

MINUTES OF MEETING OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON Monday, 19th October, 2015, 7.00 - 10.05 pm

Councillors: Charles Wright (Chair), Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair), Eugene Ayisi, Kirsten Hearn and Adam Jogee

Also Attending: Members of the Friends of Finsbury Park and Hackney Residents (for Minute numbers 38 & 46), and the following Haringey officers: Daliah Barrett (Licensing Team Leader), Martin Bradford (Principal Scrutiny Officer), Tracie Evans (Chief Operating Officer), Margaret Gallagher (Performance Manager, Commissioning), Denise Gandy (Director of Housing Demand), Sarah Jones (Partnerships Officer, Parks), Eubert Malcolm (Head of Community Safety and Regulatory Services), Neville Murton (Head of Finance, Accounting & Control), Charlotte Pomery (Commissioning Manager), Christian Scade (Principal Scrutiny Officer), Simon Farrow (Interim Head of Direct Services), Natalie Layton (Clerk)

and Cllr Hare (observer)

34. 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'.

35. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

36. URGENT BUSINESS

None

37. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hearn declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item 14 – Scrutiny Review Final Report – Finsbury Park Events - by virtue of being a Stroud Green Ward Councillor.

Councillor Connor declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item(s) 45,49, 51 by virtue of her sister working as a GP in Tottenham.

38. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

- a. Deputation by the Friends of Finsbury Park on the Finsbury Park Events Scrutiny Review (Agenda Item 14)

RECEIVED a deputation from members of the Friends of Finsbury Park in relation to the Finsbury Park Scrutiny Review. The following points were noted:

- that a letter had been sent to the Leader of the Council and local Member of Parliament from Sarah Caton, a governor at Stroud Green Primary School, concerning the effects of the Wireless event at Finsbury Park on children at the school.
- various schools in Islington had their sports day on the same day as Wireless and the festival had disturbed this;
- the Friends of Finsbury Park were disappointed and disagreed with some of the conclusions of the scrutiny report;
- acknowledgment of the need to raise income for the park and recognition that the report touched on how such income should be spent;
- concern of the impact of such events at the park including the social costs to people's lives and the enjoyment of their homes and the ability to get to school;
- the impact of 50,000 people on local people, whose gardens had been used as litter bins and toilets;
- such events excluded local people from the park and also resulted in damage to the park.

b. NOTED in response to questions from the Committee:

- *the Friends of Finsbury Park made a number of suggestions. For example, the deputation explained the Friends' had consistently welcomed dialogue with the council about other revenue schemes, tri-borough control of the park and the nature of the Wireless event. The deputation emphasised that the Friends welcomed alternative events;*
- during the Wireless event much of the park had been unavailable for exercise/sport at the same time as the Wimbledon tennis tournament and a local obesity conference;
- further consideration should be given to mitigate the effect such large events had on children during school hours.

b. Public questions on the Finsbury Park Scrutiny Review (Agenda Item 14)

RECIEVED the following questions in relation to the Finsbury Park Scrutiny Review, which the Chair responded to:

1. **Given anti-social, dangerous, and illegal activities which took place in Finsbury Park as a direct result of the Council hosting Wireless Festival and other events, I would like to ask what sort of image the Council wishes to project of Finsbury Park as both a recreational space and residential area (*Hackney resident*)**

Response: the scrutiny review panel believed it to be possible to mitigate the impact of such events on the local community and that a balance needed to be struck between the disruption to the area and the income generated.

2. **I live in Hackney and so have no political representation in Haringey and no choice regarding the event policy you have put in**

place for Finsbury Park. Why then do I have to suffer from excessive noise pollution/disturbance during inappropriate events, from the prolonged loss of amenity with a park encircled by intimidating security fencing and watchtowers and the use of my front garden as a place to urinate, defecate and vomit when this would not be tolerated by anyone on this scrutiny committee? (Hackney resident Jeremy Llewellyn-Jones)

Response: the review panel had received evidence from significant parties, and the final report alluded to extending community engagement. Councillor Hearn confirmed that she lived close to Finsbury Park and had herself expressed concerns about the anti-social behaviour. The report recommended looking at ways to improve crowd control including ways to ensure better stewarding.

- 3. My partner and I are forced to vacate our home every year due to these large scale festival events taking place due to the light & noise pollution that causes us and our pet great distress as well as my partner experiencing heavy anxiety attacks as result of said pollution. This imposes a large financial and mental burden on us and other families in the area.**

Our question is would you willing and how would you justify subjecting your partners, children, pets and families to the same stresses and strains that we and others are being subjected to year on year. (Hackney resident)

Response: The Chair reiterated his response, emphasising that the income generated was a significant factor given the current austerity measures but that a balance needed to be struck between the disruption to the area and the income generated. The Committee considered that there was scope to mitigate the impact of large events and had set out recommendations to that effect.

- 4. Why does the council believe it is appropriate that events should finish by 10pm on Sunday evening's prior to school days? My children were deprived of sleep and at 2140 on Sunday 5th July I called the "Control Centre" to complain that the sound levels were harming my children and to request that the music be stopped. This was ignored.**

Furthermore owing to the chaotic egress onto Seven Sisters Road 100's of revellers were allowed into the adjoining streets where they nosily loitered to wait for taxis. If Seven Sisters Road is to be closed during the egress why not allow taxi collections for there instead of allowing this widespread anti-social behaviour? (Hackney resident)

Response: The review had looked at the timings of events and had made recommendations in terms of days, and numbers of events during summer holidays. On balance the panel had felt that the operating times of the

Wireless event were appropriate. The Chair acknowledged the good point about allowing taxis on Seven Sisters Road but evidence had shown that completely closing the road was the most appropriate option. Egress was constantly under review for large events.

5. Do members think it is acceptable to hold such large scale events in a densely populated area which impacts both audibly and physically on local residents and users of the nearby transport hub. In addition such events inevitably lead to increase in anti-social behaviour including drug dealing and abuse. Laughing gas cylinders were left in the playground, and security levels were worrying. (Haringey Resident

The scrutiny review panel had held in-depth discussions with Wireless organisers and it was broadly accepted that there had been issues with security at various points. Policing and security levels would be under review for any future events.

With regard to laughing gas, the panel considered recommending the introduction of a 'public spaces protection order'. However, it was noted that the use was not of a frequent and regular nature. In addition, it was recognised that the Government was due to bring in new legislation in relation to psychoactive substances that would effectively ban the use of these as a legal high.

39. MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 1 December 2014 and 27 July 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

40. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS

NOTED the minutes of the following Scrutiny Panel meetings:

- a. Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel, 29 June 2015;
- b. Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel, 9 July 2015.

41. ORDER OF AGENDA

RESOLVED to vary the order of the agenda to consider agenda item 14 below– Scrutiny Review Final Report – Finsbury Park Events directly after the deputations and questions.

42. SCRUTINY REVIEW FINAL REPORT - FINSBURY PARK EVENTS

RECEIVED the final report of the Finsbury Park Events Scrutiny Project, introduced by the Chair as laid out on pages 183-304 of the agenda pack.

NOTED the following further to the committee's discussion of the report and the recommendations on page 299:

- The panel had seriously considered the evidence presented during the review and the Chair emphasised that much planning took place around these events. Some of the issues had arisen due to the lack of stewards and egress planning and the recommendations referred to many of the matters raised by stakeholders;
- The committee reviewed the recommendations in the report, including that:
 - Recommendation 2b – it was confirmed that the income generated by events was approximately 40% of the parks budget. The remaining 60% of the parks budget came from other income lines and approximately £300k of council funding’.
 - Recommendation 10 – the Head of Direct Services would be asked to oversee this work and would be responsible for reporting back to stakeholders;
 - Councillor Connor questioned the school-time disruption raised during the deputation. Officers confirmed that the Wireless Event had started on Friday and officers had visited Stroud Green Road but had not witnessed any bad language at the time;
 - there was a ‘show-stop’ agreement, which had been invoked with one show being stopped during the event. Councillor Hearn suggested that the show stopper clause also be applied to sound checks;
 - the Committee noted officers’ reassurances that the points raised in the letter from Sarah Caton would continue to be addressed;

post-meeting note: Committee Chair has confirmed that the letter from Sarah Caton had been followed up and meetings were being arranged with the school.

- sound checks consisted of music and vocal octave sound checks;
- Recommendation 13 – it was not possible to ban tobacco sales as a condition of the license although the council could take a decision to not allow tobacco sales at events.

RESOLVED to agree the recommendations in the Finsbury Park Events Scrutiny Project Final report.

43. REVISED SCRUTINY PANEL MEMBERSHIP

RECEIVED the report seeking a change to the membership of the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel.

RESOLVED to agree the revised membership of the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel as detailed below:

Councillor Pippa Connor (Chair)
 Councillor Gina Adamou
 Councillor David Beacham
 Councillor Clare Bull
 Councillor Stephen Mann (replaces Councillor Raj Sahota)
 Councillor Peter Mitchell (replaces ex-Councillor Denise Marshall)
 Councillor Felicia Opoku

Clerks note Cllr Wright left the meeting 20:22:

Vice-Chair CLLR CONNOR IN THE CHAIR

Cllr Wright returned at 20:28

Cllr Jogee left the meeting at 20:21 and returned at 20:23.

44. PRIORITY PERFORMANCE UPDATE - QUARTER 2

RECEIVED the latest performance data across the five corporate plan priorities, introduced by Charlotte Pomery, Assistant Director – Commissioning.

REPORTED that technical issues had resulted in a delay in the dashboards going live on the council's website which was now anticipated for the end of the week. Charlotte Pomery welcomed views on how scrutiny could monitor the priority dashboards and use the evidence to inform work programmes going forward.

NOTED, in response to questions and discussion, that:

- the priority boards, which met monthly for operation discussions with one in three meetings dedicated to strategic matters, agreed the information contained within the data packs;
- the dashboards were predominately amber-red across the board. This was due to the indicators being new and the performance data being the first set under the new monitoring process, therefore it was too early to determine any patterns;
- the new system of performance monitoring brought together other aspects of council performance such as finances and policy changes which affected the council's ability to deliver. However, the main aim was to focus on the objectives of the corporate plan. Members could be involved in reviewing the indicators over time;
- the outcomes were dependent on both internal and external factors;
- the children's services scrutiny panel would consider the data for priority 1 at its next meeting;
- priority 2 objective 3, page 78, projected a 2% targeted increase for reablement services. In response to concerns raised it was explained that the council was already doing fairly well against other boroughs and this was considered a significant achievement;
- the committee noted that priority 4 was not performing particularly well (with mainly red indicators), and that these were new, long term indicators;
- the data came from a number of different sources and was subject to validation. Internal auditors were establishing a mechanism to validate 5-10% of the indicators.

RESOLVED to note

- a. the indicators and their links to priority objectives, agreed targets and the new performance management reporting framework and methodology to update multiple audiences in a timely, insightful and forward looking way;
- b. the progress made against the delivery of the Corporate Plan, Building a Stronger Haringey Together priorities and targets at this point in the 2015/16 year.

45. BUDGET MONITORING - PERIOD 5

RECEIVED the period 5 budget monitoring report, introduced by Neville Murton, Head of Finance, Accounting & Control.

The Committee reviewed the Council's latest financial position covering the revenue and capital monitoring and questioned the rising cost of temporary accommodation.

a. Temporary Accommodation

NOTED that Denise Gandy (Director of Housing Demand) provided the following information in response to questions:

- i. the council had a duty to provide people with housing and Haringey currently had 3000 households in temporary accommodation. 400 of these were single, vulnerable households and approximately 700 were households with at least one child;
- ii. a range of temporary accommodation facilities were used by the council, some of which were cost neutral such as hostels. However, the level of supply had reduced from 1000 to 650 in 3 years and other London boroughs were experiencing similar pressures;
- iii. there were currently 1400 Haringey residents in nightly rated accommodation. The council leased some properties at a good rate but landlords were moving away from long-term leases to nightly lease rates, which were increasing significantly. London-wide conversations were taking place to attempt to limit increasing costs;
- iv. options included sourcing out-of-London accommodation and the council was also looking at how to control day to day bookings to ensure costs were minimised, including moving those in the most costly accommodation into cheaper housing;
- v. sub-regional work was being done to consider how the market could be controlled and how councils, which were all in demand for properties, could avoid outbidding each other for properties;
- vi. targets were set for housing teams to prevent homelessness and reduce the number of households in temporary accommodation. Preventing homelessness was going well but there were limited options for people to move out of temporary accommodation and the council needed to invest in acquiring properties;
- vii. a future housing supply strategy and temporary accommodation strategy would be presented to members, included options for shared hostels and accommodation further away as fewer households will be able to afford London rentals as a result of the benefit caps;
- viii. currently temporary accommodation placements were London wide, mainly Haringey and Enfield, and towards Broxbourne. Strict rules existed relating to school placements when considering where to house people to protect the key years in education. In response to concerns raised it was emphasised that, when housing families, consideration was given to special education needs and other specific criteria and not just school location;

- ix. when officers met homeless people their focus was to place them wherever possible but longer term placements needed to look in detail at social care needs in general rather than schooling in isolation;
- x. the temporary accommodation team saw approximately 2000 households a year. 650 of these went through the temporary housing application. Some of these were placed in temporary accommodation while the application was considered. However, only approximately 70 went into temporary accommodation;
- xi. Councillor Akwasi commended the work of the housing teams at Apex House and thanked officers for the serious frontline work which was becoming increasingly more challenging.

b. Adult's Services

The estimated overspend of £10.9m was a huge concern to the committee particularly the increased number of clients (100 more than at the start of the year). It was reported that the council was working to further understand the drivers of the upward pressures. Whilst there was no doubt about the increasing numbers of older people with complex needs, there were also some system inefficiencies and alternative pathways to be explored.

RESOLVED to note the Council's latest financial position.

46. **BUDGET SCRUTINY**

RECEIVED the report detailing the budget scrutiny process for 2016/17, introduced by Neville Murton, (Head of Finance, Accounting & Control) as laid out on pages 1-20 of the supplementary agenda pack. Noted that the budget presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in January 2016 would reflect any changes to the previously set budget as a result of the government's spending review.

NOTED, further to discussion, that

- the committee had already formally scrutinised the budget process for the 3 years and would only further scrutinised it if significant changes were made;
- the scrutiny panels would conduct annual budget monitoring exercises;
- Councillor Connor asked if the budget monitoring by the panels would be single item meetings and the Chair emphasised that the panels could conduct budget monitoring in various ways;
- Currently there were indicative figures for 2017/2018 and, after the spending review in November officers would seek to extend the MTFs (Medium Term Financial Strategy). In May/June 2016 officers would look to extend the MTFs by a further year or two if the budget information was available. This would include proposals for savings and investments for 2019/2020. This would go through the same scrutiny process as the 2015/2018 MTFs.

Clerk's note: Councillors Jogee and Hearn left the meeting between 21:10-21:15

RESOLVED that

1. scrutiny of the 2016/17 budget, which is part of the approved MTFS 2015 – 2018, be undertaken only by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and at its meeting in January 2016, and;
2. each scrutiny panel be able set a date, during the course of each year, to undertake a review of their areas overall service and financial performance, taking into account previous years' performance, the current year's estimated outturn position and future changes as set out in the Council's MTFS. The outcome from any review to be considered by the full Overview and Scrutiny Committee at the next meeting where the Council's overall quarterly budget performance is considered.

47. CONSULTATION ON REVISED STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY FOR GAMBLING ACT 2005

RECEIVED the draft Statement of Licensing Policy for the Gambling Act 2005 introduced by Daliah Barrett, Licensing Team Leader, as laid out in the report, pages 117-158.

REPORTED that the Statement of Licensing Policy formed part of the council's budget and policy framework. Some amendments had been made to reflect changes in the Gambling Commissions Licensing Conditions and Codes of Practise (LCCP). Further consultation would take place after January 2016 around area profiling.

NOTED, in response to questions, that

- there were no plans to allow a casino in the borough;
- gambling support organisations existed and all licences granted stipulate that information must be made available for people who need help with gambling problems. However, people can only self exclude themselves from a betting shop;
- the public health department was keen to raise awareness of the effects of gambling in schools and the licensing team would support this.

RESOLVED to note the changes to the draft Statement of Licensing Policy for the Gambling Act 2005 and that it will come back in the new year (approximately April 2016) around further changes.

48. STRATEGIC ENFORCEMENT

RECEIVED the report from the Community Safety Team, introduced by Eubert Malcolm, Head of Community Safety and Regulatory Services, updating on the recommendations (pages 165-181) from the 2013 review, including what action has been taken to date and feedback from the Council's senior leadership team.

NOTED in response to questions:

- Safer Neighbourhood Team officers attended meetings when requested and a programme was being considered to take the community safety partnership out into the community;
- proposals for joint enforcement were being considered by the council's senior leadership team to bring a number of enforcement services together under one remit;
- ways to publicise the good enforcement work conducted were being contemplated;
- lessons had been learnt about cross borough relations through the recent Finsbury Park events scrutiny review and building good relationships with local neighbouring boroughs would continue;
- there was a shortage of local neighbourhood policing and gaps across borough boundaries. Police partnership tasking groups of 6 police officers focused on monthly priority areas monthly;
- good relationships with voluntary organisations such as Havco and work continued across specific areas such as domestic violence and parks and improving working with residents' associations.

RESOLVED to note the report and the progress made in relation to the recommendations in Appendix 1, pages 165-181, of the agenda pack and that the Committee would revisit the joined-up enforcement service and the strategy early in the new year.

49. SCRUTINY REVIEW FINAL REPORT - JOB SUPPORT MARKET SCRUTINY PROJECT

RECEIVED the Overview & Scrutiny Committee project final report on the Job Support Market, introduced by Martin Bradford, Scrutiny Officer, as laid out in the report on pages 305-340 of the agenda pack.

NOTED that

- Councillor Connor expressed that she had been very impressed with visit to the Haringey Employment Support Project (HESP) and the links with East London Business Alliance, as well as plans for mentoring for young people in Haringey.
- the Chair highlighted the stigma attached to Tottenham residents where people were not getting interviews for jobs market because of where they lived. The East London Business alliance was doing a lot of work in the City to recruit people from Haringey.

RESOLVED to

1. agree the Job Support Market Final Report, Appendix 1 311-339 of the agenda pack, and;
2. agree the recommendations contained in the final report.

50. SCRUTINY REVIEW FINAL REPORT - COUNCIL LED DEVELOPMENT

RECEIVED the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel project report on Council Led Development, introduced by Martin Bradford as laid out on pages 341-364 of the agenda pack.

NOTED that the Chair of the Panel, Councillor Akwasi-Ayisi, thanked the previous Scrutiny Committee for its work and updated on the recommendations within the report.

RESOLVED to

1. agree the Council Led Development final report, Appendix 1, pages 311-339 of the agenda pack, and;
2. agree the recommendations contained in the final report.

51. SCRUTINY REVIEW PROGRESS REPORT - YOUTH TRANSITION

NOTED a verbal update from Cllr Hearn, the Chair of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel project report on Youth Transition, including that:

- the area of youth transition strong leadership and early intervention;
- a visit to Northumberland Park School had been inspiring and the panel had met many NEETs (Not in Education or Employment) and would be looking NEETS further this year;
- a visit to another school would take place before final recommendations in were brought to the next meeting of the Committee.

Clerk's note: Cllr Akwasi- Ayisi left the meeting at 21:42 and returned 21:44.

52. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

RECEIVED the proposed scrutiny work programme for the remainder of the municipal year.

NOTED that

The Adults Health and Social Care Panel would consider:

- foot care in January 2016, rather than alcohol and tobacco;
- loneliness and isolation and neighbourhood connects in March 2016;
- budget monitoring in February 2016, and;
- safeguarding in the borough starting in November 2015.

The Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel would:

- bring forward the review on Early Help and put back the review into 30 hours funding for 4 year olds;
- consider Youth Offending particularly the impact on black young men in February 2016 and;
- conduct budget monitoring as part of next cabinet member questions.

The work programme referred to the Workforce Plan and Business Infrastructure Programme, for the next Overview and Scrutiny Committee which might be deferred. However, Cabinet Member questions with Councillor Goldberg, Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Social Inclusion and Sustainability, would focus on social inclusion.

RESOLVED to agree the amendments to the panel and committee work programmes as detailed above.

53. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

54. FUTURE MEETINGS

Noted the following meeting dates:

- Monday 30 November 2015
- Thursday 17 December 2015
- Monday 25 January 2016
- Tuesday 8 March 2016

CHAIR: Councillor Charles Wright

Signed by Chair

Date