

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON THURSDAY 9TH MARCH 2017

PRESENT:

Councillors: Makbule Gunes (Chair), Barbara Blake, Clive Carter, Bob Hare, Stephen Mann and Anne Stennett

25. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at the meeting. Members noted the information contained therein.

26. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Ian Sygrave (Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches).

27. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

28. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

29. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

30. MINUTES

AGREED:

That the minutes of the meetings of 8 and 21 December be approved.

31. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS; CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES

The Panel noted that the Councillor Ayisi, the Cabinet Member for Communities had sent his apologies as he was unable to attend.

32. VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS UPDATE

Fiona Dwyer, Strategic Lead for Violence Against Women and Girls, provided the Panel with an update on;

- Progress with the implementation of the recommendations of the scrutiny review on the issue, including the Iris Scheme by Haringey CCG: and
- Details of patterns of referral.

A 10 year strategy had been agreed in November and there was now an action plan for the first three years to support it. There were four key strategic priorities beneath this:

- The development of a co-ordinated community response;
- A community wide approach to prevention;
- Support for victims/survivors; and
- Holding perpetrators to account.

A number of specific services had been commissioned:

- Independent Domestic Violence Advocates (IDVAs);
- The IRIS scheme which involved working with GP practices and was funded by the Clinical Commissioning Group;
- Perpetrator support, including the YUVA project that was aimed at young people; and
- Continued funding for the Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC).

The Panel noted that a robust data dashboard was being developed as part of a three year project. There was evidence of under reporting at the moment and the data that was available tended to be piecemeal in nature. Funding was currently being sought for the project.

In answer to a question regarding how performance was measured, Ms Dwyer stated that there were a number of key performance indicators for commissioned services. These included repeat victimisation, pre and post satisfaction levels and service outcomes, such as placement in safe accommodation and attendance on projects.

The Panel noted that work was taking place with young people through youth facilities and sports clubs, including training. In addition, social media was being used to communicate with them. It was also noted that a lot of women were homeless due to domestic violence. There were a lot of women who could be categorised as “hidden homeless” as they were, for example, staying with friends or relatives due to domestic violence. A cross borough project aimed at providing assistance to women suffering from multiple deprivation, with additional complexities, had just begun its work. The Police were key partners and actively involved in partnership activity to address Violence Against Women and Girls. In particular, they co-chaired the MARAC.

Ms Dwyer reported that the three year phased action plans were aimed at ensuring that work remained relevant. A communications strategy was being developed.

In answer to a question regarding the low numbers of referrals from the Children and Young People’s Service, she stated that this had been identified as an issue and the service was looking at it. There was a feeling though that if the Police had already made a referral, there was no need for others to also refer. However, it had been clarified that this would not lead to duplication.

She stated that funding was a continual issue as Violence Against Women and Girls cut across a number of services. Current funding arrangements had nevertheless been agreed but additional external funding was also being applied for. In addition, consideration was being given also being given to potential internal sources of funding. However, funding was always likely to be a challenge.

In answer to a question, Ms Dwyer reported that funding needed for IDVAs in hospitals and had been included as part of a bid to the Home Office. A lot of work had nevertheless been undertaken with local NHS trusts, including training.

33. HARINGEY'S SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT PROGRAMME

Emma Williamson, Assistant Director for Planning, reported on the Council's Sustainable Transport Programme as follows:

- There was a need for developers to agree travel arrangements for new developments with the Council. Some developments were designated as "car free";
- There had been a lot of investment in cycling across the borough. Current plans included the development of Quietways, which were routes that used relatively quiet side streets. In addition, the provision of cycle hangars was being extended and cycle training was provided free for residents and people who worked in the borough;
- The Council was committed to expanding facilities for the charging of electric vehicles. In addition, Haringey was part of the consortium of boroughs that was working to increase the take up of electric vehicles and expand the charging network through the Go Ultra Low City Scheme;
- Haringey had been included as one of ten Low Emission Bus Zones;
- As part of the development of the Council's new Transport Strategy, a Cycling and Walking Strategy would be developed; and
- 60 new bays were to be created as part of the expansion of car clubs.

Panel Members asked what the procedure was for the removal of abandoned bicycle parts that were left on bike stands. They felt that these were unsightly, used up valuable cycle parking space and advertised theft. Peter Boddy, Sustainable Transport Manager, reported that this was a waste issue and agreed to raise it with the Neighbourhood Action Team. In response to a question regarding the design of cycle stands, he stated that the Council's existing standard design was the "Sheffield". It was compact, widely used and supported by cycling groups. However, consideration could be given to alternatives as part of discussion of the public realm. The Panel noted that the "Camden" design of cycle stand had been developed as part of efforts to design out crime.

Mr Boddy reported that it was acknowledged that the design of stand that had been used in the Turnpike Lane area was a poor choice. Haringey Cycling Campaign and the London Cycling Campaign had assumed the role as the Council's critical friend and were able to provide feedback on designs. A number of new stands were installed every year.

In answer to a question regarding why the A1 in Highgate had not been included in the low emission bus zone area, Mr Boddy stated that he felt that this was probably

due to cost issues. The borough was glad to have two routes that were within the zones and would continue to lobby for areas within the borough to be included. He agreed to find out further information regarding the status of the A1 in respect of this.

The Panel drew attention to the plans of Source London to install 6000 charging points across London by 2020, which it was felt would equate to approximately 165 points in Haringey. Ann Cunningham, Head of Traffic Management, stated that the Council did not currently have that level of detail on the plans but would be happy to report back once it became available. The charging points would be borough wide and would be for all electric vehicles and not just private cars.

Ms Cunningham reported that car tax charges were being increased to reflect vehicle emission levels. In addition, parking permit bands had been set locally by the Council to encourage the use of vehicles with lower emissions. There were some challenges in enforcement that needed to be addressed though.

The Panel felt that positive news, such as the installation of cycle hangars, needed to be promoted strongly. Although no car developments were increasing in number, housing estates were not making the same level of progress and there was still some way to go to bring about culture change. Ms Cunningham reported that the Smarter Travel programme was aimed at bringing about behaviour change. In particular, the borough received funding from Transport for London as part of its Active Travel programme for a range of initiatives. Car Clubs were growing in popularity and the number of Controlled Parking Zones on housing estates was increasing.

In answer to a question, Mr Boddy reported that there was a record of where all bike hangars had been installed and consideration of where they currently were located was part of the prioritisation process. The hangars cost £5,000 over three years and there was currently funding for another 10 to be installed this year. He stated that they were aiming to distribute them evenly across the borough but there were some areas where demand was higher than others.

AGREED:

1. That the issue of the removal of abandoned bicycle parts on cycle stands be raised with the Neighbourhood Action Team; and
2. That the Sustainable Transport Manager be requested to provide further information on reason for the non inclusion of the A1 within a low emission bus zone.

34. GREEN LANES AREA TRANSPORT STUDY

Mr Boddy reported that a public meeting had taken place in March 2015 regarding traffic concerns. These were wide ranging in nature and centred on the Wightman Road area but also overlapped onto other areas. As a result of this, a project to consider the issues was developed and an external consultant was hired.

The study undertaken by the consultant was aimed at identifying measures to:

- Improve the urban realm;

- Rationalise traffic volume and routes;
- Improve road safety for all road users;
- Maintain or enhance bus service journey times and reliability;
- Enhance pedestrian and cycle accessibility into and within the study area; and
- Improve quality of life and health outcomes for local residents.

The consultant was appointed in February 2016. A steering group of stakeholders, chaired by the relevant Cabinet Member, was set up to act as a “critical friend”. The work undertaken by the consultant looked at a range of issues and these were developed into a series of options and ideas. The aim was to develop recommendations for the short, medium and long term. Funding of just over £1 million over three years was provided.

Wightman Road had been closed to traffic from March to September 2016 due to the need to undertake works to the bridge that crossed it. There were a series of traffic measures that had been made necessary as a result of this. The popularity of these schemes had varied. Some residents of Wightman Road had stated that they would like to road to be closed permanently. Whilst the road was closed, improvement works had been undertaken by the Council to help address some of the traffic and safety related issues.

Ms Cunningham reported that although there were weight restrictions in force, these did not apply to vehicles with access rights for such things as deliveries. Mr Boddy commented that there was widespread recognition of the impact of the closure of Wightman Road. Many residents of Wightman Road had enjoyed the closure but the impact on residents across the borough needed to be taken into account. The implications of particular options had been included within the plans.

In answer to a question, Mr Boddy stated that traffic levels on Wightman Road were close to those on Green Lanes. Whilst this was undesirable, it was also experienced in other locations in the borough. It was necessary to look carefully at the consequences of measures as they could potentially make matters worse for other residents. There were different benefits accruing from making Wightman Road one way north or south. The preference was for the option that had the least impact on Green Lanes.

In answer to a question, Mr Boddy reported that there had been a 7% drop in overall levels of traffic when Wightman Road had been closed. The majority of traffic had been displaced though. There had been some cost limitations to the number of options that could be developed but the work was nevertheless the largest piece of traffic assessment work that had been done for some time. Consultation responses were not just limited to people from within the study area but people would still be asked where they came from as this was an important consideration. Haringey Cycling Campaign were encouraging people to respond so that those cyclists who had used Wightman Road when it had been closed but did not live in the area could feed their views in. Should there be changes made to Wightman Road, it could be re-considered for inclusion as part of the Quietway route from Bowes Park. The Panel commented that the current proposed route included some very steep sections in Hornsey which could be challenging for cyclists.

In answer to a question, Mr Boddy reported that approximately £200,000 had been spent on the work so far of the funding that had been committed by the previous Cabinet Member. Although a significant amount of money had been committed to the work over the next three years, there was a need to manage expectations. There was also an awareness that there were other areas of the borough where there were issues. Ms Cunningham reported that there was a need to develop the infrastructure in Tottenham and there would be opportunities to address this through the regeneration process.

The Panel felt that, with current budgetary restrictions, the use of external consultants needed to be closely monitored. It was important that the range of options were developed into achievable plans.

Mr Boddy stated that effective measures would be developed through the use of the assessment framework. The views of the local community, the consequences of the different options and costs would all be taken into account in order to develop proposals.

A Panel Member suggested that consideration be given to developing a new entrance into Finsbury Park on its north east side, opposite Hermitage Road N4 and that this be used to develop a new pedestrian and cycle route south. Mr Boddy stated that the development of the Quietway was the current priority for cycling in Finsbury Park but he was nevertheless happy to raise the suggestion with Haringey Cycling Campaign to see if it could be an option.

35. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Panel noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had proposed that a review be undertaken by the Panel on street sweeping and that this be scheduled to start shortly. A scope and terms of reference for the proposed review were being put together. It was likely that the work on this would begin early in the new Council year, with the aim of finishing the work by the summer recess.

Panel Members were of the view that the proposed review on parks that was referred to in the current work plan should begin when the work on street sweeping was completed. It was felt that the scope and terms of reference required further development so that the issues considered reflected local concerns. The issues of funding and support were felt to be particularly relevant. It was suggested that the Friends of Parks Forum be asked for their views on what they felt the key issues were. It was noted that the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee were undertaking an inquiry on public parks and felt that their findings could help to inform the Panel's review.

AGREED:

1. The further information be sought on the progress of House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee's inquiry into public parks; and
2. That the Friends of Parks Forum be requested for their views on the issues that they feel the Panel should focus upon as part of its review on parks.

CHAIR: Councillor Makbule Gunes

Signed by Chair

Date