

**MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL
THURSDAY, 30 JUNE 2016**

Councillors Makbule Gunes (Chair), Barbara Blake, Clive Carter,
Stephen Mann and Sygrave

Co-Optees Mr I. Sygrave (Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches)

CSP84. 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.

CSP85. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Hare.

CSP86. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

CSP87. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

CSP88. DEPUTATIONS/ PETITIONS/ PRESENTATIONS/ QUESTIONS

None.

CSP89. MINUTES

AGREED:

That the minutes of the meeting of 1 March 2015 be approved.

CSP90. APPOINTMENT OF NON VOTING CO-OPTED MEMBER

AGREED:

That a representative from Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches be appointed as a non voting co-opted Member of the Panel for the 2016/17 Municipal Year.

CSP91. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERSHIP

AGREED:

That the terms of reference, protocol for overview and scrutiny and policy areas/remits and membership for each scrutiny panel for 2016/17 be noted.

CSP92. WORK PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT

MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL THURSDAY, 30 JUNE 2016

The Panel considered the draft work plan for the year and agreed to the following additions to the list of items for scheduled meetings of the Panel;

- After the Riots – Taking Tottenham Forward. It was proposed that an update be provided for the Panel on progress with the implementation of recommendations from the report;
- Wireless Festival – Update;
- Green Lanes Traffic Review, including Wightman Road; and
- Sustainable transport, including controlled parking zones (CPZs).

AGREED:

1. That, subject to the above mentioned additions, the areas outlined in Appendix A to the report be prioritised for inclusion in the 2016/17 scrutiny work programme; and
2. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee be asked to endorse (a), above, at its meeting on 21 July 2016.

CSP93. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS; CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT.

Councillor Peray Ahmet, the Cabinet Member for Environment, outlined the key priorities for her portfolio;

- The waste management contract and performance of the Council's contractor, Veolia;
- Development of the fly tipping strategy;
- Further developing joined up enforcement including the integration of housing improvement. As part of this, it was important to increase the perception of risk;
- Addressing air quality, which was also a key priority for the Mayor of London. This was a cross cutting issue and covered issues such as decreasing air pollution and encouraging the greater use of cycling as a mode of transport through the development of the Council's Cycling Strategy;
- A review of traffic in Wood Green. In addition, issues relating to controlled parking zones (CPZs) would be looked at;
- Team Noel Park pilot project. The pilot would be evaluated and its outcomes fed into plans for the development of services.

Panel Members commented that fly tipping was a particular concern of residents. In addition, rough sleeping was an emerging area of concern. This appeared to be particularly prevalent in Green Lanes and Finsbury Park. A joined up strategy that involved co-ordinated action was required to deal with the issue. The Team Noel Park pilot was considered to be an interesting and innovative project and the sharing of the outcomes of this, when available, would be very welcome. Effective enforcement was very important and had worked effectively in the past when the Council had had a heavy enforcement team. Prevention could assist in dealing with the issue at source but this might require additional resources in the short term.

The Cabinet Member commented that there needed to be a balance between enforcement and behaviour change. Enforcement was resource intense and if behaviour could be changed it could be avoided.

MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL THURSDAY, 30 JUNE 2016

The Panel noted that leaving unwanted items on the side of the pavement for people to take was technically fly tipping although it was acknowledged that the motivation for it was different. Behaviour change took time but it was important for communities to say that fly tipping was unacceptable. Education was an important part of this process. However, progress was likely to be more difficult in areas that were characterised by transient populations, where there was likely to be less of a feeling of community.

CSP94. CAR CLUB EXPANSION

Edwin Leigh, Transport Planner from the Planning Service, reported on proposals to expand the Council's Car Club scheme. There was currently one operator in the borough and the intention was to increase this number in order to promote expansion as the scheme had proven to be popular.

Car Club vehicles were cleaner than average and therefore helped to reduce harmful emissions. They also provided an alternative to car ownership for residents as well as reducing car dependency. It was estimated that 1 Car Club space removed 10 vehicles from the street and that users made seven times fewer short journeys by car. The increase in the number of providers would increase choice for residents and improve accessibility to vehicles. An assessment undertaken by Transport for London had shown that only 10% of potential demand was currently being fulfilled and the expansion of the scheme would help to address this.

The proposed approach was to keep the incumbent provider as well as bringing in new ones. This had already been done by several London boroughs and had proven to be successful, with some managing to double membership of their Car Club. It was felt that remaining with just the current provider would not deliver the necessary expansion. Alternatively, not retaining the current provider but bringing in others would not be good for current members.

The Panel noted that there were currently 75 Car Club bays in Haringey and 5,600 members. Haringey was the most successful borough that the current operator worked within. There had been a good response to expressions of interest from new providers and it was envisaged that there could be over 100 new bays within the borough following expansion. The expansion would enable areas of the borough that were less well provided for bays to be better covered.

Panel Members expressed support for the scheme and its expansion. It was suggested that they could be co-located with bike hangars. In addition, it was felt that areas subject to regeneration and new developments should be prioritised. It was noted that Section 106 agreements were often reached with developers in respect of this. Measures would be taken to avoid having bays too close to each other. It was hoped that the competition would encourage providers to improve performance to a high standard.

In answer to a question, it was noted that a few residents were not happy having bays located in close proximity to their property but efforts were made to minimise any such issues by placing them not directly outside people's houses.

AGREED:

**MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL
THURSDAY, 30 JUNE 2016**

1. That the proposed procurement of multiple operators for the Council's Car Club network be supported; and
2. That consideration be given to co-locating Car Clubs bays with bike hangars and prioritising the location of bays in new developments and regeneration areas.

CSP95. WASTE, STREET CLEANSING AND RECYCLING: CURRENT PERFORMANCE

Tom Hemming, Interim Neighbourhood Team Manager, reported on the latest statistics for waste, street cleansing and recycling. There had been a change to weekly sweeping on residential and some other roads from January 2016 in order to deliver £860,000 savings. Recent performance had decreased overall but was variable from month to month. It therefore needed to be monitored closely action taken to deal with areas where performance was falling down.

Litter performance had previously been meeting the contractual target on a consistent basis. The Council had moved from twice to once weekly sweeping in January and there had been a drop in performance that coincided with the change, with performance for only one month meeting the target. However, performance in areas that had not been subject to the changes had also deteriorated. Targeted action was being taken to remedy the drop in performance. This included engaging with residents, traders, schools and the organisers of events that are identified as causing litter problems and taking enforcement action where necessary. More time was needed to evaluate the effect of the service changes.

In answer to a question, it was noted that litter picks differed from street sweeps, which now took place once per week. Mr Hemming reported that performance in respect of graffiti removal was good. In respect of fly posting, there was still an issue with window replacement service stickers on shop windows. There were still counted but not included on performance returns any more. Fly tipping remained a problem. The position in Haringey was similar to that in neighbouring boroughs. Reporting was encouraging and efforts were being made to get a picture of where hot spots were.

In respect of recycling, performance had gone up from 26% at the start of the contract to around 37%. However, this was still short of the current target levels. An action plan had been developed that aimed to address this by promoting behaviour change. Ensuring that people placed items in the correct bin was important as contamination could lead to targets being missed. Due to a change in the law and the tightening of criteria for reprocessing, more waste was being rejected for recycling. Action to address this had also been prioritised and different types of stickers to put on bins were being tried in order to ensure that residents were aware of which bins waste should be placed.

Panel Members highlighted the fact that a previous Panel meeting had suggested that traders associations be contacted regarding the removal of window replacement stickers. In respect of fly tipping, it was possible that current levels were due to higher reporting levels, which was a positive development. Mr Hemming reported that efforts were being made to raise awareness of the issues and it was hoped that levels would go down in time. There were differences between areas of the borough, with some appearing to be more accepting of fly tipping than others. It was intended to reduce both fly tipping and reports of fly tipping.

**MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL
THURSDAY, 30 JUNE 2016**

Steve McDonnell, the Assistant Director for Commercial and Operations, reported that the Council could claim money back from the contractor for every rubbish sack that was not collected so it was important that instances of this were reported. A breakdown of fly tips could be provided for the next discussion with the Panel on waste and recycling statistics.

Panel Members drew attention to the fact that bins in Chestnuts Park had been overflowing and officers agreed to check them. In reference to gulley cleansing, it was noted that this was the responsibility of the Highways Service, who had a regular cleansing programme.

Panel Members asked whether consideration had been given to recycling food waste for compost. Mr Hemming reported that the composting of food waste had not been considered as it was felt that there would not be a high take up. It was suggested that the provision of free bio-degradable liner bags could help to encourage people to do this.

It was also suggested that increasing the level of enforcement might assist in reducing fly tipping and littering. Mr Hemming stated that enforcement had become more difficult due to relevant powers being watered down. However, the issue was being looked at, especially in respect of houses in multiple occupation.

AGREED:

That further consideration be given to the option of the composting of food waste.

Clr Makbule Gunes
Chair