

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING Climate, Community Safety & Environment Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Wednesday, 31st July, 2024, 6.30- 8.30pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Ibrahim Ali, Culverwell, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Liam Carroll, Ian Sygrave (Co-Optee), Lester Buxton (Chair) and Matt White**

**ALSO ATTENDING: Daliah Barratt, Joe Benmore**

## **23. 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'.

## **24. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllr Dunstall gave apologies for the meeting and Cllr White substituted in accordance with CSO 50 to 53. Cllr Adamou joined the meeting online.

## **25. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None

## **26. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

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

None

## **28. MINUTES**

Ian Sygrave was present at the previous meeting but omitted from the attendance list. With this correction, the minutes of the 27 February 2024 meeting were agreed as accurate record of the meeting.

## **29. MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager introduced the report which had been considered at the Overview and Scrutiny meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> of June and which has

sought approval for the terms of reference of the main committee and four panel meetings. The Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager drew the Panel's attention to the updated terms of reference for the Climate, Community Safety and Environment Panel included at pages 43 to 44 of the agenda pack and Panel Members NOTED this information.

### **30. APPOINTMENT OF NON-VOTING CO-OPTED MEMBER**

The Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager introduced the report which sought formal approval of the re-appointment of a non -voting co-opted Member to the Panel. More specifically, that a representative from Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches be appointed as a non -voting co-opted Member of the Panel for the 2024/25 Municipal Year.

The Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager outlined that each scrutiny panel was entitled to appoint up to three non-voting co-optees to assist scrutiny with its work. The terms of reference/arrangements for Overview and Scrutiny are set out in Part 2 (Article 6), Part 3 (Section B) and Part 4 (Section 6) of the Council's Constitution.

It was noted that A key aspect of the Climate, Community Safety and Environment Scrutiny Panel's work concerns community safety and the Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches are a key local organisation with a role in this. They are therefore considered well placed to assist the Panel in its work. They have also previously been represented on a co-opted basis on scrutiny panels with a role in community safety and provided valuable input on relevant areas.

In the discussion that followed the following issues were raised and responded to:

The need for proactive engagement with other groups, especially those from minoritised backgrounds. In response it was noted that the scrutiny café's initiative would include recruitment of co-opted members, and the Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager welcomed suggestions from panel members on interested groups to contact. The Chair emphasised the importance of involving new and relevant groups following the Panel's shift from Culture to Environment.

### **RESOLVED**

That a representative from Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches be appointed as a non-voting co-opted Member of the Panel for the 2024/25 Municipal Year.

### **31. UPDATE ON HARINGEY DOCKLESS BIKE HIRE SCHEME**

The Chair had received representations from officers to vary the agenda to consider the report on the dockless bikes earlier in the meeting and the Panel AGREED to vary the agenda.

Oliver Pudney and Mark Stevens joined the meeting online for this item.

Oliver Pudney introduced the report, which provided information on:

- The background to the decision to have dockless bikes provision in the borough. The provision had started in March 2024 when the Council entered into formal agreement with two dockless bike providers, known as Lime and Forest.
- Current legislative provision on dockless bikes
- The current issues being experienced in the borough
- Local policy context,
- The implementation and mobilisation, engagement,
- consultation and monitoring activities
- Work on the next steps of the scheme, which was currently due to end in 2025.

There followed a discussion on this noting report. The panel highlighted the following issues and responses provided as set out below:

- There was a question on the confidence in dockless bikes scheme as the continuing provision in the borough and whether a docked bike scheme would be better? There were also queries about the current technology and poorly parked bikes, and whether the GPS system was able to distinguish if bikes were parked correctly or not correctly docked. In addition, there were bikes near the Waltham Forest boundary on Ferry Lane and was it ascertained if these were docked or abandoned? In response, Oliver Pudney stated that the Council was still at the monitoring usage and parking compliance stage, with efforts to improve parking opportunities and GPS technology. There were regular meetings with dockless bike companies, TfL, and London Cycling Campaign to hold operators accountable. The London Cycling Campaign feared that docked bikes reduced convenience and access.
- Assurance was given that the service would continue to monitor usage and keep considering the number of journeys that were being made, reporting on any significant changes and the actions to be taken in response.
- In response to the query about the boundary with Waltham Forest on the bridge, this further reflected that there was a patchwork of approaches across London boroughs for dockless bikes. It was noted that London boroughs all have different levels of agreement, or no agreement at all, with some of these operators and this raised some challenges along borough boundaries. Assurance was given that this issue was being addressed and the Council is part of a collective group between boroughs and TfL working to find a commonality and potentially a coordinated contract going forward. However, this work was still ongoing
- Issues concerned with dockless bikes around borough schools, and estates, with delays in collection were highlighted. Reporting was often left to Councillors and residents. Oliver Pudney addressed boundary issues and response times, mentioning Councillor and internal contact details to expedite reporting. It was further noted that the Council highlights the burden of reporting non-compliance to companies and discusses e-scooters and legislation with TfL and the government.

- The Panel highlighted that an inner London borough resists a cross-London approach and questioned how Lime manages bikes during major events with road closures. In response, it was noted that temporary parking spaces for events have been successfully implemented with Islington and Hackney, serving as a template for future events. Tottenham Hotspur collaborated on parking during match days.
- The Panel noted Lime's cost and asked about Forest bikes in the east borough. There was a request for detailed data on non-compliant parking and the number of bikes in the borough and information on parking hotspots. In response the service was continually monitoring the data and parking compliance with monthly figures, on compliance from both operators
- It was queried (primarily about Lime but Forest as well) on the number of bikes that are active at any time versus inactive, as this would provide further insight into the issues in the borough. In response, it was noted that this information was not held but officers agreed to look into this. This could also assist in looking into the permitted fleet sizes and whether or not they were appropriate or if they need adjusting.
- In addition, there was a question about why pavement parking was allowed and could they not follow the same process as Zip Car provision. In response, it was noted that footway parking was allowed due to a lack of regulation, complicating enforcement.
- It was highlighted that there was both visual and virtual parking bays. It was queried why could they not only be visual? In response, it was noted that the Council was still testing this provision and monitoring virtual bays and planned to introduce more marked bays.

The Chair noted that Cllr Adamou had suggested involving officers, users and members to drill down on what was working well on the scheme and what was not working well. These views could be collated, culminating in some Scrutiny recommendations going forward. The Chair suggested a more in-depth discussion be considered at Item 12 on whether to consider a Scrutiny review of the dockless bikes scheme.

## **32. CONSULTATION ON DRAFT STATEMENT OF GAMBLING POLICY**

The Panel considered the draft statement of gambling policy, which was part of the Council's Policy Framework. The Chair noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had previously considered this policy in 2021 and put forward some recommendations to Cabinet, including research into gambling harms in 2021. The outcome of the work was contained at Appendix 3.

The Licensing Team Leader continued to introduce the report, highlighting the following information to the Panel:

- Requirement to regularly review the Council's Statement of Gambling Policy. The current policy was adopted in January 2021 and was therefore due for review this year, to be published in January 2025.
- The Gambling Commission has advised Local Authorities to extend their existing policies to have a lawful policy in place come January 2025.
- There were changes expected from Central Government and the Gambling Commission. The Department for Culture, Media & Sport had published a white paper on gambling reform in April 2023 but there has yet to be any changes to the legislation, which will not be in place, so a further review may be required in late next year to take account of any changes.
- The policy did not cover online gambling and related only to establishments. However, the significant harm being caused by online gambling was acknowledged.
- The policy only had some cosmetic changes following its previous agreed iteration in 2021, and the local area profile was not updated, and representations made about this but there was a need to await a change in the Gambling Act to allow this.

The Panel asked questions, and the following discussion took place.

- Agreed to add into the report at Appendix 2 an overlay of the new ward boundaries agreed in 2022
- In response to queries about making gambling premises less attractive, it was noted restrictions, such as prohibiting trinkets in shop windows was available and the Council could indicate what they would not want to see in premises, but this was also covered in the gambling regulations. The Public Health team were undertaking some further work on gambling harms and this issue could be raised with them
- In response to the query on demographic changes in the take up of gambling with increasing numbers of younger people affected, the normalisation of gambling was a constant and continuing challenge, which the government were aware of.
- In response to the issue of compiling Haringey-specific data to strengthen, decision-making on premises permits, the Licensing Team leader mentioned the high cost of such research, which had only been pursued by only two other larger authorities, Westminster and Manchester. The Licensing Team Leader recommended that the best way was to lobby for implementation of the white paper and legislation implementation that community impact assessments be considered and where there are areas of saturation of establishments there would be a presumption of refusal.
- Continuing the discussion on funding research and lobbying neighbouring authorities or the LGA or collaborating with academic institutions for research a member queried the local Police Commanders' views on gambling shops' impact on resources. The Licensing Team Leader responded that collaborative efforts were too costly and that local betting shops posed minimal issues according to the police.

- There was a request for clarity on the number of gambling premises in wards, and consistent figures throughout the report. The Licensing Team Leader agreed to edit the report for clarity.
- The Panel noted the short consultation period due to minor policy updates. This was following advice from the Gambling Commission and when there was a full revision, there would be a full 12-week consultation period.
- In relation to the local authority working in a more community role with the support of gambling establishments, the Public Health team were doing some of that outreach work and are doing some of that signposting work to refer residents to advice centres and available support but there was not a surgery provision for this. There were specific obligations for staff working in gambling establishments about interacting with customer and checking their betting intentions and this had to be documented. However, this was very difficult to check on as there were now cash machines in betting shops and you can tap and pay so the accessibility to funds was constant.
- In noting that there was a funding request for research in the scrutiny recommendations in March 2022, the Panel further requested a Cabinet Member update on the response to recommendations from the March 2022 Gambling Enquiry Day and a written comment on carrying out local research.

### **33. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR (ASB) OVERVIEW**

IOM Strategic Lead introduced the item, providing an overview of ASB in Haringey. Between Feb 2023 – Jan 2024, Haringey experienced over 10,000 ASB incidents, ranking 12th out of 32 boroughs and this was 18% above the London average. ASB was reported to be prevalent in high-density housing areas, but more data was needed to understand the drivers. The Council was working with the police to better use the available data for a fuller picture.

The following information was highlighted:

- Bruce Castle ward has the highest rates, with much of the ASB recorded as rowdy or inconsiderate behaviour, often noise-related. ASB peaks in summer.
- The Council's response includes a £4m investment in CCTV, with 80 new cameras making 170, and 40 redeployable cameras for flexible use.
- The Council has initiated 'Days of Action' to increase presence and engage with residents, resulting in around 15,000 interactions.
- A regular partnership problem-solving group meets, including the Police, Probation, TfL, and Transport Police.
- Three 'Clear, Hold, Build' areas tackle entrenched local issues, guided by the broken window theory.

- No significant issues were linked to the Finsbury Park Festival.

There was a discussion on the presentation.

- There was praise for the team's work and noted consistent ASB rates due to factors like density and town centres. There was a question about the impact of increased CCTV and proactive residents in Bruce Castle. There were concerns about resource allocation for the 'Clear, Hold, Build' scheme. The IOM Strategic Lead confirmed that increased reporting affected police resource allocation. He acknowledged that high-density areas often see reports of minor ASB.
- There was a question about how to differentiate serious ASB from over-reporting in high-density areas. The IOM Strategic Lead suggested taking this forward as a written question for the police. It was further noted that In 'Clear, Hold, Build' areas, police funding is available, but officer reassignments to other London areas delay progress.
- The Panel highlighted underreporting issues, as people were unsure where to report ASB. The IOM Strategic Lead agreed and mentioned website updates and resident engagement during Days of Action to clarify reporting.
- The Panel suggested including a reporting tool advert in every issue of Haringey People. The IOM Manager agreed to take this forward. ACTION.
- The Chair asked about response time data, which the IOM Strategic Lead suggested discussing in another meeting. ACTION.
- There concerns about high levels of drug dealing in and around Tottenham High Road but there was praise for clear strong partnership between police and Council officers and hopes for improvements in hotspots. IOM Strategic Lead responded that a report on four key areas is being prepared and will be sent to Councillors. ACTION.
- A member suggested the ASB reporting tool should be more prominent on the website, categorised under "Pay it" and "Report It" sections. ACTION (for the web team).
- There were noted issues with the noise complaints system's responsiveness and call for a policy on timely replies. Agreed this be sought, as this would be beneficial.
- There was a discussion about the frequency of ASB team meetings with each ward and their alignment with SMT priorities. The IOM strategic Lead agreed to raise this with senior management, highlighting resource limitations and the need for stakeholder collaboration.
- There was discussion about the Days of Action in Crouch End ward and a need for much improvement in feedback. The IOM strategic Lead noted that a number of these initiatives had been arranged with a positive mind-set but the

call on resources, co-ordination had been intensive and not sustainable, and rather than monthly activities, these would be bimonthly with feedback added in.

- It was noted that the PPSG decides camera locations monthly, with installations typically lasting three months.
- There was a request to set up meetings with SNT groups in areas with both high and low ASB activity. The IOM Strategic Lead agreed to request this from officers. ACTION. There was further discussion about the role of ward panel meetings in SNT meetings and ASB team attendance, questioning budget issues. The IOM Strategic Lead replied that officers should attend these meetings and asked Councillors to inform him or the AD for Stronger communities if this was not happening.

### **34. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE**

The Chair asked the Panel to suggest issues for the work programme.

- A member suggested that the Panel review the Walking and Cycling Action Plan to encourage more cycling. The officer responsible for dockless bikes noted the scheme's higher-than-anticipated use, indicating an underestimated appetite for cycling.
- Noted the need to schedule a date for the Cabinet Member for the Environment to attend.
- A panel member proposed that the Panel limit meetings to one external speaker for deeper discussions and emphasised the need for the Panel to restate their expectations regarding the depth and quality of information presented.
- A member highlighted the upcoming need to scrutinise the waste management contract. Ayshe Simsek noted that Cllr Chandwani would attend the Panel in September to discuss this. Ayshe Simsek will circulate the information to Panel members. ACTION.
- A member raised the issue of insourcing the Leisure contract, and Cllr White invited Panel members to attend the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to discuss it.
- A Member asked if e-scooters could be discussed due to related crime and ASB.



- The Chair raised the issue of unregulated electric bikes. A member further mentioned the current PSPO consultation, which includes e-scooters, suggesting that the Panel review the responses. Cllr Ali proposed that the Cabinet Member present a report on the consultation in November. It was mentioned that the Panel can make suggestions to the Cabinet, as this will be addressed in November.

**35. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

Noted

**36. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Noted

CHAIR: Councillor Lester Buxton

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....