

**Climate, Community Safety and Environment Scrutiny Panel HELD
on 17 December 2024, George Meehan House, Westbury Room.
From 7:30pm- 10:00pm**

Attendees

Councillors

- Cllr Buxton (Chair).
- Cllr Dunstall.
- Cllr Ali.
- Cllr Adamou (attended online).
- Cllr Cawley-Harrison.
- Cllr Carroll.
- Mr Ian Sygrave (Non- Voting Co-optee).

Officers

- Cllr Hakata (Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport).
- Zoe Robertson (Programme Director Wellbeing and Climate).
- Joe Baker (Head of Carbon Management).
- Barry Francis (Director of Environment).
- Mark Stevens (Assistant Director of Resident Experience).
- Maurice Richards (Head of Transport and Travel)

Deputation

- Mr Michael Brookes
- Ms Leila Brookes
- Mrs Christina McKenzie
- Mr Bruce McKenzie.

1- FILMING AT MEETING

The Chair ran through the required information. The information was noted by all present.

2- APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr Culverwell had sent apologies.

3- ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

4- DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None was declared.

5- DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS.

A deputation had been received within the statutory timeframe for the Panel which was a request to extend the timetable of the 603 Bus Route.

The Panel heard that:

- The bus route covered two local authorities Camden Council and Haringey Council.
- The delegation had received over 600 positive responses in support of extending the bus route.
- Camden Council had agreed to a review of the route.
- The 603 bus route served three school routes and the Royal Free Hospital. Currently, there was inadequate scheduling and only served users twice a day. Furthermore, this was not aligned with school timetables making the bus journeys under-used but in demand. Alternative routes weren't reliable and also included crossing dangerous and busy roads. There was no bus route to the Jubilee Line or the Royal Free other than this.
- There was demand both from school attendees and hospital staff, who would prefer to take the bus rather than drive during rush hour.

The floor was then open to questions from the Panel.

In response to the question as to whether the route had been reduced recently, the Delegation replied that the timetable had remained static for more than 20 years.

Another question was raised as to whether lobbying had occurred at City Hall level - and whether the Delegation had data that showed user demand. It was responded by the Delegation that their own research had found that 670 people supported extending the timetable and would use it more if it was extended to more than twice a day. The Delegation emphasised that they found there were no other similar bus routes and that the route was not synchronised with school timetables. The delegation reiterated that they required the times to be aligned to schools or extended further.

In response to the Deputation, the Head of Transport and Travel clarified that the borough had recently approached Transport for London (TfL) in 2024, to discuss further how extending the timetable was in line with Haringey's Transport Strategy. However, a detailed response had been sent from TfL that stated there was no

business case for this, as there was no user demand. The Head of Transport and Travel agreed with the Deputation that more research needed to be carried out. He offered to meet with the Deputation to discuss this more. Once this had been established, he proposed to approach Camden Council and discuss this once more with TfL. **ACTION**

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport pointed out that buses had been underfunded for years and also offered to contact his counterpart in Camden Council and discuss this further. **ACTION.**

6- MINUTES

The Committee RESOLVED to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

7- THE ANNUAL CARBON REPORT.

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport, Head of Carbon Management and the Programme Director introduced the report.

The Committee heard that:

- The Annual Carbon Report (ACR) was mentioned in the Constitution of Haringey Council. It outlined what emissions the Council was responsible for and reported on the energy produced by Council activity.
- The Carbon Commission required councils to meet the target of a reduction of 40% by 2020. The Head of Carbon Management stated that Haringey exceeded this target in 2020 by a reduction of 43% and was still making progress.
- The Carbon Commission required all boroughs to produce an annual progress report .
- The report included projects within the community to help against climate change.
- The new ACR and progress made this year would go to the Full Council Meeting in March 2025.

The team highlighted that the report was now in draft format and requested feedback on this year's report from the Committee.

The floor was then open for discussion.

Feedback from the Panel included:

- Reducing the number of pages within the 100-page report. It was suggested producing a shorter, picture-based summary would help with engagement in the community. The Cabinet Member responded that this was a good

suggestion. He spoke more about engagement with schools and the need for his team to outline what could be achieved. He stated that his team would soon be setting up the Haringey Climate Partnership and may coproduce a short visual version. **ACTION.**

- It was emphasised by the Chair that the report was not easy to read. Furthermore, the report should be listed by ward or area. The Chair also emphasised the need for transparency and honesty in the report. There was a need to state where the Council was falling behind on targets and what was being done to address this.
- Discussion then turned to schools and how to engage them effectively. It was suggested that the production of an educational toolkit or resource for school leaders would be useful for the engagement of school children. Also, the recognition and championing of school's various climate action initiatives. The Head of Carbon Management pointed out that the team attended school assemblies as part of a Schools Outreach Programme, and these points could be included within the package currently presented. Other suggestions also included making climate action messages similar to public health communications through posters and infographics and using Haringey estates (such as billboards and display boards) to advertise and disseminate messages into the community. The Cabinet Member responded that his team would consider the educational toolkit and talk more about its practicalities.
ACTION.

- It was also pointed out that many communities in Haringey had been affected by climate change. It was stated that all communities needed to be involved and engaged with climate action and messages needed to be made relevant to these groups. Further discussion then turned to how to make climate action messages relevant to all communities. The Cabinet Member mentioned that in some older communities 'repair and reuse' was culturally embedded. He indicated that local events may be the best place to engage different types of communities. Sharing information was key as the Cabinet Member admitted that the current approach inadvertently excluded people.
- Another question was raised around how the ACR report was fact-checked. It was commented that the report was written for a technical audience. A question was asked as to how was this utilised with other departments and whether the profile of the report could be raised. The Head of Carbon Management responded that the data came from the Department For Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) and the Greater London Assembly (GLA). The data itself was not audited by the Council however his team would consider whether this could be part of the overall programme development. It

was also pointed out by members of the Panel, that a results comparison with similar councils would be useful. Further information on the carbon rates of Haringey's regeneration processes was also suggested. The Head of Carbon Management said he would consider this - and also include community outreach in the next version of the ACR. **ACTION**

- The Cabinet Member stated that raising the profile of the ACR both internally (across the Council) and externally ought to be a Council-wide responsibility. The Programme Director for Wellbeing and Climate stated that she recognised that the ACR needed to follow the same lines of public health messages to make it a tool for engagement. She stated that further discussion with councillors on this would be very useful and this was agreed by all. **ACTION.** The Cabinet Member then expressed that he would like to see changes to the standard Council's decision-making template that would include climate impact.
- It was asked what steps had been taken to encourage resident behavioural change. It was stated that the financial argument for climate change should be framed and emphasised to residents - for instance saving on bills. The Cabinet Member agreed with this and emphasised that the ACR messages ought to talk more about the choices residents could make to take climate action, as well as the co-benefits of climate saving actions – such as fighting damp and mould and saving on energy bills. He stated that this would be considered in conjunction with the Climate Action Forum to get more ideas on how to frame and pitch climate messages. **ACTION**

8 - CABINET QUESTIONS: CABINET MEMBER FOR CLIMATE ACTION, TRANSPORT AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Chair opened the floor for questions.

A question was put to the Cabinet Member about the actions that the Council was taking to ensure that cycling and the types of e-bikes on the road were both safe for pedestrians and cyclists. The Cabinet Member stated that more residents were cycling – and this was good for the borough. He stated that those driving e-bikes dangerously were mainly delivery drivers on very tight schedules (and low wages); in this way delivery companies were incentivising staff to drive dangerously. He stated that there had been an increase in serious injuries and deaths involving cyclists and emphasised that it was illegal for under 18s to drive electric bikes. Discussion then turned to the types of electric bikes. The Cabinet Member clarified that pedestrians were the top of the road use hierarchy, so there was a need to protect them. He mentioned that the proposed Public Safety Protection Orders (PSPO) would give the

Council more help with enforcement when it came to the dangerous driving of cycles on pavements. Dedicated cycle lanes would also help, as cyclists would feel safe in protected areas.

Discussion then turned to the difference between experienced and inexperienced cyclists. This was particularly apparent in the young users of e-bikes and Lime Bikes, and it was stated that there was a need to address this. The Cabinet Member responded that dedicated cycle lanes would help inexperienced cycle-users and pavement users feel safe, as would a map for future bike lanes. However, he also pointed out that there had to be consultations over future cycle lanes in placement and design first. He stated that an education piece was being rolled out to schools which offered cycle training. In addition, there were cycling champions and free cycling training available throughout the borough. The Chair raised that this would make no impact on the issues with e-bikes. The Cabinet Member responded that the best approach was through education of e-bike owners and users. In addition, there had been extensive talks between TfL, the GLA and other London councils with delivery companies to ensure they were not incentivising drivers to drive unsafely. He also stated that there had been some outreach work with delivery drivers in Haringey to ensure that they had a better understanding of cycling proficiency.

It was suggested by the Panel that, when rewriting the Lime and Forest bike service level agreement (SLA), part of the obligation on Lime and Forest would be to show adverts to drivers about cycling proficiency. **ACTION**

Discussion then turned to dangerous driving by two power two-wheelers. Questions were raised as to whether this would fall under the Council's proposed PSPO remit or whether it was a police responsibility. The Assistant Director of Resident Experience clarified the definition of a power two-wheeler were two-wheeled scooters/mopeds and motorbikes, rather than e-bikes. This would fall under the police remit; however, he clarified that this was also difficult to enforce. The PSPO would help in this regard.

Further questions were raised as to how to encourage delivery companies to act appropriately regarding cycling training – and staff welfare. The Cabinet Member responded that the scale of the issue was London-wide. Delivery companies incentivised staff to act a certain way in order to deliver food on time. In addition, the food delivery time window was getting smaller. The Assistant Director added that companies weren't engaging with efforts to address this, so the best approach so far to better road safety was through individual drivers.

The Non-Voting Co-optee indicated that residents were very concerned about this. He also indicated the Officer Panel should consider the health and safety of officers when trying to enforce issues with powered two-wheelers – as the Police had encountered very similar issues.

The Cabinet Member then indicated that Vision Zero (the Council's strategy to help reduce road dangers and deaths) and powered two-wheelers were both in his and Cllr Chandwani's portfolio.

Another question was raised regarding the Roundway, a major A-road route. There had been several fatalities, and it was felt amongst the Panel that reducing the speed limit would not address the issue. The Cabinet Member replied that there was a major piece of work that was ongoing over the next 12 -18 months, that incorporated the Roundway, Vision Zero and safer corridors and junctions. There were plans for the Roundway to potentially become a Dutch-style roundabout where cyclists and pedestrians were given priority. He added that the feasibility study had been carried out and the options now would be subject to engagement. The Cabinet Member stressed that high quality segregated cycle lanes would be apparent in this borough in large sections within 12-18 months. In response to further questioning on the issue of speeding on the Roundway, Cllr Hakata indicated that his team knew there was an issue and were looking at solutions.

Discussion then turned to LTNs and School Streets. Members of the Committee highlighted that issues that residents had raised about traffic on boundary roads had to be addressed. The Non-Voting Co-optee stated that many residents were angry about the increase in traffic and the Council's downplaying of the increase as 'modest' in the LTN final report. Cllr Hakata responded that he agreed that there was an issue with the boundary roads and stipulated that work had already started on this – additional cycle lanes were being considered as well as removing parking from particular 'pinch points' on the boundary roads. He also stated that although there were issues on the boundary roads at many times of the day, at other times there was not. In addition, as with many similar traffic reducing schemes nationally, it would take time to see a reduction in traffic on boundary roads. He emphasised that engagement work would help him, and his team understand how this is from a resident point of view.

Issues regarding the W3 bus route were then considered. Concerns were raised regarding the infrequency of the route in the east of the borough. It was felt that the route was becoming unviable. It was emphasised that many schools east of the borough relied on this route and concerns were raised that

the west of the borough was being prioritised over the east. The Cabinet Member agreed that the W3 route was increasingly becoming unfit for purpose. He responded that work was underway between Haringey's Transport team and TfL. A report is expected late January on the W3 bus route and Cllr Hakata proposed to hold a meeting with all the ward councillors who are impacted, before meeting with TfL. **ACTION**

An update on the Climate Action Unit was then requested. The Cabinet Member explained that the Climate Action Unit was made up of the Programme Board and Climate Action Partnership. The Board would be leading on work – taking the Climate Change Action Plan as its basis. The Programme Director for Wellbeing and Climate would be leading on this and be putting in place governance.

9 – FURTHER BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

Written responses to councillor requests for further information from November's Budget Scrutiny Meeting were then discussed and probed further. It was commented that further information was needed from officers within the written responses. Further questions were asked by the Panel with regards to the proposed £300k of parking permit storage savings. The Assistant Director of Resident Experience clarified that the £300k included a proportion of savings for storage units and because of a greater shift towards online parking permits, which would therefore also lead savings to staffing costs. He stated that this equated to about four members of staff - either agency staff or those nearing the end of their fixed-term contracts.

No further questions were asked. The Committee was satisfied that there were no further recommendations from the Budgetary Scrutiny Meeting.

10 – STREET LIGHTING UPDATE AND WORK PLAN.

The Committee decided that:

- A few case studies of where issues with street lighting had been reported but there had been no resolution, would be forwarded to the service area by elected members. The Panel requested that a written response be prepared as to why the issue had not been resolved, and any lessons learned from the situation. **ACTION**
- Improved communication with residents was discussed. A question was raised as to how easy it would be for the contractor Marlborough when visiting the column to ascertain the nature of a fault, to put up signs/posters for residents

indicating whether the issue had been reported, a reference number, and ideally a date for residents to expect it to be working again. A written response was requested. **ACTION**

- Finding extra resource for the Street Lighting Manager (who had a minimal team) was discussed at the meeting. A written response would be sought as to whether extra resource could be found that would improve communication with residents. **ACTION.**
- The Panel requested a written response on how faults on streetlights were reported and where the problems were with this. Further information was requested on how reporting occurred and how issues were prioritised by location and urgency. The Panel were also particularly interested in how faults were reported to the third parties and how effective frontline systems were. As well as how issues themselves were flagged. **ACTION**
- Reporting processes was then discussed. More information was requested as to the Performance Indicators to ascertain what faults were being fixed according to deadline agreements. **ACTION.**
- The Street Lighting Team's staffing and contingencies were then discussed. A written response was then requested as to what contingencies were in place if the Street Lighting Manager were to be off for extended periods of time or leave. **ACTION.**

There was further discussion on the Street Lighting Mini-Review and its place in the workplan. The Panel decided that a regular verbal update as to the status of the various issues within Street Lighting at the meeting would suffice rather than an in-depth review. In addition to the updates, the service would be required to respond to the Panel's service recommendations. **ACTION.**

Meeting ended at 9:30pm.