

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY 16TH OCTOBER 2018**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Scott Emery, Adam Jogee (Chair), Julia Ogiehor, Reg Rice, Matt White and Barbara Blake**

**Co-opted Member: Ian Sygrave (Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches)**

## **27. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

## **28. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None.

## **29. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

## **30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

## **31. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS**

None.

## **32. MINUTES**

In respect of item 21 (Cabinet Member Questions: Cabinet Member for Communities, Safety and Engagement), it was noted the Panel had requested further information regarding the “Big Conversation” with young people from the Cabinet Member. It was agreed that an update would be requested on this.

Mr Sygrave reported that the Panel was still awaiting a breakdown of Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding, which it requested at its meeting on 31<sup>st</sup> January in response to the item on the Transport Strategy. In addition, the Panel had also requested details of the outcome of the review of CS1 as part of the discussion on the update of the implementation of the recommendations of the review of cycling. This was in response to concerns that had been expressed regarding an island bus stop on

the route which required people getting off buses to walk across the cycle lane. David Murray, Interim Assistant Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods, reported that the breakdown of LIP funding had recently been completed.

**AGREED:**

1. That the above-mentioned outstanding actions be followed up and responses circulated to Members of the Panel ahead of the next meeting; and
2. That the minutes of the meeting of 13 September 2018 be approved.

**33. POLICE PRIORITIES AND UPDATE ON STOP AND SEARCH AND ILLEGAL FIREARM DISCHARGES.**

The Panel welcome Helen Millichap, the Police Borough Commander, and Inspector Neil Billaney.

Ms Millichap reported on the policing priorities that had been set for Haringey. The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) had specified that all boroughs would have sexual violence, domestic abuse, child sexual exploitation, weapon-based crime and hate crime as priorities as well as anti-social behaviour. In addition, local priorities of robbery and non-domestic violence with injury had also been set. Violence with injury and robbery had increased across the Metropolitan Police area. They had now both plateaued in Haringey and, in addition, the number of knife injury victims had seen a sustained decrease in the past year.

In answer to a question regarding what had led to these decreases, she stated that the borough had bid successfully for additional resources. Assistance from the Territorial Support Group had been obtained who had adopted a specific focus on Stop and Search. In addition, the Metropolitan wide Violent Crime Task Force had been active and this had included plain clothes officers targeting habitual knife carriers. Diversionary activities that had taken place over the summer had also appeared to have had an impact. In answer to another question, she stated that it was difficult to determine whether incidents involved schoolchildren or were gang related. It was estimated that about half of gun crime was related to gangs and slightly less than half of knife crime. There were now Police officers linked to all secondary schools within Haringey. In addition, the MOPAC had offered knife wands to all schools in London.

In answer to a question, Mr Billaney stated that it was acknowledged that there were limitations to the effectiveness of knife wands and arches as knives could be concealed elsewhere if it was known that they were going to be used. Wands could be used on a random basis, making their use more difficult to anticipate. Wands and arches also had an educational function. The Borough Commander commented that no single tactic was effective on its own. It was most important to influence young people at an early stage, before they began carrying a knife. She agreed to find out which schools had knife wands or arches and pass this information onto the Panel.

Sandeep Broca, Intelligence Analyst, outlined current statistics for illegal firearm discharges and stop and search. There had been a 15% increase in the past year but

this was slightly lower than the London average. There had been 38 discharges, which constituted one in ten within the capital. Haringey had the second highest number in London. The increase was nevertheless slowing down. Incidents tended to be clustered in the east of the borough.

He reported that there had been approximately 5,500 stop and searches in the previous year, which was the eighth highest number in London. The number had declined by 2%. The largest number of stops were for drugs. This was 55% and similar to the London average. The outcome of searches was also very similar to the London average, with 71% resulting in no further action. The rate of stops was 13 per 1,000 for people identified as white and 51 per 1,000 for people identified as black. The largest percentage of searches were carried out on young people between the ages of 15 and 19, where there were 107 per 1,000. This was higher than the London average of 83 per 1,000. The percentage of positive outcomes by demographic was broadly similar. In respect of Section 60 searches, where Police had special powers to search people in a defined area for a specific period of time, the Panel noted that 115 searches had taken place in the Duckett's Common area between January and August. The majority of these took place in April in response to a number of incidents.

In answer to a question, the Borough Commander stated that in 70% of searches in London, no further action was taken. This percentage had reduced in recent years as Police had got better at using stop and search effectively but she nevertheless wanted to see better figures. Its use also had a deterrent role though. It was important that stop and search was used fairly, was intelligence led and proportionate. She stated that the levels of diversity within the Police in London had changed and data was available to demonstrate this. The Commissioner was also still committed to maintaining a London focus in recruitment. However, the changed focus took time to fully filter through.

She stated that most London boroughs had seen an increase in Stop and Search. The numbers in Haringey had nevertheless reduced slightly and it was a challenge to maintain them at a high level. Officers were now wearing cameras on their bodies and these were proving to be a useful tool in ensuring that Stop and Search was deployed sensitively and effectively. She was not enthusiastic of the use of Section 60 searches as she felt that Police officers should be required to explain why searches were being undertaken. It was to be expected that Haringey would be in the top ten of boroughs for searches as this reflected the level of offences. Stop and Search hotspots correlated to crime hotspots.

In respect of firearm discharges, the Borough Commander reported that these did not mean that they were lethal. However, the outcome could still be serious. Mr Billaney commented that searches of young black men for drugs that yielded no outcome were a source of concern and efforts were being made to ensure that searches were evidence based. Videos of searches by officers were scrutinised to see how practice could be improved. He stated that he would like to see fewer searches for drugs and more for weapons. In particular, he felt that searches for cannabis could be divisive. The Panel noted that the terminology used to describe the outcome of searches was set centrally.

In answer to a question, she stated that the TSG had been used in Haringey on occasion. Local officers who were familiar with the area worked with them when they were deployed and efforts were made to ensure that they behaved appropriately. Most TSG officers had themselves been local officers. No local officers carried firearms.

Councillor Mark Blake, the Cabinet Member for Communities, Safety and Engagement, reported that the statistics did not convey the impact that Stop and Search could have in individual cases. Some children could be traumatised by the experience and the frequency with which some young people had been stopped was also an issue. The Panel noted that the number of violent offences in Haringey was still higher than in Enfield although the trajectory in Haringey was currently better.

In answer to a question, the Borough Commander stated that it was important that community relations were considered. The workforce of the Police was currently more diverse and reflective of the community. She felt that Police officers should not necessarily aim for the “easy pickings” such as young people smoking drugs as there was a danger of unnecessarily criminalising them. Action needed to be sensitive and proportionate. Stop and search was just one tactic that was used to address crime and disorder and its use was closely monitored. Research by the Godwin Law Foundation on the views of children and young people showed them to be in favour of the right people being stopped and apprehended. Early intervention was also important in addressing crime and actions such as the work that was undertaken in schools helped to develop good relationships with children and young people. The disproportionality that there was amongst those who were stopped was also reflected amongst victims of crime and perpetrators.

David Murray, Interim Assistant of Environment and Neighbourhoods, reported that the Council and its partners had noted the views of children and young people and efforts were being made to effect change at an earlier stage.

The Borough Commander stated that she was happy to speak to any young person who had had a negative experience of being stopped. In answer to a question, she stated that stop and search was monitored closely everywhere. Efforts were being made by the Police to establish a panel of young people to assist in monitoring within Haringey and, in particular, provide an element of challenge. She was happy to receive any suggestions regarding how this might be set up most effectively.

**AGREED:**

That the Borough Commander be requested to find out which schools have knife wands or arches and pass this information onto the Panel.

**34. QUARTER 1 FINANCIAL REPORT FOR PRIORITY 3**

Mr Murray reported that the projected overspend of £1 million had been reduced significantly. The bulk of the overspend in Commissioning and Client Services related to inflationary pressures within the Veolia contract and waste provision for Homes for Haringey (HfH) and action was being taken to mitigate these. There was also a dispute with Amey regarding the specification for the cleaning contract and action was

being taken to resolve this through arbitration. Parking income was under pressure as was funding for the maintenance and upkeep of parks. Staffing levels were extremely lean with no resilience built in. In addition, the Council was locked into a number of big contracts where there was little scope for manoeuvre.

In response to a question on the introduction of charges for bulky waste, he stated that there was not necessarily a link with fly tipping and removing them would not automatically lead to an improvement. He agreed to seek clarification of the figures for the projected shortfall in income as the report contained figures that appeared to be contradictory. Consideration was being given as to whether the targets were realistic. In respect of HfH, a service level agreement was being developed in order to resolve outstanding issues and provide greater clarity.

In respect of the development of Marsh Lane depot, the Panel noted that current proposals were for the construction were for a more modest building than previously had been planned and this had led to savings in the capital budget. Councillor Hearn, the Cabinet Member for Environment, agreed to circulate figures for the amended scheme.

Mr Murray reported that further consideration was being given to enforcement when houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) were the source of flytipping. In addition, how best to encourage landlords to behave responsibly was also being looked at. Licensing would be of assistance but would not be the solution to all problems. Specific consideration would be given to measures that had proved to be successful elsewhere.

The Cabinet Member reported that there would be discussions at Corporate Board on budget options and these would be put before Members. There was quite a large budget gap and this would need to be filled in order to achieve a legal budget. The budget for Environment was under particular threat and savings from it were not regarded as having the same human impact as other areas. Particular efforts were being made to maximise income but she felt that there was a need for a greater level of scepticism about targets.

In answer to a question, Mr Murray reported that there was a constructive relationship between the Council and Veolia. Stringent efforts were made to ensure value for money but it was important not to erode standards.

**AGREED:**

1. That the Interim Assistant Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods be requested to provide clarification of the shortfall in achieving income targets for the collection of bulky waste; and
2. That the Assistant Director of Planning be requested to provide a short briefing note for Panel Members on current plans for Council depot sites.

**35. STREET CLEANSING, WASTE AND RECYCLING: CURRENT PERFORMANCE**

Panel Members requested data on queueing times at waste and recycling facilities. It was felt that people were more likely to fly tip if it was difficult to use the Council's

facilities. Clarification on targets and definitions in respect of missed collections was also requested. Mr Murray stated that he would pass on the issues and aim to provide great clarity in future performance reports. He reported that efforts were being made to influence behaviour to reduce levels of waste and littering. One option that was being considered was to remove waste bins from some locations. However, there was no solution that was sufficient on its own.

Panel Members commented that jet washing of areas contaminated by fly tipping was not always entirely successful. The need for engagement with residents was also emphasised. Mr Murray stated that the service tried to learn lessons from what had been successful and what had not and were very keen to involve the local community in obtaining feedback.

### **36. CABINET MEMBER Q&A - CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT**

Councillor Hearn, the Cabinet Member for Environment outlined key areas in her portfolio. She was concerned about the lack of money available for parks. She was keen to address littering and fly tipping by bringing about behaviour change and felt that this was an area where scrutiny could make a useful contribution to the development of policy. She was also prioritising work to reduce or remove the use of plastic and address air quality, for which specific funding had been obtained from the GLA.

In answer to a question, the Cabinet Member for Environment stated that it was regrettable that it had been necessary to close the Park View Depot Re-use and Recycle facility as part of budget cuts but there were no plans to open a new site for Tottenham.

In answer to a question on climate change, she stated that the greater use of solar power could make a contribution but a balance needed to be struck so that the promotion of cheap energy did not encourage greater use of it. In particular, she felt that there was a need to ensure that homes were energy efficient when refurbishments were taking place. She was also looking to increase the number of electric car charging points. In addition, work was being undertaken to encourage people to get out of their cars and walk or cycle through initiatives such as Liveable Streets.

In respect of fly tipping, the Panel commented that incentives could also be used to encourage responsible behaviour rather than just enforcement. There also needed to be simple and easy ways of enabling people to dispose of unwanted items. The Cabinet Member stated that she agreed with the use of incentives but there were still some people who it was necessary to pursue via enforcement action. There were websites such as Freecycle and charity shops that could also be used to dispose of goods and she would welcome alternatives being publicised.

In answer to a question, she stated that consideration was being given to increasing the monitoring of air quality. In respect of the Environmental Visual Audit (EVA) of Finsbury Park, it was agreed that details of this would be circulated to the Panel. In answer to another question, Mr Murray reported that the size of the parks maintenance team was being looked at to determine if it was sufficiently large.

Consideration was also being given to how standards of cleanliness could be improved as these were currently lower than those for streets.

**AGREED:**

That details of the outcome of the Environmental Visual Audit (EVA) of Finsbury Park be circulated to the Panel

**37. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE**

**AGREED:**

1. That a further update on progress with the implementation of the Scrutiny Review on Cycling be added to the draft work plan; and
2. That, subject to the above, the draft work plan be agreed and submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 19 November for approval.

CHAIR: Councillor Adam Jogee

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....