

MINUTES OF MEETING Full Council HELD ON Monday, 17th January, 2022. – 7.35pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Peray Ahmet, Dawn Barnes, Patrick Berryman, John Bevan, Barbara Blake, Zena Brabazon, Dana Carlin, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Sakina Chenot, Pippa Connor, Eldridge Culverwell, Nick da Costa, Lucia das Neves, Julie Davies, Paul Dennison, Josh Dixon, Erdal Dogan, Scott Emery, Ruth Gordon, Makbule Gunes, Bob Hare, Justin Hinchcliffe, Emine Ibrahim, Adam Jogee (Mayor), Peter Mitchell, Liz Morris, Julia Ogiehor, Tammy Palmer, Sheila Peacock, Reg Rice, Viv Ross, Alessandra Rossetti, Yvonne Say, Noah Tucker, Matt White and Sarah Williams

56. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Mayor referred to the notice of filming at meetings set out at agenda item 1 and the meeting noted this information.

57. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were from:

Cllr Adamou

Cllr Adje

Cllr Amin

Cllr Basu

Cllr M Blake

Cllr Bull

Cllr Carroll

Cllr Chiriyankandath

Cllr Demir

Cllr Diakides

Cllr Hakata

Cllr Hearn

Cllr James

Cllr Moyeed

Cllr Opoku

Cllr Stennett

Cllr Stone

Cllr Tabois
Cllr Weston

58. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest put forward.

59. TO CONSIDER REQUESTS TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS AND, IF APPROVED, TO RECEIVE THEM

There were no deputations in relation to the agenda item.

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

The Mayor called on Cllr Emery to propose Motion E.

Cllr Emery spoke about residents living in severe deprivation in North East London between Enfield and Haringey. These residents were socio -economically disadvantaged and had much higher health issues and faced health inequalities made much worse due to the levels of pollution. Cllr Emery contended that this was not a good area to have a waste incinerator and would cause long term harm to local residents. He spoke about the commitments made to manage the new incinerator emissions and protection of local residents and referred to a similar incinerator plant in Copenhagen which now imported waste from hundreds of miles to make the site financially viable and felt that this issue will be faced here and the capacity of the incinerator being built was an indication of this. There seemed to be no consideration of a future reduction in waste being given and whether this plant would be needed given the commitments being made in the Climate Action Plan.

Cllr Emery felt that the promised modern efficient facilities to enable reduction in nitrous oxide were a distraction and there would likely be burning of plastic with waste which would increase air pollution in the local area. This would be further exacerbated with the increase in vehicles in the area, bringing waste to the plant.

He challenged the decision to build an incinerator in one of the poorest parts of London and referred to local residents also being opposition to this new plant. Cllr Emery referred to other voices speaking against the incinerator and advocating better recycling, electricity and gas generated through wind and heat pumps.

He concluded by urging councillors to consider that a better future was through waste reduction , rather than building an expensive incinerator which could be unused in future years.

Cllr Palmer seconded the motion, outlining that climate change was a social issue and making a continued case about fairness. The poorest communities suffered from climate change. She referred to 28 waste incinerators being located in 20% of the most deprived and ethnically diverse areas in the UK.

Cllr Palmer spoke about the decision-making power of the administration and their responsibility in relation to this social justice issue. She challenged the administration's record for responding to this local issue when the Council had committed to the Climate Change Action Plan.

The Mayor had received an amendment to this motion and called on the Leader of the Council to move the amendment.

The Leader of the Council spoke about the administration making sure the new incinerator plant was safe for local residents and outlined that she had twice written to the North London Waste Authority. This was to firstly ask for a pause and review and a second time to urge for use of greener technology and ambitious recycling initiatives for Haringey. She emphasised that Cabinet colleagues on the North London Waste Authority Board had decided not to vote for award of this contract and many Labour colleagues has been working closely with campaigners on this local issue.

The amendments to the motion seek to intend that the meeting has a focus to formally note the Council's commitment to holding the facility to the highest environmental standards. The administration would campaign for the NLWA to accelerate carbon capture and prepared to the storage element of the plant and to reduce carbon emissions.

The Leader continued to outline:

- the need to boost low recycling rates in the borough and London,
- involving all residents in the green economy,
- neighbourhood recycling strategies reflecting local circumstances,
- co-producing a new joint waste management strategy,
- protecting the local community around Edmonton, and a campaign to stop using plastics.

The Leader of the Council was committed to holding the NLWA to account and working with residents to build a greener and fairer Haringey.

Cllr Ibrahim seconded the amendment to Motion E, outlining the alternatives involved and the important issues being considered for the future of the planet. She spoke about the Beddington incinerator in Sutton and the local opposition to this and the residents' concerns in Edmonton about their health and the health of their children.

She spoke about climate emergency and how the Council had not supported the incinerator and highlighted the Council's commitment to regional recycling targets and questioned why carbon capture was not being built into the storage facilities of the new plant.

She concluded by calling for the review of democratic arrangements that created the North London Waste Authority and had caused local people to feel that they do not have a say in this key local issue.

The Mayor opened the debate.

Cllr Rossetti spoke about the All Parliamentary Group report and that the emerging evidence was not supporting the increase in incineration in London. She called for pause and reflection to not allow excess capacity to drive burning of waste. She

welcomed the Leader's letter to the NLWA, calling for a pause and review, but felt that the motion stepped back from this and called for further discussions with local groups and NLWA to find an alternative solution to the incinerator and not just take forward recycling initiatives. There were alternatives which were outlined by the deputation at the November Council meeting as well as taking forward improvements locally to recycling rates.

Cllr Carlin spoke about the Council standing up to the North London Waste Authority and Haringey members of the board not supporting the incinerator plan. There were concerns about the measures to reduce emissions and commitments made by the Leader of the Council which were important for working with other London authorities to: have mitigation measures, hold the NLWA to account, and do more with recycling, ensuring that minimum waste going to the incinerator .

Cllr Ross referred to All Parliamentary Group's expert and medical associated membership who had called for a moratorium on expansion of incinerators and for there to be a stop of the burning of recyclable waste. He referred to local politicians and North London stakeholders who had asked for to pause and review. He highlighted that the decisions were being taken forward by councillors of other London boroughs and who will not be affected by the emissions and called for the motion to be agreed unamended.

Cllr Williams spoke about the accumulated waste produced by the seven London boroughs and spoke about landfill producing carbon which is harmful and reflecting that many councillors had researched the matter seriously and knew the issues. She accepted that recycling rates were reducing and pandemic had caused an expansion in waste and there were real problems to face that affected residents and children. She felt that it was important to reduce waste and this was not just by recycling more but taking responsibility which the Haringey members of the NLWA had done.

Cllr Hinchcliffe reflected on the protests against the incinerator decision which should have given the NLWA pause for thought. This also showed that there had been little done to assure local communities and more effort given by the NLWA to informing and assuring the north London council councillors to support the decision. He referred to incineration having more of a hazardous environmental impact than landfill. He spoke about the emissions from heavy vehicles to the plant, causing more air pollution to local residents and that residents had not heard of any mitigation for these eventualities. Cllr Hinchcliffe continued to speak about the permanent damage caused by harmful pollutants to children and living near main roads and densely populated areas.

Cllr Berryman reflected on the significant increases in household waste and that recycling rates had dropped. There was a need to assess where 2 million resident's waste was going to be disposed and supported holding the meeting to consider this issue. The motion was not supported and concerns should be highlighted that the incinerator should not burn other Council's waste.

Cllr White reflected that the main argument for the increased capacity of the incinerator was to be able to contend with increased non-recyclable waste which may last many decades. This was felt to be too passive an approach and with better

sorting of waste the amount of recycling would increase and less waste needed in the incinerator. He spoke about the Council coming up with better ways of helping to sort rubbish and achieve higher recycling of waste instead of assigning this responsibility to residents. There was a need to invest in technology and unionised staff to support sorting of waste together with a campaign for manufacturers to use recycled or composed materials for packaging. These actions would help to reduce non-recyclable waste to nearly zero . It was necessary to address the climate emergency and a better way forward than estimating on failure to not meet recycling rates whilst improving an incinerator with a lifespan of 50 to 70 years.

Cllr White spoke further about the democratic oversight and disconnect of the NLWA and referred to their activities on burning waste at a profit to sell energy produced to the electric grid and need to be able to make local strategic decisions to meet the actions to respond to the climate emergency.

Cllr Emery, responded to the debate and set out the following:

- All councillors in the meeting had the power to make a difference and vote in favour of the motion, unamended, to continue the campaign against the incinerator.
- Important to vote on this issue and although noting that the 2 voting members of Haringey had voted against the incinerator, this had not been reflected in their comments during the debate at the NLWA meeting.
- Questioned consistency of arguments between Beddington and Edmonton incinerators.
- Many groups do not want the incinerator.
- Pause and review means voting in favour of the motion unamended.
- Closeness of Northumberland Park residents to the incinerator and the likely plume of pollution.
- Recycling less was the borough's failure
- Deputation taken to the NLWA and disregarding behaviour of the chair to the issues raised.
- Hoped that the issue of capping any other waste from other boroughs being incinerated is taken forward.
- Need to listen to wide range of voices, including medical professionals about their concerns for increasing incinerator capacity and health impact of pollution.
- Noted no mixed recycling facility currently at Edmonton.

There was a vote on the amendment to motion put forward by the Leader of the Council and seconded by Councillor Ibrahim.

20 in favour

15 against

1 abstention

The amendment to the motion was AGREED.

Before moving to a vote on the substantive motion, and in accordance with CSO15.8 (e) Cllr Emery proposed a further amendment to the amended motion. After further considering the Labour amendment there was felt to be a lot of good issues raised such as efforts to improve recycling rates, the joint waste strategy from the NLWA and further air quality monitoring. However, he proposed that there must be a fixed position on a pause and review. The further amendment allowed for the additions made by the first amendment by the Leader and Cllr Ibrahim but in addition allowed the Council to formally request to pause and review before going ahead with the incinerator.

Cllr Palmer seconded the further amendment put forward, adding that as a local resident she had not been consulted on the incinerator and administration had until recently been silent on this issue.

The Mayor paused the meeting to allow the second amendment to be circulated and read by councillors.

A named vote was requested with 8 councillors standing in their place.

In response to Cllr Rice's query, there was to be a named vote on the second amendment put forward and no debate.

Cllr Peacock was provided with the amendments to the motion.

Cllr Davies was concerned that the second amendment put forward still deleted parts of the 1st amendment, just agreed, and needed further time to read through the length of the amendments to feel confident on voting on this. She sought advice from the Monitoring Officer if it was possible to move changes to an amendment to a motion just passed.

The Mayor clarified that the substantive motion had not yet been voted on and CSO15.8(e) and 15.12 (b) allowed further amendment to be put. If the further amendments were not agreed with then the response was to vote this down.

Cllr Ibrahim queried whether parts of the motion which had just been amended could be altered and voted on again.

Cllr Ogiehor – commented that the amendments were clearly set out in track changes in the tabled paper.

The Monitoring Officer responded that the Council should proceed to vote on the further amendments as the substantive motion had not been voted upon. If these further amendments were not agreed with then the Council would proceed to vote on the first amended motion as the substantive motion as set out by the Mayor.

The Chief Whip sought further clarification and the Monitoring Officer outlined that 15.8 (e) allows for further amendments to be put the motion. Again as the meeting had not voted on the substantial motion, this was allowed.

The Mayor interrupted the Leader and Cllr Ogiehor and asked for a vote on the second amendment moved by Cllr Emery and seconded by Cllr Palmer.

There were 15 in favour of amendment Councillors: Barnes, Cawley – Harrison, Chenot, Connor, da Costa, Dennison , Dixon, Emery, Hare, Hinchcliffe, Morris, Ogiehor, Palmer, Ross and Rossetti.

There were 20 against - Councillors: Ahmet, Berryman, Bevan, B Blake, Brabazon, Carlin, das Neves, Davies, Dogan, Gordon, Gunes, Ibrahim, Mitchell, Peacock, Rice, Tucker, White, Say, Williams and Jogee.

1 abstention, Councillor Culverwell

The second amendment to MOTION E was LOST.

The Mayor continued to seek a vote on the substantive motion as first amended by Cllr Ahmet and Cllr Ibrahim.

20 were in Favour

15 Against

1 abstention

Motion E as amended was AGREED.

Motion E

Work with the NLWA and our communities to ensure the Edmonton Energy Recovery Facility meets the highest environmental standards

Proposer: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Secunder: Councillor Emine Ibrahim

Council notes that:

- Haringey has declared a Climate Emergency, and has committed to becoming net-zero carbon by 2041;
- There has been some initial engagement with residents by the Council and the North London Waste Authority (NLWA), including a formal consultation in 2015, a community roadshow in St Anne's library in November 2021, and a roundtable with environmental campaigners in December 2021;
- The North London Heat and Power Project, including the new energy recovery facility (ERF) and new recycling infrastructure will cost £1.22bn (in line with the programme budget). Haringey and the other boroughs will pay for this through the annual levy which is expected to increase to pay for the modern, better facilities. Residents will therefore rightly expect thorough and transparent fiscal accountability; There have been feasibility-planning, design and business case work undertaken on the inclusion of Carbon Capture Use and Storage. The NLWA has put forward a timeline for the inclusion of the technology which states it can be implemented by mid-2030s;
- In 2020/21, Haringey had a recycling rate of just 31.2%, down from 37.4% in 2014/15, which is unsustainably low;

- The London Assembly noted in February 2018 that incinerators can negatively affect long-term recycling rates, but Haringey is strongly committed to, at the very minimum, meeting the Mayor of London's 50% local authority recycling rate by 2030;
- 10,000 premature deaths are already linked to poor air quality each year in London, and 98% of the city's schools are in areas where air pollution exceeds World Health Organisation limits;
- Studies show that continued exposure to excessive levels of air pollution stunts lung growth in children and worsens chronic diseases. Evidence on the links between incineration and birth outcomes is inconclusive and requires further study. Emissions from the new Edmonton plant will be far lower than those from plants considered in recent studies, as well as much lower than the plant that is currently in place;
- The immediate community surrounding the Edmonton site live in one of the most deprived wards in Enfield, with a large Black Asian and Minority Ethnic population who are already more likely to suffer poorer than average health outcomes due to a number of socioeconomic disadvantages and systemic inequality. This is compounded by proximity to the North Circular (A406), which has one of the highest levels of air pollution in the country;

The Leader of Haringey Council wrote to the NLWA to request they consider a pause and review of the project in order to investigate the possibility of implementing Carbon Capture technology sooner, and to work more closely with the council and Haringey residents to improve local recycling rates and create a more circular economy. Council believes that:

- Industrialised nations like the United Kingdom have a responsibility to reduce their carbon emissions more drastically than developing countries;
- There is no current good alternative to burning non-recyclable waste at the volumes North London produces;
- The future of our country must rely on a circular economy, with an increased focus on reducing waste and increasing recycling; it is Haringey's ambition to, at a minimum, meet the Mayor of London's target of 65% municipal recycling rate and 50% local authority recycling rate by 2030;
- The Council continues to work with the NLWA and trade unions to ensure that the socioeconomic and environmental benefits of the scheme are successful. This includes good local jobs and apprenticeships; the Energy from Waste generated by the plant which will supply heat and electricity to local homes and be part of our move away from burning fossil fuels; and new and improved recycling facilities.

Council resolves to:

- Continue to insist that the NLWA accelerate the Carbon Capture and Storage element of the plans, and lobby other boroughs to do the same;
- In line with the letter sent by the Leader of the Council to the NLWA on 17 January 2022, to work with the NLWA and other relevant parties to ensure the following:

- That the NLWA work proactively with elected members and residents of the boroughs to convene a recycling working group and develop a neighbourhood recycling strategy, the aims of which will be to help Haringey reach the Mayor of London’s recycling target of 65% municipal recycling rate and 50% local authority recycling rate by 2030;
- That the NLWA provide funding to further the aims of the hyper-local schemes devised by the working group, as well as other local non-profit organisations aimed at increasing recycling rates;
- That the NLWA work with Councils and residents to develop and implement a new Joint Waste Management Strategy for North London which produces a less waste, more circular reuse and recycling programme which minimises the amount of waste we produce whilst maximising the amount we recycle;
- That the NLWA set up a framework for co-producing an updated Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan;
- That the NLWA work with the Council to continue to ensure the maximisation of the social value (i.e. good jobs and apprenticeships) and value for money for Haringey residents;
- That the NLWA work with the council to address the concerns of the immediate community, monitor any impact that the plant (including its construction) may have on the quality of life of the residents, and undertake a significant greening strategy that will improve the lives of the residents, whose quality of life is already heavily impacted by living near to the A406;
- That the NLWA work with the Council and other authorities to run a specific campaign aimed at dramatically reducing the sale and use of plastic packaging.
- Begin a conversation across London Local Government on methods to address the democratic and accountability challenges presented by the historic establishment of the waste authority arrangements that followed the abolition of the Greater London Council.

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair

Date