, indicated that she was in favour of the motion as amended.

Motion B as amended was AGREED.

Widening participation in cycling

**Council notes:**

1. That [the Walking and Cycling Commissioner for London](#) has stated that *“More people cycling frees up space on overcrowded buses and trains. It makes our air cleaner. It gives everyone the chance to get around London quickly and affordably. It improves our mental and physical health. It makes our high streets and public places more vibrant. Making it easier to cycle means our city will be a better place to live, to work, to invest in, to raise children in.”*
2. That [data from TfL](#) shows that, prior to the spring lockdown, there were an average 4.6 million daily car trips in London, and of these, 35% (1.6 million) were journeys of under 2km (1.2 miles).
3. That a survey of 16,923 residents across 12 UK cities by [NatCen](#) found that 28% “do not cycle but would like to”. [This number rose](#) to 55% amongst people from ethnic minority groups, 38% for people at risk of deprivation, 36% for women, and 31% for people with disabilities and that safety concerns were particularly acute amongst these groups.
4. That between February and June of this year, the [distance travelled by Lime electric bikes](#) increased by 129% across London, and by 253% on roads where new bike lines were constructed during the COVID-19 pandemic.
5. That [TfL records](#) show that in 2019 there were 126 cyclist casualties on roads in Haringey, a 17% increase on the previous year, and the second highest number across all Outer London boroughs.
6. That the Council’s LIP concedes that *“the borough lacks a coherent cycle network, reducing the ability for people to partake in active travel.”*
7. That [DfT guidance on Cycle Infrastructure design](#) says that *“light segregation adds some protection to a mandatory cycle lane. It can be installed relatively cheaply, for example when routine maintenance and general highway improvements are being carried out.”*
8. That since April 2020, the Council has utilised funding from the Department for Transport to improve the safety of existing cycle lanes in the borough.
9. That the Council’s [Good Economy Recovery Action Plan](#), published in August 2020, has committed the Council to explore a ‘15-minute city’ approach where residents have the facilities, shops, and services they need within walking distance.
10. That the Council is looking for ways to invest our own capital money into walking and cycling infrastructure in this and future financial years, and plan on bringing proposals to that effect to the next Cabinet alongside the Council’s wider budget proposals.
11. That [the vehicle miles travelled on Haringey’s roads](#) has increased by a third since 2010.

**Council believes:**

1. That a modal shift towards cycling, along with other forms of active travel, has enormous potential to improve the wellbeing of Haringey residents, improve the borough’s air quality, and reduce the number of vehicles on the borough’s roads.
2. That these benefits not only accrue to cyclists but to the community as a whole.

3. That as a local authority Haringey should do all it can to promote walking and cycling for the following reasons:
  - a. There is “clear evidence” that segregated routes lead to significant reductions in deaths and serious injuries.
  - b. The impact of obesity and inactivity leads to its own epidemic of disease.
  - c. The fact that road pollution is the “principal source” in the capital of toxic air that causes the early deaths of thousands of Londoners every year.
  - d. The impact on reducing climate change.
  - e. The negative impact of people being unwilling to spend time outside in heavily trafficked neighbourhoods.
4. That Haringey has delivered a range of improvements to existing cycleways in the borough to improve the safety for cyclists and pedestrians. The Council continues to pursue funding opportunities internally and externally to deliver new routes which will continue to increase cycling rates in the borough. A number of issues prevent many of the Borough’s residents from cycling despite their wish to do so. It seems likely that this will be especially so for people from the groups mentioned in Council notes #3.
5. That there must be a fresh focus on ensuring that any Haringey resident who want to cycle feel, and are, safe doing so.

**Council resolves:**

1. To, subject to funding and engagement with relevant stakeholders and residents, roll out temporary cycle lanes on main roads in accordance with the priority routes as set out in Haringey’s draft walking and cycling action plan, so as to ensure the safe movement of people during the current Covid-19 pandemic.
2. To increase the provision of segregated cycle lane in the borough year on year for the next three years, to be further detailed in the draft emerging Walking & Cycling Action Plan.
3. That all future cycle routes in the Borough should abide by the key design principles set out in the DfT’s [“Gear Change: A Bold Vision for Cycling and Walking”](#) that, where possible:
  - a. Cyclists must be separated from volume traffic, both at junctions and on the stretches of road between them.
  - b. Cyclists must be separated from pedestrians.
  - c. Cyclists must be treated as vehicles, not pedestrians.
  - d. Routes must join together; isolated stretches of good provision are of little value.
  - e. Routes must feel direct, logical and be intuitively understandable by all road users.
  - f. Routes and schemes must take account of how users actually behave.
  - g. Purely cosmetic alterations should be avoided.
  - h. Routes should be designed only by those who have experienced the road on a cycle.
4. As many future cycle routes as possible in the Borough must be properly segregated from motor traffic.

5. To utilise/expand the existing Transport Forum to include cycling projects, involving cycling professionals and organisations that would be consulted in an official capacity on all future cycling infrastructure, with any recommendations of the panel incorporated into infrastructure designs.
6. To strengthen our outreach to include groups that have traditionally cycled less to ensure the Council is making effective efforts to increase their access to cycling through training, access to equipment/facilities, sign posting to safe routes etc, so that behavioural change is encouraged with all residents, not just those predisposed to cycling. Examples of the Council's existing outreach projects include:
  - a. The Green Wheels Project - created to engage with the local community and give local residents the opportunity to learn key skills in bicycle maintenance, safety skills riding on public roads and participating in cycle rides to aid health and wellbeing.
  - b. Living Under One Sun (LUOS) – providing cycling and walking activities in Tottenham.
  - c. The Markfield Project – providing structured travel training for up to 7 young people and adults aged 16+ with learning disabilities and autism.
7. To work with residents, businesses, bike hire providers, other boroughs and/or the Mayor of London, to bring a publicly accessible trial bike hire provision to Haringey.
8. That by May 2021, reports should be brought to Cabinet:
  - a) Outlining the work, the Council is already doing in assessing existing cycle routes to see if they fulfil the standards set out in the resolutions #1 and #2 and relevant cycle route design guidance from TfL and the DfT, detailing actions for resolving any identified deficiencies.
  - b) Detailing a plan to reallocate enough road space, currently used for motor vehicle parking, so that it is repurposed for 'cycle corrals' or bike hangars to ensure that it is as easy to securely park as a car where feasible.

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....