

MINUTES OF MEETING Full Council HELD ON Monday, 14th March, 2022, 7.30pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Charles Adje, Peray Ahmet, Dawn Barnes, Patrick Berryman, John Bevan, Barbara Blake, Gideon Bull, Dana Carlin, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Seema Chandwani, Sakina Chenot, Pippa Connor, Eldridge Culverwell, Paul Dennison, Isidoros Diakides, Josh Dixon, Erdal Dogan, Joseph Ejiofor, Scott Emery, Ruth Gordon, Makbule Gunes, Mike Hakata, Bob Hare, Justin Hinchcliffe, Emine Ibrahim, Adam Jogee (Mayor), Peter Mitchell, Liz Morris, Felicia Opoku, Tammy Palmer, Reg Rice, Viv Ross, Yvonne Say, Anne Stennett, Noah Tucker, Matt White and Sarah Williams

81. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Mayor referred to the filming at meetings notice and this was noted by attendees.

82. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The following Councillors provided apologies for absence:

Cllr das Neves

Cllr Peacock

Cllr Rossetti

Cllr Ogiehor

Cllr Adamou

Cllr Amin

Cllr Basu

Cllr Chiriyankandath

Cllr Weston

Cllr Brabazon

Cllr Demir

Cllr Moyeed

Cllr da Costa

Cllr M Blake

Cllr Hearn ,

Cllr Carroll

Apologies for lateness was noted from Cllr Ejiofor.

83. 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 Mayor accepted the following items as late urgent business.

Item 7.1 – Draft Council Calendar of meetings 2022/23, this was to allow further consultation and comment on proposed meeting dates.

Item 7.2 – Changes to Political Groups and changes to Committee Membership - This was to allow political group nominations to a vacant committee position and changes to membership of a committee as a result of changes to political proportionality. The report needs consideration at this meeting to allow positions to be filled for meetings taking place before the end of the municipal year.

Item 10a) Revised Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule - this was late due to consideration at Cabinet on the 8th of March , after the publication of Council papers. This report required agreement to implement the Revised Community Infrastructure Charging Schedule.

Item 10b - Standards Committee report was late to allow finalisation and consultation on the report. There is a need to agree the Member's Allowance Scheme for 2022/23 prior to the 31st of March and agree the extension of the appointment of independent Members to the Standards Committee at an ordinary meeting of the Council, prior to the 30th of June 2022.

10c)The Report from Corporate Committee on Treasury Management midyear update - The Reason for lateness was due to Corporate Committee meeting after the publication of Council papers.

Item 13 Questions and Written Answers - The reason for lateness is 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 14 – Motions - The amendments to motions are not requested until 10am on the day of the Council meeting and we have received an amendment to Motion G which has been published and distributed today as a supplementary pack.

84. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

85. TO APPROVE AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 22 FEBRUARY 2022 AND 1 MARCH 2022

RESOLVED

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on the 22nd of February 2022 and minutes of the meeting held on the 1st of March 2022.

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

The Mayor had recently, on the 1st of March, provided an update on activities and highlighted the following:

- Raised the flag for Commonwealth day at George Meehan House.
- Concert for Ukraine to be held at Holy Innocents Church and councillors encouraged to buy tickets.
- Happy St Patrick's day for the 17th of March.

87. TO RECEIVE THE REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Chief Executive introduced the report which set out the changes to Political groups and sought changes to the Committee memberships of Staffing and Remuneration Committee and the main Licensing Committee. These were set out at paragraphs 4.5 and 4.8.

The Chief Executive further introduced report 7.2 which provided an outline of the draft schedule of meetings for the municipal year 2022/23.

The Assistant Chief Whip MOVED that the reports and recommendations be agreed.

RESOLVED

1. To note the changes to the political composition set out at paragraph 4.3.
2. To agree the resultant changes to Council Committee memberships as detailed in paragraphs 4.5 and 4.8.
3. That the attached schedule of meetings for 2022/23 be noted and comments put forward to Democratic Services Manager.

88. TO RECEIVE THE REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER AND HEAD OF LEGAL SERVICES

The Monitoring Officer had no matters to report on.

89. ELEVENTH ANNUAL CARBON REPORT (2021)

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency moved the report and its recommendations.

RESOLVED

1. That the Eleventh Annual Carbon Report (2021) is published.
2. That Councillors and the Council continue to support carbon reduction and lead action in their community, promoting the importance of reducing carbon emissions whilst increasing prosperity.
3. That the future projects outlined in the Annual Carbon Report and that have been agreed through the HCCAP continue to be delivered, where funding is available or has already been agreed, and that further opportunities to reduce carbon emissions are identified and pursued.

90. TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM THE FOLLOWING BODIES

Report from Cabinet

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Licensing and Planning introduced the report on the Revised Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule and moved the report and recommendations.

RESOLVED

1. To note the Examiner's report on the examination of the partial review of Haringey's Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule, as modified set out at Appendix C of the attached Cabinet report;
2. To note that Members of Strategic Planning Committee endorsed the Revised Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule to take effect on 1 September 2022;
3. That the Revised Haringey Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule be approved and publicised as set out at Appendix D of the attached Cabinet report to take effect on 1 September 2022.

Report from Standards Committee

Standards Committee report on Approval of the Member's Allowance Scheme 2022/23 and Extension of Appointment of Independent Person on Standards Committee

The Standards Committee Chair introduced the report and moved the recommendations.

RESOLVED

1. To revoke the Members Allowance Scheme for 2021/22 as of 31st March 2022;

2. To approve the new Members' Allowances Scheme for the municipal year 2022/23 as set out at Appendix 1 of the attached report.
3. To approve the extended appointment of Lisa Klein as Independent Person, and Stephen Ross as secondary Independent Person under s28(7) of the Localism Act 2011 for a further period of 1 year commencing on 1st July 2022 and ending on 31st of June 2023;
4. To approve the allowance to be paid to the Independent Person, and Secondary Independent person at £1250.00 and £250.00 per annum respectively.

Report from Corporate Committee

Treasury Management Update Quarter 3 –

The Chair of Corporate Committee introduced the report and moved the recommendations.

RESOLVED

1. To note the Treasury Management activity undertaken during the first three quarters of the financial year to 31 December 2021 and the performance achieved which is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.
2. To note that all treasury activities were undertaken in line with the approved Treasury Management Strategy.

91. HARINGEY DEBATE - TEAM HARINGEY : BRINGING OUR PEOPLE TOGETHER

The Mayor welcomed Rabbi David Mason to the meeting to open the debate.

Rabbi Mason spoke about his family's historical roots and how important it was to help other people. He spoke about the coming together of the Haringey Faith Network and how faith was important to team Haringey.

He described the different roles and attributes of a team together with the need to immerse in the diversity of the borough, supporting what team Haringey can offer.

He highlighted that leadership and management were critical to achieve a united Haringey team and a community network strategy was needed to build links and proactively create inclusion.

The Mayor thanked Rabbi Mason for his speech and opened the debate.

Cllr Connor spoke about the co- production of services, referring in particular to Adult Social services, and actively engaging with those that changes will affect, giving them an equal say and working through changes with residents and service users. She spoke about the essential role of co- production in delivering better services. She

hoped that the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel recommendations on co-production would be considered and taken forward by all services.

Cllr Say focused on connecting to local people directly and actively working in the community. She referred to community involvement in foodbanks and importance of mutual aid organisations which were crucial in helping people in the pandemic. She felt that local authorities should continue working with the community, sign posting residents to services.

Cllr Ross spoke about his family background and his mother being homeless as a young child, after the war. His mother and uncle had subsequently been taken into care and separated, meeting many later years. He spoke about the profound effects of separation and being in care, underlining the role of Councillors supporting children in care to ensure that they have the best possible care. Councillors had a key safeguarding role and needed to be champions for looked after children. He spoke about the non-attendance of Labour Councillors at some Corporate Parenting meetings and the need to prioritise these meetings and hear from young people.

Cllr Opoku explained that she had not been able to attend Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee due to meeting clashes. The Mayor suggested ensuring no meeting clashes with the Corporate Parenting Committee in 2022/23 calendar.

Gerry Robinson, Executive Headteacher of the Haringey Learning Partnership, a guest speaker arrived at the meeting at this point and the Mayor invited her to speak.

She spoke about the coming together of the Haringey Learning Partnership and how it became an integral part of Haringey. This provision was a product of de-academisation and had been brought back into local authority and genuinely became important part of Haringey, supporting young people excluded from schools.

She referred to the positive impact the school had had on a particular pupil. He had been missing out on his education and feeling socially not cared about. The school had encouraged the young person to be actively engaged in black history month, resulting in him leading an event, providing him confidence and a feeling of being cared for. This had resulted in a turning point to improving his academic outcome. Gerry underlined the importance of helping young people who feel cast out to feel included and supported.

Gerry spoke about the reduction in permanent exclusions by 77% and also the reduction in the exclusion of young people with black Caribbean heritage by 86%. There had been a concerted effort to tackle exclusions and this involved thinking differently about young people, hearing and seeing them and having a faith in their future. Gerry Robinson hoped that pupils at the Haringey Learning Partnership felt part of the community and feel they are working together with the community and partners to improve their lives.

Cllr Carlin spoke about the responsibility of Councillors, as public servants, to bring residents together. She spoke about the last 18 months and thanked the local community for their support to each other. She referred to Women's Day celebrations and their meaning and significance. She felt that there should be a focus on women's representation in the coming municipal year and referred to the ongoing scrutiny

review of violence against women and girls. Celebrating diversity, inclusion should be a collective goal.

Cllr Morris spoke about importance of strong communities and how she had become a Councillor to help mobilise services. She said that it had been a privilege to serve the community and borough, over the last 8 years. She spoke about the strong sense of community in Highgate helped by businesses, churches and community services coming together. The community in Highgate had been strengthened by working together as a collective in the pandemic and had extended their support to wider community across the borough.

She highlighted that the cost-of-living crisis meant communities would need to continue to work together and the work of food banks would continue to be important. Communities were already coming together and welcoming Ukrainian refugees. She concluded that Councillors had significant responsibility for community working and said goodbye to Councillors and officers and wished them all the best for the future.

Cllr Dogan shared how the administration reached out to communities and referred to: the Council's work in creating community networks, The Community Gold project, taking forward a digital strategy to support residents, and bespoke surgery sessions for communities. He was proud of the achievements of the administration. He thanked current ward colleagues, and highlighted Cllr Basu's commitment to the Council and thanked him for all his support to the Council over many years.

Cllr Hare shared his experience of participating in Planning Sub Committee meetings in the early to mid-2000's and the depoliticisation of Planning meetings which had occurred. He referred to making sure political members are able to work together which was a fundamental element of co-production.

Cllr Barbara Blake spoke about the right of the opposition to challenge the administration, the number of people who contacted her in her difficult times to support her, and about co – production meetings where the community was part of changes planned for the local area.

Cllr Palmer spoke about children and young people being the future of the borough and deserving to be front and centre of thinking. They had experienced an incredibly difficult time over the last 18 months and had to contend with worries over: climate change, unprecedented global uncertainty, Brexit and the Ukraine war. She spoke about Councillors being able to do a range of activities and sharing their skills to help children and young people. She urged councillors to: encourage play schemes in their local areas, bring communities together, lobby for more action on the environment, listen to young voices on climate change, protect green spaces, champion the voices of young people and believe in them and create a borough that is child first.

Cllr Hakata spoke about the recent co-production Parks summit to co-produce the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy. Community led grassroots activity on tackling climate change was key and was glad to raise this issue in the chamber. He felt that this was a present climate change danger given recent flooding issues in the borough. Community action was key in tackling climate change locally and transition to net zero. There was a need to embed environmental targets into decision making and

ensure that Council projects were carbon neutral. He felt that there was an opportunity for new democratic partnership with communities and there must be an offer of a range of routes to participation. He noted that LTN 's were exemplary examples of working with residents and the exemptions policy had been considered at the start of the LTN process.

Cllr Mitchell spoke about Haringey and acknowledged the many people that make it a good place to live. He described the many challenges faced and having good community leaders and volunteers to support residents and the community. He spoke about how quickly mutual aid groups were set up during the pandemic and schools' key role in the community. He was honoured to represent the Woodside ward since 2015, following the death of former councillor ,George Meehan, who had served 40 years on the Council. He commented on the Council having dedicated officers who shared the aims of the Council leadership to tackle inequality.

Cllr Gordon described implementing co-production from the bottom up and referred to her local work involving co-production in Down Lane Park which had opened the door to all communities and it was exciting to see the energy and ideas from residents to rejuvenate the park.

Cllr Berryman spoke about his 8 years on the Council, recent disengagement with virtual meetings, importance of democracy in bringing people together. He spoke about the impact of the pandemic being far reaching and agreed with a focus on team events in Haringey for bringing people together.

The Leader closed the debate , referring to the wealth of community groups and community leaders and their work in making sure all have an equal stake. She felt it was important to consider communities that do not have a voice and ensure the groundwork is completed to ensure no communities were left behind in important changes and policy decisions. She spoke about consultation documents being available in local languages and completing listening exercises with marginalised groups to connect with them. She referred to the wider ambitions of the borough, enabling local areas to work for its residents and that Haringey's strength was its diversity. The administration would continue this work to make the borough stronger. The Leader of the Council thanked all councillors that were standing down for their work in the borough and support to the community.

The Mayor led the chamber in a round of applause for the councillors that were standing down for their support to the Council. He thanked Cllr Mitchell, Cllr Berryman, Cllr Palmer, Cllr Hare and Cllr Morris for service to the community. He further thanked Rabbi Mason and Gerry Robinson for their work in the borough and leading the debate.

92. TO CONSIDER REQUESTS TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS AND/OR PETITIONS AND, IF APPROVED, TO RECEIVE THEM

The Mayor had received one deputation which he had accepted.

The deputation was from Giovanna Iozzi who represented concerned residents forming the North London/Haringey Tree Protectors. They were asking the Council to adopt a more nature-centred approach to its planned 10-year works on wildlife reserve at Parkland Walk.

The Mayor invited Giovanna Iozzi to make her representations.

The deputation outlined that the Council began a 10-year project of works on the Parkland Walk nature reserve. One of the aims was to rebuild several bridges including the Stanhope Road bridge. The deputation contended that the works to date had been detrimental to the nature reserve; eroding surrounding habitats. The works so far had caused the felling of over 100 trees and this demonstrated a lack of ecological care. Overall, it was felt that planners were not using an integrated green approach.

The North London/Haringey Tree Protectors were concerned that further works would fracture the ecological continuity of the nature reserve through using concrete bridges. It was thought that Tollington and Stanhope Road bridges were setting a precedent for the works, turning the nature reserve into an urban walk where user needs superseded ecological stability. In the deputation's view, the bridges did not incorporate ecological design features. For example, the Tollington bridge used self-binding gravel which did not promote biodiversity or plant growth.

The deputation contended that the Stanhope Road bridge would have similarly detrimental effects to the surrounding natural environment, a view which was reflected by residents as 200 objections had been raised to its construction. In addition, the contractors who were building the bridge were not conservationist specialists; therefore, they did not have the requisite skill in construction in relation to a natural asset.

The deputation thought that the works on the nature reserve placed the Council in contravention of the *Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 1986*. This placed a duty on public authorities to have regard for the conservation of biodiversity when delivering their functions. The works so far did not represent regard for the conservation of biodiversity.

The deputation believed that the Council was treating the Stanhope Road bridge as a single amenity, rather than taking a holistic approach which treated the nature reserve as a single amenity; this represented a misinterpretation of planning law. The proposed construction of the Stanhope Road bridge would change the bridge into a busy highway for pedestrians and cyclists, affecting more vulnerable users of the nature reserve.

The construction of Stanhope Road bridge represented an opportunity for the Council to engage in co-production and affirmative change. The North London/Haringey Tree Protectors called on the Council to create a new design for the bridge giving greater weight to ecological considerations. It was felt that a green bridge design, as seen in other parts of the UK, would be a good solution to this issue.

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

- While, the proposed Stanhope Road bridge factored in disability access, it was felt there were other alternative routes that could be improved to give suitable access to the nature reserve. This solution would ensure minimal ecological impact to the nature reserve.

The Mayor invited the Deputy Leader of the Council to respond to the deputation.

The Deputy Leader thanked the deputation for raising the issue, which underlined the importance of protecting nature reserves and preserving an area's biodiversity. He outlined the following points in relation to the planned works at the nature reserve:

- A variety of surveys had been undertaken , such as topographical, tree, root, and radar surveys;
- A strategic overview of all bridges and pathways was undertaken with a view to preserving existing biodiversity, with a co-production approach;
- The works at the nature reserve were ongoing, being subject to improvement and refinement where applicable;
- Accessibility to the nature reserve was non-negotiable and fundamental. It was felt that it was possible to protect and enhance the nature reserves ecology and biodiversity, while promoting equal access; and
- He commended the concept of green bridge design. Encouraging the Council to engage in forms of co-production that accommodated these types of design.

The Mayor thanked the deputation for their representation.

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

In accordance with Council Standing Order 9.1, the Council had received 9 public questions and there was a total time allocation of 20 minutes for public questions.

In accordance with Council standing order 9.2 - the order of questions would be asked in the order that they were received and in accordance with Council Standing Order 9.5 the questioner was only permitted one supplementary question for elucidation purposes.

The Mayor advised that 5 of the questioners are present at the meeting and the remaining 4 questioners would receive a written response.

The Mayor invited Dr Jeremy Klein to put forward his question to the Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Welfare and the Public Realm

Dr Klein asked

On the 10 March 2020 Cabinet considered a new CPZ policy. The Report to Cabinet noted that the Secretary of State for Transport recommends that local authorities should consult on their parking policies. Yet the Cabinet decided to ignore this

guidance and approve the policy as submitted. In practice, the new CPZ policy is deeply flawed, particularly with respect to the consultation process which is insufficiently clear on many points including who is allowed to vote and what validity checks will be undertaken. Does the Cabinet Member not realise that consultation can actually lead to problems being identified and ironed out and will the Cabinet Member explain why she thinks that the residents of this borough should be denied the voice in the formulation of policy that even this government thinks we are entitled to?

The Cabinet Member responded to the question, advising that it is recommended that local authorities should consult on their parking policies, however it was not a requirement to do so, but, in practice, the majority of changes to parking policy were consulted on.

The report presented to Cabinet in March 2020 sought to formalise arrangements for CPZ implementation that had evolved over many years, with updated design principles and a built-in review process. It was not a new policy.

The Cabinet Member did not believe that the policy was flawed as it allowed the community to engage with the Council to help decision-making. However, should any significant change be recommended to this policy in the future, public consultation may be required prior to any formal decisions being taken.

Dr Klein urged for improvements and change to be made to the policy and consider how a new policy can be co-produced with residents

This was agreed with by Cabinet Member.

Mr Michael Williamson put forward the following question.

In a Cabinet meeting on March 10, 2020, it was agreed, as part of the new CPZ policy, that a sub-area of the wider consultation area could be selected, if the majority of those responding in that area favoured parking controls. Given that this was not the case during the previous consultation (November 2017), why was this vitally important change of policy not made clear to residents in the questionnaire used in the current Hornsey North Consultation?

The Cabinet Member responded as follows:

Operationally, prior to the introduction of the CPZ parking policy in 2020, decisions were based on the results of the consultation, with these being detailed on a road-by-road basis and outcomes discussed with ward Councillors.

Any amendments to the proposed CPZ zone were discussed and agreed with ward Councillors' This was how the 'Rectory Gardens CPZ area' was introduced in 2017.

The CPZ Policy introduced in 2020 formalised Haringey's previous CPZ consultation operating procedures. s. This policy is available on our website, but to make this addition clear to residents, future consultations will signpost residents to the CPZ Policy.

There was a supplementary point on the recent consultation showing residents were not in favour of the CPZ and no indication of a sub area being taken forward had been

given. Therefore, would the Council check with residents that they were in favour of this?

The Cabinet Member advised that the Council were yet to publish the results of Hornsey North area CPZ consultation. In the next stage the consultation was statutory and residents would be consulted

Mr Brian Bowles was invited to ask his question.

The question related to the Hornsey North CPZ consultation. The consultation ended on 23 March 2021. Haringey's Consultation Charter states: "At the end of the consultation we will communicate what will happen next, when the results of the consultation will be published, when and by whom the decision(s) on the proposal(s) will be taken, and when the decision(s) will be published". It is now almost 12 months since the completion of the consultation and the entire area of over 30 roads is still awaiting formal acceptance of the result of the consultation by the Council and release of the same. Not only did the Council fail in the above commitments, requests to Councillors for this information have either gone unanswered or were answered without including the information detailed above: to date we have no timetable and no decision. Does the Cabinet Member agree that, in the case of the North Hornsey CPZ consultation, Haringey Council has failed lamentably to honour its commitments as laid out in the Consultation Charter?

The Cabinet Member responded as follows:

The Council aimed to conclude CPZ consultations as quickly as possible. There was no defined period in which that would be done as each consultation differs, with more complex issues to be considered in some situations.

This applied in the case of the Hornsey North consultation. This also needed to be considered in the context of the challenges of undertaking such consultations and delivering a comprehensive parking programme during the Covid-19 pandemic.

The Council had not failed to deliver on its commitments, but instead had carefully considered the outcomes of this consultation and would conclude decision-making in the near future and notify residents of the outcome.

There was a supplementary question on the charter which includes a clause that consultation should be impartial and suggested that the Council make use of the services of an arbiter.

The Cabinet Member noted that these were good suggestions to look at but these could not be agreed at the meeting. However, they could be part of the inbuilt review where also the language of consultation was being considered as there was feedback of misunderstandings.

Lindsay Fowler was invited to put forward her question. This was as follows:

We have been informed by Council officers following an FOI request that the justification for the Hornsey North consultation on whether to introduce a CPZ was in response to a mere two verifiable requests from local residents. (The Parking Projects Manager cited requests by phone and conversations between residents and ward

Councillors as further justification but no formal record was made of these. As such any such conversations should be seen as hearsay with little or no validity in any formal process.) Does this not show that the Hornsey North CPZ consultation was not "resident led" but rather Council led which is contrary to the Council's own Climate Action Plan?

[Note 1. Haringey Climate Action Plan Page 32: "To roll out a resident led CPZ programme and review existing CPZs to ensure that they continue to meet the demands of residents and businesses in order to maximise coverage across the borough, reduce car usage as far as possible and manage visitors to the borough by car.]

The Cabinet Member responded as follows:

The Council had recorded two formal requests from residents for parking controls to be introduced within the Hornsey North Area. The Council started formally recording CPZ requests in September 2019, shortly before the CPZ Policy was finalised and introduced in 2020. There is no formal record of CPZ requests prior to 2019.

The Council had, however, been made aware of increasing pressures in parking experienced by residents, either directly or through Ward Councillors.

A public consultation was undertaken to understand if residents were experiencing parking pressures and whether they support controls. The public consultation was not a mandate to inform residents that a CPZ is to be introduced. Only if there was sufficient support for a CPZ, would it be taken to the statutory consultation stage.

The Council's CPZ policy did state that:

The area of the borough where it is intended to implement parking restrictions will be determined by parking stress surveys and expressions of interest received from residents and agreed by Ward Councillors. Parking occupancy of 80% and above would suggest pressure. Residents of roads on the boundary of an area, who may be at risk of displacement if a CPZ is subsequently implemented, will also be consulted on proposals, and offered the opportunity of inclusion in the zone.

As the proposed Hornsey North CPZ area was bounded on its southern boundary by Hornsey North and Crouch End A CPZs and with Alexandra Palace, introducing paid-to-park facilities across its site, it seemed sensible to consult on CPZ for Hornsey North. Ward Councillors had sight of the draft documents before officers commenced the public consultation. This proposed CPZ was included in the Parking Investment Plan approved by Cabinet in March 2021, details of which were in the public domain.

There was a supplementary question regarding the complaints process as the threshold for taking forward a CPZ was too low and she did not believe that this was resident led.

The Cabinet Member did not agree that this was not resident led as there would be a further consultation and the result would indicate the outcome.

The Mayor invited the representative of Peter Pearce to come forward and put the question to the Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Welfare and the Public Realm.

The following question was put forward:

The CPZ policy adopted by the Council in 2020 states that a 10% response rate is considered adequate and that 51% of that 10% in favour is sufficient for the Council to implement a CPZ. This means that barely more than 5% of households could trigger a CPZ. My street is trying to organise a street party and has been informed that the Council requires that 70% of households agree before permission will be granted. Does this mean that the Council believes a one-day street party will have 14 times more impact on residents than a permanent CPZ?

The Cabinet Member responded as follows:

There was a substantial difference between a CPZ consultation covering a number of roads and the views of many thousands of stakeholders and consultation on a street party. The introduction of controlled parking does not prohibit vehicular traffic to any street.

The public consultation was only the first stage in the delivery of a CPZ and only understands support to progress to the legally required statutory consultation. The request for a street party is a timed event which affects residents' ability to access, park or move their vehicles from that street.

The 70% threshold was set to ensure that the overall majority are in favour of the event, ensuring no substantial detriment to other residents, the likelihood of compliance with the closure and reducing any impact on the safety of residents during the closure period.

There was a supplementary question about Richmond Council which had a 30% threshold and suggestion made to apply the same figure at Haringey, having a higher threshold rather than a low threshold

The Cabinet Member responded that the Council had chosen to formalise the existing practices and conventions in March 2020. This was an interactive process and if significant changes were needed then there would be consultation. The inbuilt review mentioned previously could include consideration of the threshold.

The Mayor thanked the questioners for attending the meeting.

The Mayor had accepted the responses to written questions admitted as late business and the meeting agreed to receive the written question responses as set out in the tabled pack.

Cllr Dennison proposed to close the item 13 and move to item 14 – this was in accordance with CSO 14 (j). This was seconded by Cllr Cawley- Harrison and motion AGREED.

It was noted that responses to written questions would be provided in accordance with CSO 10.5(d).

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

The Mayor advised that both motions G and H would continue to be considered and completed as the item in hand.

The Mayor invited Cllr Palmer to propose her motion, which was Motion G: *Show Us You Care Too*.

Councillor Palmer proposed her motion stating its personal importance to her. She spoke about spending most of her childhood in foster care and was adopted shortly before turning 18 years old. She spoke about struggling to tell others about her experience in care; one of the reasons for this was due to the negative perceptions people had of care leavers. She gave examples from her personal life about times she had been negatively stereotyped due to being in foster care and the impact this had on her mental health.

Cllr Palmer described how she overcame these challenges and had gone to university, had a professional career, and a family. She explained that she found it difficult talking about being a care leaver, while trying to hide the fact that she was a care leaver from certain institutions due to anxiety over negative responses she might encounter.

Stereotypes that she faced during her childhood persisted. She recently overheard people talking negatively about people with care experience. In support of this she cited a recent report from *The Independent Children's Home Association* which showed that children in care homes were treated like criminals rather than victims. She quoted objections to the building of new care homes which demonstrated how children in care were thought of as 'disruptive' and a 'significant risk to neighbours'.

She urged Councillors to consider that people with care experience deserved better. They were underrepresented in every profession and were rarely asked to input or feedback on policies that affected them. She asked the Council to address misconceptions about care leavers through listening, learning, and aiming to understand more about the challenges people with care experience faced.

Councillor Dixon seconded the motion. He summarised that the *Show Us You Care Too* campaign led by the *Together Trust* were lobbying for care experienced people to become the tenth protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010. An understanding of the challenges faced by those with care experience could only be ascertained through centring their lived experience in decision making and broader policy conversation. These challenges were emphasised through government statistics:

- Care leavers were three times more likely not to be in education, employment, or training than other young people;
- In 2017 40% of care leavers aged 19-21 were not in education, employment or training, compared to 13% of the same age group in the general population;
- 25% of homeless people had been in care at some point in their lives; and
- Premature death considered to be much more likely for those with care experience.

He felt that these statistics should not act as confirmation for longstanding biases, rather that society had made inadequate adjustments for this group of people. Only

through proper recognition of the systemic discrimination and the barriers that care leavers face could decision makers begin to make adequate provisions for this group of people.

The Mayor asked if any other members wished to speak to the motion.

Councillor Chandwani spoke about her personal experience of being in care as a teenager. She spoke about being placed in a placement, outside the borough, a significant distance away from her school in Haringey and the consequences this had on her education. She had then also experienced housing issues and was fortunate in finding support in the borough. However, not all care leavers were so fortunate. She believed that assistance for care leavers should not be left to chance and supported the motion for creating a tenth protected characteristic for those with care experience.

Councillor Opoku said that as a corporate parent and member of the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee, she welcomed the motion. She provided examples of where the Council had worked in partnership with businesses and outside bodies to create more optimal outcomes for those with care experience. She welcomed the motion, hoping it would prompt further collaboration between the Council and those with care experience to improve this group's outcomes.

The Leader of the Council thanked Councillor Palmer and Chandwani for sharing their personal stories, particularly for the inspiration they would bring to others. She proposed that the vote on the motion be a recorded vote. The Mayor advised that eight members have to rise to support the motion.

The Mayor invited Councillor Palmer to respond to the speeches. Councillor Palmer thanked all the members who had responded to her motion. She encouraged all members to support the motion. It was acknowledged that if the motion were to go through, Haringey Council would be the first Council to support such a motion and encourage others in the next administration to carry this forward.

Eight Members stood in their place in accordance with CSO 17.4.

The Mayor said there would now be a recorded vote. He asked the Democratic Services & Scrutiny Manager to call each Councillor individually to register their vote.

The Motion was AGREED following a vote with 37 votes in favour of the motion. Members who voted for the resolution were Councillors: Adje, Ahmet, Barnes, Berryman, Bevan, Barbara Blake, Bull, Carlin, Cawley-Harrison, Chandwani, Chenot, Conner, Culverwell, Dennison, Diakides, Dixon, Dogan, Ejiofor, Emery, Gordon, Gunes, Hakata, Hare, Hinchcliffe, Ibrahim, Mitchell, Morris, Opoku, Palmer, Rice, Ross, Say, Stennett, Tucker, White, Williams, and Jogee.

RESOLVED

Motion G: Show Us You Care Too
Proposer: Councillor Tammy Palmer
Seconder: Councillor Josh Dixon

Council notes that:

- Care experienced people face significant barriers that impact them throughout their lives;
- Despite the resilience of many care experienced people, society too often does not take their needs into account;
- Care experienced people often face discrimination and stigma across housing, health, education, relationships employment and in the criminal justice system;
- Care experienced people often face a postcode lottery of support;
- As corporate parents, Councillors have a collective responsibility for providing the best possible care and safeguarding for the children who are looked after by us as an authority;
- All corporate parents should commit to acting as mentors, hearing the voices of looked after children and young people and to consider their needs in any aspect of Council work;
- Councillors should be champions of our looked after children and challenge the negative attitudes and prejudice that exists in all aspects of society;
- The Public Sector Equality Duty requires public bodies, such as Councils, to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, and victimisation of people with protected characteristics; and
- In March 2021, the Independent Review into Children's Social Care began its work.

Council believes that:

- Care experienced people are an oppressed group who face discrimination;
- Councils have a duty to put the needs of oppressed people at the heart of decision-making through co-production and collaboration; and
- Services and policies should be assessed through Equality Impact Assessments to determine the impact of changes on people with care experience.

Council resolves:

- To formally support the Show Us You Care Too campaign which calls for care experience to be made a protected characteristic as part of the Independent Review into Children's Social Care;
- For the Council to proactively seek out and listen to the voices of care experienced people when developing new policies based on their views;
- To continue to build on the existing ringfenced apprenticeship opportunities for care experienced people by committing to an agreed number of apprenticeships places each year delivered through the Council's levy funding; and
- To take an intersectional approach and commit to tackling the systemic discrimination and disproportionality faced by specific groups of care experienced people.

The Mayor asked the Deputy Leader of the Council to propose his motion, which was Motion H: Addressing the cost-of-living crisis through reducing energy bills.

The Deputy Leader proposed his motion. He summarised that the cost-of-living crisis and the energy price crisis were a product of mismanagement and corruption. It was important to act locally and protect residents.

Councillor Barbara Blake formally seconded the motion. She flagged that the UK would endure the biggest cost-of-living crisis in thirty years, an issue seemingly ignored by central government. Inflation was at 5% and rising, energy tariffs were escalating, tax rises were impending, and benefits were being cut. This had led to experts claiming that a significant number of people would be living slightly better off than destitute. It was important to support the motion to recognise the challenges that working people and the vulnerable face.

The Mayor outlined that he had received an amendment in accordance with Council Standing Orders. He called on Councillor Emery to move the amendment, which had been second by Councillor Dennison.

Councillor Emery spoke about the energy and cost-of-living crisis being created by the Conservative government. Inflation had been spiralling out of control for months, the Conservative government had failed to create necessary green infrastructure and seemingly did not care about the poorest groups in Britain. Since the disbanding of the Coalition government renewable energy output had decreased. Currently the Conservative government had responded to the energy crisis through a loan. This was distributed regressively excluding the poorest groups in society. The Conservative government had ignored calls led by the Liberal Democrats for a windfall tax on north sea oil and gas to cut residents energy bills.

Cllr Emery emphasised that this issue needed to be dealt with nationally through an emergency budget. Locally he proposed to bring forward the plans to insulate Council homes by five years and insulate Council buildings a year earlier. Accelerating these time frames would make a significant difference for families needing to heat their homes. Additionally, he proposed greater transparency on actions against rogue property owners who had not fulfilled their obligations on insulating their properties. Alongside this there was a need to improve transparency on tracking Council home efficiencies.

Councillor Dennison highlighted that the solutions to the energy crisis were better insulated homes and decreasing dependence on fossil fuels. EDF were raising the cost of their bills by 54%. Labour and Liberal Democrats were united in calling for a windfall tax on north sea oil and gas companies. It was important that motion did more than condemn the Conservative government. It was important to support the amendment to the motion that was focused on what the Council can do to support residents.

A short debate was taken forward.

Councillor Ibrahim highlighted the importance of the issue of inflation and impact on everyday food prices and how it was the lowest cost foods that were steeply increasing in price. There were tangible responses to inflation, including the cost of prepayment energy metres, which often effected the poorest families in the borough. Overall, inflation impacted the poorest in society most.

Councillor Williams stated that central government had failed to regulate the energy market, effectively tax north sea oil and gas companies, and had not adequately

insulated homes. Haringey Council had mitigated some of these effects through groups such as *Haringey Here to Help* and *Haringey Support Fund*. The Council did not have the resources to tackle the cost-of-living crisis alone, there was a need for central government to act to mitigate adverse outcomes for residents.

Councillor Gordon stressed that since the privatisation of energy companies' prices had increased exponentially. The motion was important in order to emphasise the intolerability of price rises for residents in the borough.

The Mayor invited Deputy Leader to respond to the amendment. The Deputy Leader highlighted that the amendment had been received on the day of the meeting. Therefore, it was not possible to examine the operability of the amendment. It was stressed that the Council had one of the most ambitious retrofitting programmes nationally.

There was a vote on the amendment to the motion, 13 in favour of the amendment, 24 against and no abstentions.

The amendment to the motion was NOT AGREED.

There was a vote on the original motion, 37 in favour, none against and no abstentions.

The motion was AGREED.

RESOLVED

Motion H: Addressing the cost-of-living crisis through reducing energy bills

Proposed by: Cllr Mike Hakata

Seconded by: Cllr Barbara Blake

This Council believes:

- The Conservative government has failed to protect working families from unprecedented rises in energy bills;
- The Conservative government have failed to regulate our energy market properly with dozens of firms going bust, leaving Haringey residents to foot the bill;
- The Conservative government has failed to meet Britain's renewable energy potential;
- The Conservative government has failed to produce a comprehensive national strategy for insulating homes;
- The government needs to do more to protect Haringey residents from the rise in cost of energy bills; and
- Nationalisation of (at least parts of) the energy sector would democratise and decarbonise our energy systems and reduce energy bills for residents.

This Council notes:

- Haringey residents are facing an unprecedented cost of living rise, with some of our residents having to choose between buying food or heating their homes;
- On 1 April, UK fuel poverty is set to triple overnight to 6.3 million households;

- Haringey Council has introduced extensive financial support for residents struggling with the cost of living; - In a poorly insulated property in Haringey, up to £1 of every £3 spent on heating is being wasted due to heat loss;
- The Haringey Here to Help scheme is designed to ensure that Haringey residents get all the help and support available to them, including the Haringey Support Fund which supports residents facing unexpected costs;
- Haringey Council has adopted Employer's Requirements that ensures all our new Council Homes are Zero Carbon from start to finish. All new developments will be built to Passivhaus principles using low carbon heat sources and renewables which will result in low energy bills for residents;
- Haringey Council is working towards its ambition to fully insulate all of our Council Homes by 2035, and all of our core corporate buildings by 2027;
- These measures Haringey Council has taken so far will not only reduce energy bills, but also helps tackle the climate emergency by reducing carbon emissions;
- Roughly one third of Haringey residents live in the private rented sector, which limits residents' access to a well-insulated home;
- MPs voted against a Labour motion to introduce legislation that would cut the VAT on energy; and
- Labour has a plan for tackling the rise in energy bills, including a windfall tax on North Sea Oil and Gas; and measures to reduce bills to save most households £200, with extra support for pensioners, low earners, and the squeezed middle who will receive up to £600 off energy bills.

This Council resolves:

- To continue to support residents who are struggling with high energy bills;
- To investigate ways that the Council can provide even more financial support for household bills;
- To investigate ways to help more residents in the private rented sector insulate their homes;
- To ask the Leader of the Council to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy to request the following:
 - o That the government provide immediate financial support for residents struggling to afford energy bills by introducing a one-off windfall tax on North Sea Oil and Gas producers who have profited from the energy price rises;
 - o That the government regulate the energy market effectively to prevent huge increases in energy bills;
 - o That the government take a long-term approach to lowering energy bills, including:
 - Reducing Britain's reliance on imported gas by accelerating home grown renewables;
 - Undertaking a national home insulation strategy which takes into account the private rented sector and encourages landlords to insulate properties they rent; and
 - Taking practical steps to nationalise some or all of the energy sector, with the aim of providing affordable energy for all.

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair

Date