

# **MINUTES OF MEETING Climate, Community Safety & Culture Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Monday, 11th September, 2023, 6.40 - 9.00 pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Luke Cawley-Harrison, Michelle Simmons-Safo (Chair) and  
Tammy Hymas**

**ALSO ATTENDING: Ian Sygrave (Co-Optee)**

## **223. 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'.

## **224. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Diakides and Cllr Dunstall. Cllr Hymas attended the meeting as a substitute

## **225. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None

## **226. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

## **227. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS**

There were no deputations, petitions or public questions received.

## **228. MINUTES**

In regards to a previous action around blocked footway gullies, officers asked the co-opted member of the Panel to email them with details of which gullies were blocked on Harringay Passage and these would be passed on to the drainage team. **(Action: Ian).**

The Panel enquired whether footway gullies could be marked with spray paint when they had been cleaned, as happened with road gullies. Officers advised that they would feed this back to the team.

Officers advised that they had contacted TfL about installing a joint SUDS scheme on Council land but that TfL had not shown any interest in undertaking such a scheme. The Chair agreed to pick up with officers outside of the meeting about what could be done to push back to TfL and get them to undertake drainage works in and around the road network that they manage. **(Action: Chair).**

## **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> July were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

### **229. BARONESS CASEY REVIEW- (UPDATE ON COUNCIL'S RESPONSE)**

The Panel received a report and accompanying presentation which set out the Council's response to the Baroness Casey Review into the standards of behaviour and the internal culture of the Metropolitan Police Service. The report was introduced by Cllr Adam Jogee, Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Cohesion, as set out in the agenda pack at pages 7 to 23.

The Cabinet Member welcomed the fact that the Panel had requested an update on this subject, given the concerns shared by a lot of people about racism, homophobia, misogyny and the generally shocking mind sets of some members of the police, as outlined in the Casey report. The Cabinet Member set out that he had emailed members separately outlining the discussions he had with the police. The Cabinet Member commented it was incumbent upon Members to keep our communities safe and to hold the police to account.

The Cabinet Member advised that he and the Leader saw their role as acting as a critical friend and were not there to make excuses on behalf of the police. To that end, there had been frank discussions with senior police colleagues. The Met Commissioner had visited Haringey twice in recent months and the Cabinet Member and Leader met regularly with the Borough Commander. The Cabinet Member set out that during these discussions there was no space for Police colleagues to not understand how seriously the Council was taking the issues raised in the Casey report. The Cabinet Member reiterated that the administration was not seeking to do the Police's job for them, but that they would be seeking to hold them to account.

The following arose during the discussion of this report:

- a. The Panel commented that one concern that had been raised in the past was that a lot of police officers in London had been drawn from all over the country and perhaps did not understand the different communities and cultures that they served. Members would like to see police officers be representative of communities like those in Haringey. Members sought clarity about how future community engagement events with police would focus on the bigger picture, rather than quite localised problems. The Cabinet Member responded that, in his experience, the vast majority of police officers were hard working, law-abiding, public servants who did understand the communities they served and were willing to learn about them when they did not. It was commented that the

Safer Neighbourhood Teams did care about communities and wanted to serve them.

- b. The Cabinet Member set out that the background to this was 14 years of austerity and sustained attacks on the funding model for public services, including policing which had led to the scaling back of Safer Neighbourhood policing. Within this context, morale within the police was not great. The Cabinet Member acknowledged the need for police to represent the communities that they served and that he had seen the Police have stalls in Wood Green where they held pop-up recruitment drives.
- c. In response to a question about a previous meeting between councillors and the Police in July, the Cabinet Member advised that all colleagues were invited but that it was arranged at short-notice, based on the Met Commissioner's availability and the fact that he wanted Haringey to be the first borough that he visited due to the unique history and challenges of policing in Haringey.
- d. In light of the conclusions of the Casey Review, the Panel characterised the institutional structure of the Met as being racist and sought clarification from the Cabinet Member whether he agreed with this assessment. In response, the Cabinet Member set out that everyone could see evidence that there had been examples of racism, sexism and other discriminatory behaviour, but that he did not think it was helpful for him to give a yes or no answer to this question. The Cabinet Member set out that he was not here to make excuses for an agency that was failing to uphold the standards expected of it as a public body. The Cabinet Member set out that he had been assured personally by the Commissioner of the Metropolitan police that the examples of this appalling behaviour would not be allowed to continue. As councillors, it was important that Members call out instances where they have seen examples of discriminatory behaviour.
- e. The Panel set out that the Police had been found to be institutionally racist following the Stephen Lawrence enquiry and that very little seemed to have changed since then. There was a new Community Safety & Hate Crime strategy out to consultation and Members queried whether as part of this, the police should be given increased powers with a greater police presence, or whether their role in community justice should be reduced. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that he wanted to see a Haringey where people were free from fear of criminals and fear from the police violence. The issue was not about whether the police had more or less power but it was about police doing their jobs properly. The Cabinet Member advised that whilst in his role he would make sure that the police were held to account and that they did their jobs properly.
- f. The Chair set out that in her experience the institutional discriminatory behaviour was embedded within in the structure of the organisation and that the concerns raised in the Macpherson Report had still not been addressed. It was commented that until the issue was fully recognised, it would never be tackled. It was suggested that the key issue during the riots in Tottenham both in 1985 and in 2011 was to do with relations with the police. The Chair advocated that it was important that the findings of the Casey Review were embraced and that there it was a catalyst for change.
- g. The Chair sought clarification about the Met's commitment to put more officers and PCSOs into local neighbourhoods and questioned how many additional

officers this would mean. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that they were still working through this and he had not been given an exact figure, but that he would speak to the Police and see if there was an exact figure on this. **(Action: Cllr Jogee)**. The Cabinet Member set out that community policing needed to mean community policing and that the police should be embedded within our communities.

- h. In response to a question about what strategy the police had to address a lack of diversity and ensure that their values aligned with the values of our communities, the Cabinet Member commented that this was a question that should be put to the Police at the next meeting. The Cabinet Member commented that the question about police values seemed like the right question and that if policing was done by consent then it had to reflect the values of our communities. Officers noted that one of the key recommendations from the Baroness Casey Review was around recruitment and making the force more representative.
- i. The Panel commented that there used to be regular meetings between all members and the police in the Civic Centre and questioned whether these meetings could be reinstated. The Cabinet Member responded that if there was the appetite then he would look at reinstating these but reflected that the last meeting with Members and the borough commander that he arranged was only attended by five councillors. The Cabinet Member agreed to give some thought about how best to take forward the request for regular all member meetings with the police. **(Action: Cllr Jogee)**.
- j. The Panel commented that there seemed to be a marked difference in community policing across different parts of the borough and queried what could be done to make this more uniformed and to learn lessons from where this worked well. In response, the Cabinet Member acknowledged the need to learn from where this was done well but emphasised that a key element of this was around community by-in. The Cabinet Member advised that one of the senior officers within the Haringey & Enfield BCU was looking at how this could be improved. The Cabinet Member set out that the Commissioner had identified a renewed focus on community policing.
- k. The Panel sought clarification whether the police and Council's priorities were aligned in terms of local policing in Haringey. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that priorities aligned in terms hotspots, trends, domestic violence, alcohol and drug related crime. The Cabinet Member recognised that priorities could change but the overarching values were aligned.
- l. The Chair of Haringey Neighbourhood Watch reiterated the fact that, following the Casey Report and the development of a New Met for London, the police seemed to be putting a new emphasis on community policing and that he had been told that undertaking a community policing role would be a key consideration for promotion within the Met going forward. In terms of numbers, it was suggested that the Met were looking to recruit an additional 500 PCSOs in the coming months. It was suggested that the numbers and timescales were set out within A New Met for London.

**RESOLVED.**

Noted

## 230. STREET LIGHTING CONTRACT PERFORMANCE

The Panel received a report which provided feedback on the Council's current street lighting contractor's programmes and performance, and also discusses other issues relating to the street lighting central management system (CMS) and UK Power Networks (UKPN). The report was introduced by Mark Stevens, AD for Direct Services as set out in the agenda pack at pages 23 -28. The following arose as part of the discussion of this report:

- a. The Panel sought clarification about whether the Council was on target to for the implementation of a new central management system by November 2023. In response, officers advised that a new lead officer had been appointed by Marlborough Highways and that they would be pushing Urbis Schreder to ensure that this was achieved. In general, officers advised that they were satisfied with the performance of Marlborough Highways but acknowledged that the performance of Urbis Schreder was less satisfactory.
- b. The Chair advocated the importance of street lighting in terms of keeping people safe, and in particular in terms of preventing violence against women and girls. The Panel sought clarification about the process for fixing lamp columns that were broken. In response, officers advised that Marlborough Highways would go out and attempt to fix the problem, if the LED was damaged for instance. In some cases, the issue may be caused by a conflict between the CMS and the lighting equipment and they would try to resolve this where possible, however it may be a more fundamental problem. In cases where there was an electricity supply problem, the issue had to be referred to UKPN and they had 28 days to resolve the issue.
- c. The Panel raised concerns about the time taken to fix broken lamp columns, particularly in Harringay ward. In response, officers apologised and acknowledged that there was a breakdown in the process between inspections and columns being incorrectly recorded as being fixed, which led to complaints. Officers advised that there was progress being made on this issue and advised that the team were working hard to resolve it.
- d. In response to a follow up question, the Assistant Director advised that he first became aware that this was a bigger problem than just individual components not working, following the last scrutiny panel meeting. Officers advised that they were concerned that there was a bigger problem after hearing from Members of the panel and going back to the team and looking at the issue in more detail. Officers advised that they shared members' frustrations about lamp columns seemingly being reported as fixed when they were not.
- e. In response to a further question, officers set out that the Highways Group Engineer had been tasked with overseeing this issue and that it was expected that the issue would be resolved. The Team had been asked to keep a record of the works that had been done and the issues that came up, and to ensure that issues were being fixed.
- f. The Panel suggested that the number of open cases should be a red flag, both in terms of street lighting faults, but also more widely across frontline services. Concerns were raised that in this instance it seems to have been councillors raising the issue that has alerted officers to their being a more fundamental

problem. In response, the Assistant Director acknowledged these concerns and advised that the KPI data around street lighting faults was now being examined as a much higher level than it had previously and that he expected that the problem would be resolved fairly shortly.

## **RESOLVED**

Noted

### **231. UPDATE ON ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING**

The Panel received a report which provided an update on Electric Vehicle (EV) charging across the borough and the Council's wider Ultra Low Emission Vehicle (ULEV) Action Plan. The report was introduced by Joe Baker, Head of Carbon Management as set out in the additional report pages 1-4. Mark Stevens, AD for Direct Services was present for this Item. Cllr Mike Hakata, Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport, and Deputy Leader of the Council was also present online. The following arose in discussion of the report:

- a. The Panel sought clarification around instances of people without a driveway trailing charging cables over the footway to charge their vehicles and whether this was allowed. In response, officers advised that this was an offence under the Highways Act. It is possible to have a channel cut into the footway so that the cable was no longer a trip hazard but the person would have to pay the cost for the works and would need public liability insurance. Furthermore, that person would not have an automatic right to park in front of their own property. The Panel noted that whilst some local authorities would permit a channel to be installed many were reluctant to do so, as it was costly and impractical. Instead, Haringey was seeking to increase the number of on-street EV charging points.
- b. The Panel noted that channels had been cut in front of the Civic Centre to support a SUDS scheme. It was also commented that when a person applied for a crossover they were essentially preventing anyone parking in front of their property. In response to a request for clarification, officers advised that, pertaining to trailing cables over the footway being an offence, the relevant part of the Highways Act 1980 was Section 178, sub-section 1.
- c. The Panel suggested that the stated goal of 400 on-street chargers was not enough to support large scale usage of EVs. It was commented that if everyone had an EV, two or three charging points would be needed on every street. The Panel also questioned why the on-street chargers were at the end of streets and queried whether this was related to CPZ boundaries and the need for a new CPZ consultation to be undertaken. In response, officers advised that whilst the number of vehicles was increasing, so was their range and so they required less charging time. This would reduce the number of charging points needed over time. In regard to chargers being located at the end of roads, officers advised that this was more do with the charger having more accessibility at the end of roads and the fact that people were more likely to object if one was installed in front of their home. It was also noted that the solution to widespread access to EV charging would likely be market driven and EV charging facilities available at petrol stations, for example.

- d. The Panel referred to small cylindrical charging points recently installed by Barnet, called Trojan energy hubs. In response, officers advised that they would look into these chargers in more detail outside of the meeting but that a cursory look on the internet raised concerns that these would be too low down and would have wheelchair accessibility concerns as well as potentially being a trip hazard. There was DfT guidance about installing street furniture that was less than 600mm from the ground.
- e. In response to a question, it was commented that Part S of the new building regulations stated that all new car parks had to have EV charging points.
- f. The Panel suggested that 400 charging points across the borough did not seem enough, when you considered the amount of terraced housing and flats in the borough that did not have driveways. In response, the Cabinet Member acknowledged 400 alone may not be enough, but that the volume of charging stations would rise further with market driven solutions. It was suggested that private sector solutions would likely receive increasing incentivisation from the government as we headed to the 2030 cut off point for new petrol and diesel cars being sold in the UK.
- g. The Panel stressed the importance of having multiple providers for EV charging across the borough.

**RESOLVED**

Noted

**232. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE**

The following items were put forward for the following meeting:

- The Priorities for the Community Safety partnership for the year
- The Police’s response to Baroness Casey Review and A new Met for London.

**RESOLVED**

That the Panel considered its work plan for 2022-24, attached at Appendix A of the report, and whether any amendments were required.

**233. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

N/A

**234. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

- 6<sup>th</sup> November
- 19<sup>th</sup> December
- 27<sup>th</sup> February

CHAIR: Councillor Michelle Simmons-Safo

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....