

MINUTES OF MEETING Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Thursday, 3rd March, 2022, 6.30 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Scott Emery, Dana Carlin and Yvonne Say

ALSO ATTENDING: Ian Sygrave (Co-Optee)

128. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted the information contained therein'.

129. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Ogiehor, Cllr Bull and Cllr Amin.

Cllr Yvonne Say attended as a substitute for Cllr Amin.

130. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

131. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

132. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

133. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting on 14th December 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

134. UPDATE ON FLY TIPPING STRATEGY

The Panel received a report which provided an update on the work being done to meet Borough Plan commitments around reducing fly tipping in the borough. The

report was introduced by Beth Waltzer, Community Safety, Enforcement & Waste Manger and Brian Ellick Head of ASB & Enforcement. The report was included in the agenda pack at pages 11-22. The following arose during the discussion of this agenda item:

- a. The Panel questioned whether the amount of fly tipping increased in the second week of the waste collection cycle and queried the extent to which fly tipping was partly caused by people's black bins being full. In response, the Cabinet Member for Transformation and Public Realm Investment advised that Haringey still undertook weekly collections for recycling, whilst many other boroughs did not. It was estimated that 80% of the waste collected in the borough was able to be recycled and that there was more work to be done to educate residents about what items could and could not be recycled.
- b. The Cabinet Member set out that there was no data to support the link between flytipping with bin collection cycles. The areas where this was most likely to be a factor was areas with high concentrations of HMOs and the Panel was reassured that enforcement officers monitored these areas and would liaise with HMO landlords to increase bin capacity if that was required.
- c. The Panel sought assurances about how the Council could better educate residents about collection times. In response, the Panel was advised that the Council had a rolling cartoon on Facebook that provided key information about what items could be recycled and that some external funding had been secured to do this. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that it was a confusing landscape, with different boroughs able to recycle different items. It was also acknowledged that some people would never be engaged with recycling their waste properly.
- d. The Cabinet Member advised the Panel that the team was undertaking some work with Birbeck to undertake a behaviour study of HMO residents. The Panel was also advised that the government changes being introduced in 2024/25, such as a return deposit scheme, would change the whole recycling landscape.
- e. The Chair of the LCSP commented that walking down Green Lanes, it was easy enough to ascertain which were the problem properties as they were the ones with overflowing bins. It was suggested that these properties should be targeted and that the Council should adopt a firm approach with these problem properties. It was suggested that asking landlords to have a small notice board at the front door of their properties which set out the waste collection arrangements would likely help. In response, officers advised that as part of the HMO licensing process they were able to mandate conditions on the license about ensuring that landlords properly informed their tenants of waste collection arrangements.
- f. The Chair of the LCSP welcomed the introduction of black boxes in Green Lanes and commented that they had worked well so far. The Panel requested that the boxes were cleaned regularly to prevent them smelling. In response, the Cabinet Member acknowledged that there was provision in the budget to ensure that these were cleaned regularly.
- g. The Panel also suggested that some consideration be given as to where these were located in relation to restaurants and with a view to existing street clutter being removed if needed. In response, the Cabinet Member commented that they tried not to locate the black boxes outside restaurants

and health centres and that they had also had a series of meetings with traders in Green Lanes to agree the best locations for these.

- h. The Chair enquired whether black boxes could also be located in areas of high population density as well as flats above shops. In response the Cabinet Member suggested that this was a possibility but that she believed that it was important to understand the reasons behind why bins were overflowing and whether there were potentially bigger issues at play, on a case by case basis.
- i. The Cabinet Member also advised that Haringey was ensuring that waste storage was a consideration at the planning stage for new developments in the borough.
- j. The Chair commented that there had been a real improvement in relation to waste and recycling issues in the borough and that, in her opinion, Haringey was looking a lot better than some other London boroughs.

RESOLVED

That the Panel noted the performance to date and the progress against Borough Plan commitments.

135. UPDATE ON PARKING MANAGEMENT IT SYSTEM

The Panel received a verbal presentation, which provided an update on the new Parking Management IT System. The presentation was introduced by Mark Stevens, AD for Direct Services as set out in the tabled papers published on the website at pages 1 to 14. The Cabinet Member for Transformation and Public Realm investment was also present for this agenda item. The following arose during the discussion of this presentation:

- a. The Chair recounted her own experience of trying to use the PMIS to purchase visitor permits for parking. The Chair advised that she found this process to be unnecessarily difficult and requested that visitor permits should be clearly labelled and be front and centre, as the most sought after permit. The Chair also commented that she got stuck in a feedback loop and queried why users had to re-enter their address details after the first time.
- b. In response the Cabinet Member advised that the Council had used the Civica system for 13 years and that to some extent this could be explained by people just being used to the old system. The Cabinet Member advised that there were only four companies that could provide an online parking IT solution and that Taranto were used by a number of other local authorities and that their system had been developed in conjunction with feedback from a number of other boroughs. The term 'vouchers' was used by Taranto rather than 'visitor permits'. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that the Council had to be consistent in the terminology it used and that work needed to be done with the Communications team and other to make sure there was consistency.
- c. In relation to the point raised about having to re-enter address details, the Cabinet Member advised that this should not be the case and that the system should remember address details. The Cabinet Member advised that she would add this to the issue log they had with Taranto.
- d. Officers advised that they were working with Taranto to make changes to the platform and that they were also encouraging Taranto to bring the timescales forwards for when those changes would be made.

- e. The Cabinet Member commented that there were 177k visitor permits issued in a year and that upon further investigation, it was apparent that a chunk of these permits were for people receiving care at home and who might receive 20/30 transactional visits a week. The Cabinet Member advised that Cabinet were in the process of providing a free transferable permit for carers.
- f. In response to a question, officers advised that anyone who came into a Customer Service Centre would receive an assessment to see if they could use online payments/permits, including offering public access computers. However, if this was not suitable, then paper permits would be offered. The Panel was advised that there was no age limit for paper permits and that it was based entirely upon an individual's circumstances.
- g. The Chair made a plea that the word 'visitor' was added to the front end of the website for purchasing vouchers/visitor permits. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that this was one of the top ten issues that the Council was progressing with Taranto but that it was lower down the order than some other key issues. It was suggested that the system was issuing 35k-40k permits a month and that on the whole it was working effectively.
- h. The Chair emphasised that they system needed to be as easy to use as possible and that people were used to doing a whole range of things online, consequently if the system was not easy to use then people would just stop using it. Officers advised that there were three different services working on this project to make the system as user friendly as possible.

RESOLVED

That the update on the Parking Management IT System was noted.

136. Q&A WITH THE CABINET MEMBER FOR CUSTOMER SERVICE, WELFARE AND THE PUBLIC REALM

The Panel had a verbal Q&A session with Cllr Seema Chandwani, the Cabinet Member for Transformation and the Public Realm, on issues relating to her portfolio. Mark Stevens, AD for Direct Services was present for this item along with Simon Farrow, Head of Parks and Leisure. The following arose during the discussion of this agenda item:

- a. The Cabinet Member advised that she had a number of reports coming up for Cabinet/Cabinet Member decision. These were the Highways and Street Lighting Investment Plan; Road Danger Reduction Plan; Flooding Investment Plan; and the Parking Management Plan. It was noted that within the Parking Management Plan there would be provisions to provide free parking permits for carers and also the scraping of the £10 replacement fee for stolen Blue Badges.
- b. The Panel asked questions around noise nuisance and the Chair of the LCSP described a recent incident in which a family affected by noise nuisance had been passed back and forth between the police and the Council with neither organisation taking satisfactory responsibility for dealing with it. The person in question was directed to an out of hours recorded message when they phoned

the Council and subsequently began regularly reporting the issue during the daytime. It was reported that it took around a month for a Noise Officer to witness the nuisance and that the Abatement Notice had not yet been issued. In response, the Cabinet Member noted that the issue of noise nuisance was under Cllr Dogan's portfolio but that it sounded as though the complainant had initially been directed through the out of hours call centre. It was noted that the Noise Service was orientated towards nuisance at weekends and only operated Thursday to Sunday. The Cabinet Member advised that she would look into setting up a community trigger for this case and would circulate further details to the clerk. **(Action: Cllr Chandwani).**

- c. The Chair commented that it sounded as though there were also licensing issues involved in this case.
- d. The Panel sought clarification on whether CIL money could be used for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) funding. In response, to this question, the Cabinet Member advised that there were numerous possible sources of funding for SuDS), including CIL and that all sources of funding had been fully explored.
- e. In relation to a particular flooding incident and the potential to use cellulose crystals, officers advised that a borehole had been dug and that the site was not suitable, due to the ground being made up of London clay which was not porous.
- f. In response to a question about what alternative options were being reviewed to tackle flooding in Hornsey, the Cabinet Member emphasised the importance of the flood works in Queens Wood to the areas overall flood defences, as well as the need to protect the trees in the wood from further instances of flooding.
- g. In addition to the Muswell Hill SuDS scheme and the Queen's Wood scheme, officers also highlighted the maintenance work that was being done by Thames Water to the Priory Road attenuation tank. Officers advised that the investment into SuDS and the work carried out would provide some resilience to future flooding in the area.
- h. In relation to concerns about poor drainage in Coldfall Woods and the entrances being very boggy, officers acknowledged that there was an issue and advised that they were looking to install new permanent pathways to the wood and hoped that they would be in place by the summer.
- i. The Panel also raised concerns about flooding in and around the baseball field at Finsbury Park and the consequent flooding that this caused on Endymion Road and Williamson Road. In response, officers advised that this particular instance of flooding was caused by the banks of the New River leaking and that the Council was in discussions with Thames Water to resolve this issue. It was noted that Thames Water would need to lower the level of the New River in order to undertake the works required.

RESOLVED

Noted.

137. UPDATE ON THE WORKS AT STANHOPE ROAD BRIDGE

The Panel received a presentation which provided an update on the works to Stanhope Bridge along with further updates on other tree related issues in the borough. The presentation was introduced by Simon Farrow, Head of Parks and Leisure, as set out in the agenda pack at pages 27-41. Mark Stevens, AD Direct Services and Alex Fraser, Tree & Nature Conservation Manager were also present for this agenda item. The following arose during the discussion of this agenda item:

- a. The Panel noted that there were twelve bridges on Parkland Walk, ten of which were managed by Haringey and the other two were managed by Islington. Of the ten bridges managed by Haringey, seven were the responsibility of Parks and three were managed by Highways. £11.6 m funding had been secured over five years for works to the bridges. Stanhope Road Bridge was undergoing refurbishment due to sustained progressive failure of the bridge's abutments. The design work for this project had been completed and Planning Permission received.
- b. Two small groups of trees had already been removed from the site and survey work had identified a further five trees that needed to be removed. Two of which had already been removed, leaving a remaining three trees that required removal. Of the five trees, these were all on the east side of Stanhope Road. The Panel noted that the current abutments were wider than what was required for a footbridge and that the height of the bridge also had to be raised to 5.3 metres in order to meet current highways standards. The trees needed to be removed as part of the excavation work to the abutments which would involve adding between 0.5 and 1.25 metres of soil on to the root plate of the three trees, which would kill them eventually.
- c. In relation to heightening of the bridge, officers advised Members that this was not related to any attempt to increase the size of vehicles on that route. This was being done to meet current highways standards and prevent bridge strike. This would also future proof the route if TfL subsequently wanted to direct double decker busses under the bridge.
- d. The Panel sought assurances about what would be done to ensure that additional trees were not felled by mistake, as had happened previously. In response, officers advised that the trees had been clearly marked up and that Alex and his team would be closely supervising the tree felling. Officers also advised that they had agreed with the relevant Cabinet Member that a fresh tree survey would be undertaken for every tree within five metres of future bridge works and that ground penetrating radar would be used to accurately plot their root systems. Officers also assured the Panel that they would undertake a walkabout with stakeholders and concerned residents at each bridge site.
- e. In response to a question around alternative courses of action, officers set out that the fundamental problem was that the bridges had deteriorated due to the proximity of trees and so interventions were required to protect the future of Parkland Walk in the long term. Officers provided reassurances to the Panel that the works would be carried out in conjunction with the development of a new conservation plan for Parkland Walk.
- f. Officers commented that sycamore was the most prominent tree on Parkland Walk and that they suffered from a disease which caused die back. It was

hoped that by managing those affected sycamore trees effectively, this would open up space for self-seeding native trees.

- g. The Chair suggested that, given this was third bridge of seven, the Council needed to look at its comms around tree felling on Parkland Walk as the concerns from residents would continue. It was suggested that the Council should get ahead of any negative communications by erecting large notice boards at the site of any trees being felled at Parkland Walk. It was commented that Parkland Walk was a high footfall area and that a simple notice board setting out the reasons the tree was being felled would counter a lot of negative communications. In response, officers advised that they had started the process of getting messaging out through the Council's Communication team and that they would look into putting notices boards on site. The AD Direct Services also agreed to look at publishing the presentation on the website. **(Action: Mark Stevens).**
- h. The Panel noted the comments of one of the Panel Members that one of the key reasons the works were given Planning Permission was that they would make Parkland Walk more accessible to wheelchair users.

RESOLVED

Noted.

138. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Panel noted its Work Programme for the 2021-2022 municipal year.

139. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

140. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

It was noted that this was the last meeting of the municipal year. Future meeting dates would be agreed following the Annual Council meeting on 23rd May 2022.

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair

Date