

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CLIMATE, COMMUNITY SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON THURSDAY, 12TH SEPTEMBER, 2024, 7:00PM

PRESENT:

Councillors: Ibrahim Ali, Culverwell, Luke Cawley-Harrison and Lester Buxton (Chair)

ALSO ATTENDING:

Cllr Seema Chandwani- Cabinet member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequalities

Mr Ian Sygrave – Co-opted member of Committee

Beth Waltzer – Head of Waste Management

Mark Stevens – Assistant Director Direct Services

Eubert Malcolm - Assistant Director for Stronger and Safer Communities,

Ayshe Simsek – Democratic and Scrutiny Manager,

Serena Shani – Interim Principal Committee Co-ordinator

37. 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’.

38. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr Adamou and Cllr Carroll

39. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

41. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

The Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager responded that no deputations had been received within the statutory timeframe.

42. MINUTES

The Chair and Committee AGREED the minutes from the last meeting.

43. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR TACKLING INEQUALITY AND RESIDENTS SERVICES

The Chair introduced the session, highlighting that the Cabinet Member's remit was part of the Corporate Delivery Plan for quarter one, and concerned:

- Waste management and recycling.
- Fly tipping and waste enforcement.
- Highways
- Flooding
- Parking.

Waste management and recycling.

Waste management and recycling in the borough was discussed - the main points summarised below:

- A request was made for more information on the cost benefit analysis and collections of the at-home textiles recycling trial scheme. The Head of Waste Management responded that the statistics could be sent to the Committee. **ACTION.** She also emphasised that the textile recycling scheme was no longer a trial but part of the service.
- Questions were also raised around the new advertising campaign on waste in the borough and whether there had been any behaviour change since then. The Cabinet Member for Tackling Inequality and Resident Services indicated that it was too early to say but the adverts were part of an education package for the public around waste.
- Discussion then turned to the clear up operation after Finsbury Park events which councillors thought unsatisfactory. The Cabinet Member asserted that they had a good set up. Complaints were dealt with as part of the Local Area Management Plan. She also clarified that rubbish collection *within* the parks would fall under Cllr Arkell. Questions were then asked about whether collections could increase after a major event. The Cabinet Member reiterated that this was not under her portfolio, there were demarcations as to the responsibilities. However, the overall contract will be renewed for 2027, and the team will be looking at needs-based resourcing and more flexibility in the new contract.
- The issue of a lack of recycling facilities on streets was then raised. There was only one point of disposal for waste at Bruce Castle – and no recycling points. The Cabinet Member responded that bin park assets vary, however they are looking at standardising them across the borough to dual recycling bins. She stated that volunteers who do litter picks did not always understand the colour codes for bin liners making contamination a real issue especially in park bins.
- It was stated that the current waste management arrangements especially after major events such as football matches were unsatisfactory. Especially around parking areas. Residents' bins were being used for waste disposal - if waste was being disposed of at all. It was felt by councillors that the footprint for

cleaning was too small around major events. The Cabinet Member responded that the council did not receive funds from the Spurs club for the clean-up operation. She explained that they were currently in talks with Spurs about this.

- Dog – waste disposal units and their availability in residential areas were then discussed. It was brought to the Committee's attention that residents complain when dog waste gets put in their general bins. The Cabinet Member stated that the team were running a campaign to show dog owners how to dispose of waste correctly - however it was not possible to put dog waste disposal units on every street, or have it collected as often as was needed, as resources were tight.
- The Co-opted Member then mentioned the issue of the condition of the black bins on high roads and whether they were being audited and replaced when needed. The Cabinet Member responded that the re-purposed black high street bins had been more successful than anticipated. They were here to stay and will undergo a cleaning process.
- Questions were then raised about the technology that street teams possessed to report dumped items. The Cabinet Member stated that the street sweeping team often used their own phones to report dumped rubbish. She highlighted that occasionally the rubbish that is seen, is left in a safe place, and is waiting for enforcement to pick up. The team will be looking at this going forward and possibly at providing the technology to the street sweeping team for this purpose.
- The Co-opted Member then talked about numerous complaints from residents on the Haringey Ladder about speeding Veolia HGVs. The Cabinet Member stated that her team had conducted a site visit. Each Veolia HGV was fitted with a tracker. It had been outlined that they should not speed. She highlighted that there were ten separate waste companies in Haringey, and it may not have been Veolia, but another company who may be the culprit. She stated that her and her team would investigate the matter and report back to the Committee. **ACTION.**
- Collection rates and the timings of waste collections in Tottenham was raised. It was felt that Green Lanes was prioritised over Tottenham High Street. It was stated by the Head of Waste that the collection times of Tottenham High Road and Green Lanes were the same - however Green Lanes is one third of the size of Tottenham High Road. The Cabinet Member indicated the team could discuss a different way of doing things - including transport hubs. The Head of Waste agreed to look at this. **ACTION**
- It was asked whether street sweepers could be given weed pullers to quickly remove weeds on their routes. The Cabinet Member replied that weed removal was part of a seasonal contract with Veolia. More money would have to be spent if the council changed the spec of the street sweeper team at this stage. However, this could be modified in the redrawing of the contract between the council and Veolia in 2027. **ACTION.**

Waste enforcement

The topic of waste enforcement was then discussed. The main points summarised below.

- The Committee asked the team to email the locations of all the street black bins in the area. **ACTION.** Concerns were raised about the proper disposal of commercial waste. Although it was highlighted the council could not penalise businesses who do not manage waste properly – might relations with the

contractors be looked at to make up for this. The Cabinet Member responded that there were ten waste organisations who took care of commercial waste. The legal responsibility lay with the business owner. However, she admitted some businesses have no commercial waste contract – and used residential bins. The team had some powers to enforce. She emphasised that education was the first port of call however enforcement could be used. The idea of financial incentives or schemes such as ‘considerate constructor’ for businesses was raised for those who correctly disposed of waste and kept areas clean.

- A question was then put to the Cabinet Member about the responsibility for bins left on streets. The Cabinet Member replied that the owner of the bin is responsible however Veolia should return the bin to the proper place if the entrance is up to health and safety standards.

Fly tipping

Discussion then turned to fly tipping. It was raised that there was no follow up with residents who had reported fly tipping. The Cabinet Member admitted that although it would be good to get public confidence, she lacked the staff levels for the personal touch. She is looking at developing Community Waste Champions so that they could feed back into the community.

A question was then asked how success was being measured in particularly problematic locations as residents were not seeing patrols or officers. The Cabinet Member responded that there was hotspot data for the whole community -she added that half of all reports were submitted by Veolia. She highlighted that there was not just one reason that people fly tip- there are wider issues at stake. There may be reasons such as HMO, illegal dwellings, and planning issues.

Flooding and Highways

- Discussion then turned to the consultation for all remaining roads in Haringey to become 20 mph speed limit. The Committee was concerned that no appropriate signage or physical traffic calming measures had been installed. The Cabinet Member responded that local authorities had been given the means to reduce speed, but the bottom line was that they could not enforce it. It was down to the Police to issue fines. She stated that there were twelve roads that did not have the 20mph speed limit – some of which were problematic and required additional engineering. Her team relied on police for figures on collisions – and where there was a need for structural calming measures. It was mentioned that the speed measures do not have to be structural - where cars park, can force cars to slow down. It was brought to the officer’s attention that at the junction between Great Cambridge Road and White Hart Lane there had been multiple collisions and traffic light replacements. The Cabinet Member stated that she would investigate this with TFL. **ACTION**
- The Committee enquired whether there was a way residents could choose when gully cleaning happened - as the whole street would have parking suspension enforced - often with only 14- or 7-days’ notice. Also, whether there was any other way that the suspension of parking bays could be communicated in the form of a map or visual format of where it was possible to park. The Cabinet Member responded that most cleaning was done by clusters of roads however it would be investigated if this was causing an issue with parking. The Assistant Director Direct Services clarified that there were many instances

where suspension notices were ignored, meaning that gully cleansing could not proceed at specific locations, impacting on the scheduling planned by the contractor. For this reason, it was not practical to provide more than 7 days advanced notice. **ACTION.** The Assistant Director Direct Services would investigate how feasible it was to produce a map of which parking bays were to be suspended under the notice to help provide greater clarity. **ACTION.**

- A pay-as-you-go commercial waste scheme for businesses was suggested. The Cabinet Member explained that there was no national best practice scheme. In many cases businesses did not have an adequate waste licence. However, she stated that the pay as you go idea would be investigated further by her team. **ACTION**
- Discussion then turned to the lack of authority that councils had over speed cameras and imposing fines. Questions were asked by the panel as to whether the new government would be lobbied to make it a council and not a police issue. The Assistant Director Direct Services clarified that Wandsworth Council had begun to trial speed enforcement but this was stopped by Central Government as it was inconsistent with the approach taken nationally where the police enforce on behalf of safety camera partnerships.
- A report was requested by the Committee on the street lighting issue as it was still not resolved. **ACTION.** The Cabinet Member responded that she needed to know in advance about the level of detail that the Committee required. The Assistant Director Direct Services stated that there was an ongoing conflict between the central management system and the LED lamps. These conflicts were present in many local authorities. He also stated that at present there were only two people in the Street Lighting Team so this had proven challenging. The Assistant Director also stated that the issue had reduced significantly. He confirmed that contractors Marlborough and URBIS were working with the team to resolve the problem.

44. PARKING STRATEGY AND POLICIES - UPDATE

- The scale of part pavement parking issues in the borough were discussed. Questions were asked whether enforcement was prioritised according to urgency and the impact on those affected. The Cabinet Member replied that there had been eight statutory consultations with another two planned. She stated that there were 102 roads with problems and some very complex engineering issues. The team was taking a few complicated roads at a time, as these would take a longer time to resolve. She stated that she would resend the Committee the Cabinet paper – where the 102 roads are published and graded according to complexity. She also said that she would look at the criteria for urgency – as she thought it was a good idea to prioritise works by those affected such as school children. **ACTION.**
- The Co-opted member of the Committee then raised the issue of abolishing daily visitors permits. He stated he had a very well attended meeting with residents in the borough regarding this where several concerns were raised. He cited concerns that the strategy considered only circumstantial evidence as its basis. Moreover, the CPZ zones varied. The proposal would mean some very expensive stays for some of the borough. He cited that it would be £16 per day for a visitor to Northumberland Park. He was very concerned about the failure of the council to follow the prescribed consultation process. Residents were not

aware of any consultations. He pointed out that the failure of the council to co-design and produce changes with the public, made the short consultation period an issue, as any feedback given by residents would go unheard. The Cabinet Member responded that legally she could not answer most of these concerns as to do so could be construed as influencing the statutory consultation and the council could not show any predetermination of the decision. She emphasised that the Cabinet had not given the go ahead to abolish daily visitor permits or any of the other proposals made, only agreeing that such matters be consulted upon. She asked the Co-opted member of the Committee to urge residents to respond to the consultation once it had begun. She stated that the council would consider the objections if they were valid. She clarified that the consultation process being described by the co-opted member applied to consultation for CPZs, which was not prescribed by the law but an approach that Haringey Council had introduced. She also clarified that the statutory consultation would commence on the 16th of October and will last 21 days and will be advertised as per any other consultation. The Cabinet Member then asked the Committee to note that there is a cap on parking on council estates. Street parking was £3 per hour – and the council part-subsidises this, so the resident pays £1.25 per hour and £4 per day. She said that statutory consultation results would deem whether it was right for the borough or not.

- A concern was then raised about the ANPR vehicles and what these would deliver. There was unease about the timings of parking enforcement – it was felt it was done very early in the day - especially for events. The Assistant Director Direct Services answered that his team were looking at how they delivered parking enforcement and parking capacity for one off events at Ally Pally or Finsbury Park. ANPR vehicles would pick up data to help in the process and eventually synchronise with the enforcement system. The Cabinet Member also added that the parking enforcement team was in house and not third party. The ANPR vehicle would be able to scan for cars for valid permits. This would lead to efficiencies.
- It was then asked whether the team was taking consultations from the communities that held religious and community events. The Cabinet Member clarified that the Parking Strategy had been agreed by Cabinet in July, so they were only just taking this forward. She stated that the strategy would operate as a workplan, however the co-production had not started yet for the Religious and Community Events parking policy. The policy was still to be shaped and scoped.
- It was requested that the evidence that formed the basis of the proposal be detailed in the consultation, as well as any additional costs. Also, whether any other options were being considered. The Cabinet Member highlighted that, as this was a statutory consultation, it had to be noticeably clear – therefore this would be a one item proposal.
- It was stated that the Parking Strategy considered Blue Badge fraud however it was not clear about what was being done about allowing disabled parking in the borough and enforcement for those parking in disabled bays without a Blue Badge. The Cabinet Member stated that legally councils were not able to enforce by camera on yellow lines, however, could enforce by camera on red routes. She suggested that the best way to prevent this issue would be for disabled badge holders to turn their parking bays into dedicated bays, as this

comes with extra signage and a dedicated phone number for enforcement. The Cabinet Member then suggested that she circulate to the Committee information on how many of these types of violations had been recorded, and the number of checks that had been conducted. **ACTION.**

45. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Chair then notified members of the Scrutiny Café consultation on the 20th of September and encouraged attendance.

It was requested that street lighting be added to future agendas as an item for discussion. It was viewed that street lighting that did not work was a systematic problem. A question was put to the Committee on whether there should be a full Scrutiny Review of street lighting, as it had been a full year later since concerns were first raised and the function may be under resourced. It was questioned whether there needed to be a fundamental change or more evidence for budget holders to ask for more resource. The Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager stated that a short report on the Committee's views could be given to Cabinet and a response asked for. She stated that periodic reports would occur regardless - however if it was more depth that the Committee required, a meeting should be set up as to how best they wanted their questions answered of the lighting situation. The Co-opted member raised that this would have to happen with some urgency as the clocks were going back next month. **ACTION**

The website was then raised as something that could be scrutinised in a review. As the website and communications came under the remit of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC), it was asked whether it was possible to ask the OSC to delegate this issue to them. The Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager responded that this was possible to put forward under the OSC however consideration should be taken as to the length and timing of the review also the timings of the recommendations. The Chair then suggested that the Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager would come back to the Committee with some options on how best to proceed with these requests. **ACTION.**

The Committee agreed that the cycling infrastructure was something that should be on the Committee's workplans. The relationship between ASB, ASB enforcement and Housing and funding was also discussed – and was agreed to be added to the workplan.

The Committee then agreed to move the dates of the Budget scrutiny meeting to 14th November to allow for better timings for responses and an online briefing session and training to be conducted. The next meeting on Community Safety would then be moved to December. **ACTION**

46. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

47. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

14th November 2024
17th December 2024

CHAIR: Councillor Lester Buxton

Signed by Chair

Date