

## **Draft Minutes of the Environment and Housing Scrutiny Panel 21<sup>st</sup> March 2013**

**Present:** Cllr Alexander, Cllr Bloch, Cllr McNamara (Chair), Cllr Stanton and Cllr Weber

**Also present:** Cllr Allison, Cllr Canver and Cllr Hare

**Attending:** Ann Cunningham (Head of Traffic Management), Emma Davies (Contract Development Officer), Stephen McDonnell (Assistant Director, Single Front Line), Gary Weston (Parking Infrastructure Manager),

### **1. Apologies for absence**

1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Gibson.

### **2. Declarations of interest**

2.1 As the Council's representative on the North London Waste Authority board, Cllr Canver declared an interest in items or discussions pertaining to North London Waste Authority.

### **3. Urgent Business.**

3.1 None received.

### **4. Minutes and actions points**

4.1 The panel were updated on the action points from the 8<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

#### Action point 5 – housing scrutiny

4.2 The Chair of the Environment and Housing Scrutiny Panel had met with the chairs of Homes for Haringey scrutiny bodies (Performance Committee and Resident Scrutiny Panel) together with the Homes for Haringey Director of Operations to discuss the scrutiny of local housing issues. The meeting enabled representatives to share information about current and future work programmes to avoid duplication. Representatives agreed to meet twice annually.

#### Action point 8 – Cabinet meeting with Overview & Scrutiny Committee

4.3 Members of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee (OSC) and Cabinet had met to discuss local scrutiny arrangements. The meeting was helpful in determining how the work of scrutiny could compliment the strategic priorities of the Council and ensure that there was no duplication. It was agreed that Cabinet and OSC would meet twice annually (once directly after the Annual General Meeting).

4.4 The panel sought to emphasise a number of key principles that should underpin the selection of topics for scrutiny and for future work programming, which included:

- that there should not be any dilution of the principle that scrutiny should be free to choose what work it undertakes;
- that scrutiny can work effectively in operational matters as well as in policy and that through looking at systemic issues it can help to improve service performance;
- that sufficient flexibility should be inbuilt in to work programming to allow scrutiny bodies to respond to issues as they emerge throughout the year;
- that dialogue with services should underpin topic selection and scoping;

- that consultation with other authorities is fundamental to shaping and informing policy and practice here in Haringey.

**Agreed:** The panel agreed it would like to receive a briefing on the how the Corporate Plan was developed and its relationship with the Forward Plan.

Action point 9 – Posting of special waste collection notices on Bank Holidays

- 4.5 The panel noted that the only time that special notices would need to be posted on the Council and Veolia website would be Christmas, as there is no other time in the year when there will be variance to the planned collection schedule (i.e. collections operate as normal every other Bank Holiday). A notice indicating that there is no change to the current collection system has been added to both websites for the Easter period.

Action Point 12 -Strategic Enforcement

- 4.6 The Chair indicated that he had met with the Chief Executive to discuss the panel's future planned work on strategic enforcement. It had been agreed that this would be a useful topic to consider and would assist the Council. The panel would further discuss the aims and objectives of this work in item 9.
- 4.7 The panel agreed the minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

**5. Cabinet Member Questions**

- 5.1 Councillor Canver, Cabinet Member for the Environment, attended to respond to member questions within this portfolio. Prior to taking member questions, the Cabinet member welcomed the work of the panel to help increase recycling in the borough and also made a number of points:
- The roll-out of fortnightly collection had helped to improve the recycling rate from 26% to 32% and is currently above contractual target for year end 12/13;
  - The Council had been given money from Defra for a food waste collection system for flatted properties and this would be developed over the coming months.

Reuse and Recycling Centre

- 5.2 In response to questions around the transfer of the Reuse and Recycling site from Hornsey High Street, the panel noted that planning consent and a waste management license were being sought for the new site at Cranfield Way. The panel noted that there was no intention for the loss of this facility during the transfer. The panel requested that further information (a briefing) is provided on the Reuse and Recycling Centre transfer process.

**Agreed:** That a briefing is prepared on the transfer of the Reuse and Recycling Centre in Hornsey High Street to Cranfield Way (e.g. plans, planning approval, timescales and risks).

Waste and recycling collection

- 5.3 In relation to the roll-out of fortnightly waste collections, there was a perception that there were still ongoing problems which were not being resolved quickly enough, particularly in relation to side waste and overflowing bins at specific properties and locations. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that whilst the overwhelming majority of households had complied with the new collection system, problems remained with

about 5% of households. Veolia and Single Front Line were taking steps to monitor and engage such households.

- 5.4 The panel noted that there should be a range of policy options at the disposal of the Council to encourage more people to comply with the new waste and recycling collection systems, including both incentives and enforcement options. To encourage people to make the necessary changes to their behaviour would require the use of a range of different policy tools by the Council.
- 5.5 The Cabinet Member also noted that recycling contamination rates were also relatively low in Haringey; currently this was about 0.5% of loads. This was also confirmed in the panel visit to Materials Recovery Facility where it was noted that contamination rates from North London Waste Authority areas was low. Nonetheless, the panel noted that the service continued to 'drill down' to identify localities where contamination occurred and further engage local residents.
- 5.6 The panel noted that one year on from the new collection system there were still ongoing problems (too many bins on the street and overflowing bins) at one of the case study sites (Milton Road and Milton Avenue, N6). It was acknowledged that there were ongoing issues with the Miltons (N6) and that the service continued to work with local residents to find a solution. The panel noted that a further consultation with local residents was planned in April 2013 to ascertain views on the current system and to identify any further action required.

**Agreed:** That the panel to be kept informed of the outcomes from the follow up consultation with the Miltons (N6).

- 5.7 The panel noted that there were also ongoing problems with waste collection from Winchester Place (a student accommodation block). In this location, access was restricted and waste collection by standard collection vehicles (26 tonnes) was not possible and this was causing problems with side waste. Despite a number of enquiries, it was not clear if there was a smaller vehicle (12 tonnes) in the Veolia fleet which could collect rubbish from this site.

**Agreed:** That Single Front Line would further investigate the availability of a smaller vehicle for collection of rubbish from the student accommodation block on Winchester Place.

- 5.8 Further to the monies obtained by the Council (from Defra) to assist in development of food waste collection from flats, it was noted that this included all flatted properties in the borough including those managed by Homes for Haringey, other Registered Housing Providers and privately managed apartment blocks.

#### School recycling

- 5.9 The panel indicated that it intends to look at recycling in schools within its future work programme. To assist the scoping of this work, the Cabinet Member agreed that a briefing could be provided which outlined current and future work of both Veolia and Single Front Line to promote recycling in schools.

**Agreed:** That a briefing is prepared on current and future work planned by both Single Front Line and Veolia to promote recycling in schools.

Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)

5.10 The panel noted the visit to the Biffa operate MRF on March 18<sup>th</sup> 2013. One of the issues arising from this visit was the pay and conditions of those working on this site (workers were paid the national minimum wage not the London living wage and were required to work 12 hour shifts). It was agreed that the panel would write to NLWA outlining its concerns.

**Agreed:** That the panel would write to NLWA to outline its concerns on the employment and pay of staff at the Biffa MRF (the letter would be circulated to Overview & Scrutiny Committee for approval).

Street recycling

5.11 In response to questions about the recycling of street waste, the panel noted that there were plans in place by Veolia to introduce new recycling bins in each of the eight village areas in Haringey. Whilst it was acknowledged that there are problems with recycling contamination from street waste, it was anticipated that the planned investment would help to increase the volume of street waste that was recycled.

Hazardous waste

5.12 In response to questions about the disposal routes for hazardous chemical waste (e.g. asbestos, chemicals etc) the panel noted that the City of London Corporation run a collection service for all London residents which can be booked through the corporation. Other waste such as paint can be disposed of at local Reuse and Recycle Centres. The panel noted that further details were available through the Council website.

HGV use of Ladder (Harringay)

5.13 In response to questions about Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) using the ladder in Harringay Ward and the problems that arise for local residents, the panel noted that this was a very complex situation particularly in relation to enforcement of any controls and the prospect of displacement of traffic on to other streets. The panel noted that a number of possible solutions were being investigated, including the use of number plate recognition technology and temporary cameras.

5.14 The panel noted that there were particular problems with HGVs and other vehicles at the junction of Hewitt Road and Green Lanes, with traffic continuing to turn right and causing an obstruction to the main traffic flow on the Green Lanes corridor. The Cabinet Member noted that a meeting with Hewitt's Road Residents association is being planned with traffic engineers to help find a local solution.

5.15 The Cabinet Member also noted that there were plans for the development of the Green Lanes traffic corridor, which may provide a further opportunity to find a holistic solution to traffic issues in this part of the borough. The panel indicated that it would like to receive a briefing on planned future developments to assist transport and traffic in the Green Lanes corridor.

**Agreed:** That a briefing is prepared for the next meeting of plans to develop the Green Lanes corridor.

## **6. Tottenham Hotspur CPZ**

- 6.1 The panel noted the report on the Councils approach to CPZ in Haringey.
- 6.2 The panel received a presentation from Traffic Management with an update on plans to introduce a Tottenham Hotspur Match Day/Event Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). A summary of the issues covered in the presentation and subsequent panel discussion is provided below (a full copy of the presentation is attached).
- 6.3 The panel noted that a total of £980k has been allocated through the Mayors Regeneration Fund for a phased development of the Tottenham CPZ (with £330k being available in phase 1). Phase 2 is conditional on commencement of stadium build. The service emphasised that the approach to this CPZ would be holistic and would involve all stakeholders. In addition, the work would provide an opportunity to assess and resolve many localised parking and road traffic issues within the proposed CPZ.
- 6.4 The panel noted that local Councillors had been consulted in phase 1 who had concerns that this CPZ was based on anticipated demand rather than actual demand, which has been the general policy of the council to date. In this context, both members and residents found it difficult to envisage what controls should be in place given that the development had yet to be built and no additional traffic problems had resulted in the area thus far.
- 6.5 The panel noted that an initial consultation with local residents was attended by 24 people. The panel noted that there were a number of key issues to emerge from this which included:
  - Surrounding localities expressed some support for additional controls;
  - The need to improve bus transport in this area;
  - The need for additional safety precautions for increased HGV usage around the area ahead of stadium build phase;
  - The need to address pop-up parking (unregulated off street parking).
- 6.6 The panel noted that the actual CPZ consultation will include over 8,000 households and would be conducted over a period of 8 weeks to ensure the following commitments:
  - 4 drop-in day sessions one in each ward;
  - Pop up consultation events in High Road and Northumberland Park;
  - Leaflet distribution;
  - To provide information to areas in surrounding areas.
- 6.7 The panel noted the department is aiming to start the consultation in May/June 2013 with a final report to Cabinet on the proposed scheme in September 2013. On site works will commence later in September in readiness for the opening of the supermarket in November 2013.
- 6.8 The panel noted that there were three outstanding issues which needed to be addressed:

- To agree an approach to managing pop up parking;
- To agree whether match day parking can be provided in commercial/industrial areas within the zone;
- Agree how administration costs will be covered for new and future renewals of match day only permits.

6.9 The panel noted concerns around the THFC ambition that the stadium would be a leisure destination 365 days a year and whether planned for parking controls would be sufficient to not cause problems for local residents. Other concerns raised by the panel included whether there would be adequate provision for public toilets in the area as this was a specific problem on match days.

**Agreed:** That a short briefing is provided on the anticipated number of events to be held at the new Tottenham Hotspur Stadium.

6.10 The panel noted that an experimental approach was being adopted in the introduction of this CPZ which meant that a review process would be built in to the development of the scheme. This would give local residents, members and officers a further opportunity to review the scheme once it has been installed.

6.11 It was emphasised to the panel that there would be a link-up to Regeneration within the planning of this CPZ. This would ensure that growth and regeneration issues would be reflected in to parking and traffic management plans.

**Agreed:** That a short briefing is prepared on which types of CPZ (e.g. experimental, full consultation or extensions) are in operation at different locations across Haringey.

## 7. Strategic Parking Issues ahead of Tottenham Hotspur redevelopment

### Report back from Phillip Lane Walkabout

7.1 The panel noted the report which provided itemised cost to undertake works identified in the walkabout on Phillip Lane.

7.2 The panel noted that £46,650 would be needed to complete all identified work, though this could be reduced if this was programmed to be completed as one scheme as this would reduce consultation and legal costs ascribed to individual improvements.

7.3 The panel noted that the cost of these works needed to be weighted and prioritised against the budget available and other essential works. The panel noted that there is currently a budget of £60k for parking infrastructure maintenance and £550k for reactive maintenance.

7.4 The panel suggested that other funding avenues should also be pursued to further help reduce the total costs for this work. It was noted that some of the works identified from the walkabout relate to traffic pinch-points on Phillip Lane, and it may be of some interest to Transport for London (TfL) that these are rectified to help reduce bus delays in the area. In this context, TfL should be approached to ascertain if they would be willing to contribute to any of the scheme proposals.

**Agreed:** That Traffic Management Service should approach Transport for London as a possible contributor to the Phillip Lane scheme.

- 7.5 The panel noted that the walkabout approach which has been used to identify remedial parking and traffic management works in a defined area could be used as a model in which (subject to resources and other priorities) it could be replicated elsewhere across the borough.
- 7.6 As a result of a recent reorganisation, the panel noted that parking services had been merged with sustainable travel into a singular Traffic Management service. It was suggested that this merger would encourage more area based working and facilitate more joined up solutions to local traffic issues (as exemplified in the Philip Lane Walkabout scheme).
- 7.7 Traffic Management Orders are used to instigate local road traffic restrictions (e.g. yellow lines, parking bays and one-way systems). The panel noted that there had been some recent amendments to the way that these are authorised.

**Agreed:** The panel requested a brief update on recent changes to the process used to grant Traffic Management Orders.

Report back from Tottenham Hotspur Match day Visit

- 7.8 The panel noted the report of its visit to Tottenham Hotspur to assess match day parking issues.
- 7.9 The panel noted that pop-up (unregulated off street) parking was widespread in the area and beyond on match days. Even in this assessment, over 25 different sites were identified to offer local parking for match day traffic at cost of between £5-18. The nature of sites offering parking also varied including local schools, community centres and business forecourts.
- 7.10 The panel observed that match day parking restrictions were in operation in non-residential areas during the visit, such as in commercial and residential areas and that many of these streets where controls were in place were empty of cars. Given that pop-up parking is also available in the area, the panel indicated that this represented a potential loss of income for the council. In this context, the panel suggested that the special match day parking should be considered in such non-residential areas where controls currently exist.
- 7.11 From the visit, the panel also noted the number of Blue Badges which were used at a number of locations around the stadium. The panel noted that whilst most of these may be used genuinely, the scale of the usage around the site would suggest that this issue would require further examination. The panel noted that the scale of Blue Badge use on match days may deter local holders of Blue Badge parking permits to use the area.

**Agreed:** The panel agreed to defer consideration of the use of Blue Badges on match days to a future meeting.

7.12 The Panel also noted the report on the visit to six council operated car parks. A key assessment made by the panel from the visit was that signposting to car park sites could be improved at key entry points in to the borough. Improved signage would help to direct match day traffic to local car parks with a view to improving take up and turnover on match days.

#### Perspectives from other Local Authorities

7.13 A verbal update was provided to the panel which outlined further perspectives of match day parking issues from other local authorities which host similar type stadia in their area.

7.14 In relation to the operation of Match day CPZs:

- Many areas were already covered by a CPZ, though with additional (extended) controls in operation on match days;
- Given changes in TV coverage, matches are occurring at different times of the day and some authorities indicated that the timing of match day CPZ would need to be revisited.

7.15 In relation to pop-up parking, a number of observations were reported from other authorities:

- The density of local development was a determinant of the availability of pop-up parking. Not all those authorities questioned experienced similar levels of pop-up parking to that recorded in Haringey, as the area surrounding stadia was more developed;
- In one authority, the council operated a match day parking scheme at many potential pop-up parking sites in the vicinity of the stadium (including schools, colleges, and private businesses). Payment is made through a mobile phone or vouchers purchased from the Council. Although this generated additional income, no further details were available on the terms of such arrangements;
- It was generally accepted that pop-up parking occurs around many event venues, but given its opportunistic nature, is difficult to manage.

7.16 In relation to enforcement of Blue Badge schemes, the panel noted that in those authorities consulted:

- A number indicated that they had some concerns about Blue Badge use and possible abuse on match days;
- A number of authorities had dedicated Blue Badge Fraud Officers to help detect fraudulent use, though it was acknowledged that these posts were not cost neutral, as any income derived from their work (e.g. fines) was not returned to the service.

7.17 In relation to supporting communications for match day /events parking the panel noted that:

- Most authorities listed future match day events on their website;
- One authority operated an email alert system to notify local residents (upon sign up) of up-coming events and related road traffic issues.

7.18 The panel noted that the Department of Transport had notified local authorities of the availability of controls within the Road Traffic regulation Act 1984, which would enable the operation of a discretionary licensing scheme in which all unregulated off



street parking in a defined area would require a license. The panel noted however, that, to the knowledge of DT officials, this licensing scheme had not been used to control parking by a local authority to date.

7.19 Based on the evidence it had received, the panel outlined some recommendations that it was considering in this area of work:

- 1) Explore options for the establishment of a special event day parking on commercial streets (flat rate fee, phone payment and signage);
- 2) Create a two part focus for existing match day controls to reverse emphasis with no residential parking to allow match day parking with residential sections continuing as resident only parking;
- 3) Ring fence income from the above to support:
  - Environmental and remedial works in council operated car parks;
  - Erect pay and display signage for pay and display car parks at entry points to Tottenham;
  - Creation of a traffic scheme review fund to finance traffic works (CPZ reviews, main road remedial works and other scheme reviews (e.g. one way systems);
- 4) Seed fund the above developments for the introductory phase from existing parking income with a view to it being self financing as a soon as the SED is up and running;
- 5) Investigation of reasonable regulation of 'pop-up parking' schemes based on the policy and practice of other boroughs with large stadia and the development of criteria for regulation and enforcement.

**Agreed:** That a short report detailing the work of the panel, its conclusions and recommendations to be produced in a discrete report for panel approval.

7.20 The Chair and the panel thanked all parking and road traffic officers for their support in this work. It was noted that officers had been of great assistance in responding to member questions and assisting in site visits.

## 8. Waste and recycling

### Progress report on implementation of earlier recommendations

8.1 The report updating the panel on earlier recommendations relating to the new waste and recycling service was noted by the panel.

8.2 The panel noted the analysis of complaint data that was provided in relation to the waste and recycling collection system. From this report the panel noted that:

- Of the 280 stage one complaints received about the waste and recycling service from march 2012 to February 2013, 47 (17%) were escalated to a stage 2.
- A majority (65%) of stage 1 complaints received about the waste and recycling collection service related to missed collections, though other concerns related to the new containers (6%), the quality of the service (6%) or the new policy itself (5%).

### Report back from the panel visit to the Ecopark and Biffa operated MRF

8.3 There was insufficient time to consider this item and this was deferred.

#### Recycling from Flats

8.4 There was insufficient time to consider this item and this was deferred.

#### Further policy options to increase recycling

8.5 There was insufficient time to consider this item and this was deferred.

### **9. Strategic Enforcement**

9.1 The panel reported back on discussions in relation to the scope of a future review of the enforcement functions of the Council. The panel indicated that there should be three outcomes for this work:

- To produce an audit of enforceable functions of both the Council and its partners;
- To establish criteria for enforceable actions (for example, public safety, costs, public interest);
- To develop protocols to enable and support partnership working and information sharing in support of enforceable actions.

### **10. Community Engagement with the Planning Process.**

10.1 There was insufficient time to consider this item and this was deferred to a future meeting of the panel.

### **11. Future meetings**

11.1 The panel agreed to meet on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> April at 18.30.

### **12. Work programme**

There was insufficient time to consider this item and this was deferred to the next meeting of the panel.

### **13. Any other business**

**Meeting close** – The meeting finished at 10.00pm

Cllr Stuart McNamara  
Chair, Environment & Housing scrutiny Panel  
March 2013