

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
HELD ON THURSDAY, 20 JANUARY 2022**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT** (Chair) Susan Erbil, Lee David-Sanders, Birsen Demirel, Mahmut Aksanoglu, James Hockney and Derek Levy

**ABSENT** Margaret Greer and Elif Erbil

**STATUTORY CO-OPTTEES:** *1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative), vacancy (other faiths/denominations representative), Mr Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative), Alicia Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent Governor representative) - Italics Denotes absence*

**OFFICERS:**

**Also Attending:** Councillor Nesil Caliskan (Leader of the Council)  
Councillor Mahtab Uddin (Cabinet Member for Children's Services)  
Chris Ferrary (on behalf of Lead Petitioner)  
Mustafa Berk-Ak (Enfield Deputy Young Mayor)

**1**

**WELCOME & APOLOGIES**

The Chair, Cllr Susan Erbil welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

Apologies were received from Cllr Margaret Greer (substitutue Ergen Erbil), Cllr Elif Erbil, Cllr Charif Gunawandera (substitute Cllr Daniel Anderson)

**2**

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Susan Erbil declared a non pecurinary interest on item 4 and will not chair this item

**3**

**CALL IN: BOWES PRIMARY AREA QUIETER NEIGHBOURHOOD**

Cllr Ebril introduced this item and outlined the process to be followed. It was re-iterated that only comments and questions relating to the points included within the Reasons for Call-in would be permitted. Cllr Erbil welcomed Cllr Maria Alexandrou as the Call-in Lead.

**NOTED:**

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 20.1.2022

Cllr Alexandrou expressed that the 18-month trial has not been a success. The reduction in traffic has been too small to reach the objectives. Data is missing from the report on 8 of the 29 roads and is incoherent with the bus time survey.

No survey on walking has been done. The scheme has had no overall effect on pollution, noise, or speeding. The report stated the accident rate within the quieter neighbourhood increased after the scheme was implemented. The cycling survey shows cycling in the area has declined. Offences have increased by 8% across Bowes and residents have raised concerns.

Warnings were given by the London Ambulance Service and this was ignored. The scheme has failed in all its objectives, it has not increased active travel but increased congestion. The clear negative opinions in the consultation made by residents were ignored. The negative impacts of this scheme far outweigh the positives.

Cllr Erbil thanked Cllr Alexandrou and invited Cllr Nesil Caliskan, Leader of the Council to respond:

The response from the administration was shared and published in advance which set out in detail response to specific points raised in the call in. The government and TFL recognise due to growth expected in the borough over the next 15 years we need to improve the quality of air. We recognise it has been difficult for residents to adjust. We recognise that we can improve the scheme, subsequent reports are to be produced that explores improving access for residents with disabilities and school streets in Bowes Primary school.

We are in constant communication with emergency services, areas are being reviewed due to their feedback. Pedestrian data was monitored which did have seasonal variation.

NOTED: Cllr Hockney raised a point of order on the code of conduct.

The Chair thanked Cllr Caliskan and Officers for their response and then asked members of OSC to consider any questions.

The following issues were raised by Members and responded to by Cllr Caliskan, Cllr Barnes, Doug Wilkinson

Q1. When will exemptions for those with disabilities be introduced and will they be standard in quieter neighbourhoods.?

A1. It is being worked on now, an amendment cannot be made until a scheme is made permanent. Each scheme is unique to an area.

Q2. The report shows air quality figures are negligible, was this disappointing?

A2. Air quality is not the only factor made in the decisions, we need to think of the bigger picture and longer term.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 20.1.2022

Q3. Why didn't Haringey install the LTN at the same time?

A3. We cannot speak on behalf of them. We have had close contact with them throughout the process, they are now proposing to join our LTN.

Q4. People with disabilities disapproved of this scheme, how is it fair to consider disabled after the decision has been taken?

A4. Response to consultation was low at 4%. Those who have a disability or care responsibilities felt they was restricted; we are now looking at how we can help these people, and this will continue to be monitored. We have consulted with external experts to ensure we are compliant in all aspects of the process.

Q5. If everyone was obliged to have an electric car would the LTN be reversed?

A5. If this happened there would be reduced pollution but still be congestion on our roads. This scheme is to encourage active travel so the LTN would still be in place.

Q6. The consultation had a 75% opposition to the scheme, why is the administration overriding the majority?

A6. Correct figures are 52% opposition, which is 1.9% of the area.

Q7. Some residents have suggested having the entrance/exit in the South instead of North, has this been considered?

A7. It is in the report as an option, after consideration and on balance the current scheme as implemented gives the best solution. If members would like us to look at this again, we are happy to do this.

Q8. Can the bollards be changed to cameras?

A8. This is hugely costly, there is a one-off cost and maintenance. It also limits the opportunity to reclaim road space and include greenspace.

Q9. The LTN was paid for by the government as part of its net zero strategy, have you heard from secretary of the state about the scheme?

A9. We have not heard, but we have been given more funding. The short period for consultation was linked to us gaining the funding.

Q10. Since the start of the trial there has been 3 incidents with London Ambulance, can we have some more context on this?

A.10 We meet regular with them, they don't raise the specific nature of incident but let us know where it happened. We make sure when changes are made this is updated by commercial software, so navigation is updated.

Q.11 Is this a quieter neighbourhood scheme or low traffic?

A.11 The low traffic scheme comes under the quieter neighbourhood umbrella.

Q.12 Are fines going down now people have got used to the LTN.

A.12 They have gone down 60% since it was first installed.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 20.1.2022

Q.13 Crime has gone up in the area, what considerations have been made to mitigate this as part of the report?

A.13 We have implemented changes in lighting which was highlighted by residents. The times they go on/off have changed and they have been made brighter.

Cllr Alexandrou summarised; if the scheme needs to change it has failed. The main purpose of the scheme was to significantly reduce traffic in the Bowes area to help the environment and encourage active travel. Traffic has been diverted onto longer journeys, there is no usable evidence it has evaporated.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee considered the reasons provided for the call-in and responses provided. Having considered the information, the Committee agreed to confirm the original decision made by the Leader of the Council.

Councillors Aksanolgu, Demiriel, Ergin and Yusuf voted in favour of the decision. Councillors David-Sanders, Hockney and Levy voted to refer the decision back to the decision maker. The original decision was therefore agreed.

Cllr Ebril welcomed Cllr Daniel Anderson as the Call-in Lead for the second part of the call-in item.

### **NOTED:**

Cllr Anderson expressed the data of the report does not reliably show the benefits and that they outweigh the harm caused to residents or the environment. The data does not show whether active travel has improved directly as a result of the scheme.

The post implementation traffic was conducted over five days, one of these was world no car day and London car free today which is not mentioned in the report. Another one of these days was impacted by Autumn 2021 petrol crisis which would have had an effect.

In response, the Leader explained many residents have written to them over a long period of time to address the climate crisis and this scheme addresses that. The methodology used for the data is standard, used in the industry across the board. She expressed that she has complete faith and thank for professionalism for all officers involved.

Richard Eason (Healthy Streets Programme Director) added that a range of specialist consultants as well as officers had an input in the report. The petrol crisis did not effect the data on traffic flows. The addendum made removed data from affected dates to consider the crisis. We are confident in the detailed analysis.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 20.1.2022

The following issues were raised by Members and responded to by Cllr Caliskan, Cllr Barns and Richard Eason:

Q1. How many pollution monitors are in the LTN and surrounding areas?

A1. There are two diffusion tubes and a primary air quality monitoring station on a406 by Bowes Park Primary School.

Q2. Congestion has been driven onto other roads, causing engine idling raising concern amongst residents. Could we have rolled out electric charging points all over the borough, have pollution monitors and a robust anti engine idling campaign?

A1. Another part of our toolkit involves rolling out EV points as a trial, if successful will be rolled out across the borough. We expect rapid charging stations being put in by giants will undercut everyone else. This is a long-term behaviour change programme which will take time, it is a challenging process in a challenging time.

Q3. We are in the top 5 London boroughs with high number of vehicles, what message has officers and the administration put out to reduce car ownership?

A3. The issue is on short journeys rather than getting rid of cars to help to reduce the number of cars on the road at any one time.

Q4. Does the scheme as its presented reliably represent its objectives?

A4. The data and report put together by officers with specialist knowledge and the decision maker confirmed she has complete faith in the professional judgement of the officers.

Cllr Anderson summarised; the idea of traffic reduction and appropriate measures to be taken on climate change is supported. The issue is the data doesn't back up the decision.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee considered the reasons provided for the call-in and responses provided. Having considered the information, the Committee agreed to confirm the original decision made by the Leader of the Council.

## 4

### **CALL IN: MERIDIAN WATER RESIDENTIAL DELIVERY PROGRAMME**

Cllr Erbil excused herself from this item due to an interest. Cllr Yusuf nominated Cllr Aksanglu to be chair which was seconded and agreed. The chair then welcome the call in lead, Cllr Smith.

### **NOTED:**

Cllr Smith explained the report was called in due to only providing a superficial level of information on the residential delivery programme. The Leader has said she has been provided with enough information to enable her to make the decision, but the report has a worrying absence of any strategic financial context in which to evaluate the scheme.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 20.1.2022

The report should have set out what the overall objectives of Meridian Water should be in terms of target size of the programme, details of the affordable homes mix, the maximum height of buildings, public open space and social infrastructure. We have not seen the progress that has been made in meeting targets.

The overall progress of the scheme has been so slow, and the overall costs have risen to such an extent. There has been reluctance to engage with the issues raised with the OSC workstream and no successful reports which highlight the key parameters and risk involved. The response to the call in has been inadequate.

Cllr Aksanoglu thanked Cllr Smith and invited the decision maker, Cllr Caliskan to respond;

Cllr Caliskan explained what was described by Cllr Smith is out of date, all relevant reports are referenced within this report, it is not practical to include all reports. They are worried about the lack of homes but at any opportunity they vote against investing to build homes therefore the argument is incoherent.

We are now the lead developer which gives us more control which enables us to speed up phase 4 to deliver more affordable homes. This also incorporates two skills academies, workspaces, and film studios. Every time there is a significant development or proposal it is detailed in cabinet reports, referenced in full council, and goes to planning committee. The report is not inadequate, I would welcome the contribution of members to look at if there is anything more, we can do.

Cllr Caliskan was thanked for her response and members were invited to ask any questions:

Q1. Why does point 9 say officers have not been directed to respond to matters arising out of scrutiny workstream? It is recognised that it is impractical to include all reports, but it is dismissive to offer an answer to the call in to be told substantial information was provided.

A1. Sufficient information is provided verbally and is in publicly available documents. The report does address the points, but the role of scrutiny is recognised so we can address relevant questions. The workstreams of scrutiny are responded to by officers. It would be impractical to ask officers to respond to work outside of the structure of our constitution. MEQ's are in place, there is a scrutiny process where officers respond.

Q2. Is the administration still committed to deliver 10,000 homes?

Q2. The 10,000-home target is still what we set out to achieve. The report provides a summary of the progress on the residential aspects of Meridian 4. The report recommends we increase the size of Meridian 4 to accelerate the delivery of homes.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 20.1.2022

Q3. As the Lead Developer, is there any successful examples of this model of delivery on this scale?

A3. The local authority is acting as the lead developer so we can have control and do it on a phase by phases process. The decision was done due to the quality of bids which didn't meet the administrations objectives. The Barking Riverside development also has a 10k home scheme with heavy public sector lead partnership. The Old Oak Common project in West London which has a mayoral development corporation taking the lead.

Q4. What are the drivers behind the slippages on point 3.3 of report? If contractors come on board what will the extra costs be?

A4. Meridian 3 is a scheme that involves cabinet authority and planning to proceed with a mixed scheme of student housing, co living and residential housing. Was due to be marketed last year but did not due to the shadow of covid. We are hoping to launch this spring once the market has returned and there will be strong levels of interest. Meridian 3 and 4 sit on land which will be serviced and remediated as part of the Housing Infrastructure Fund. There has been strong inflation pressures in the construction industry, the confidential appendix attached to the December cabinet report provides financial analysis which takes this into account.

Q5. There have been reports that average earner in Enfield would struggle on affordability of homes in Meridian water, do you feel this is fair and has the approach changed?

A5. We are aware of the affordability challenges in the borough. We don't have the ability to set the market value of a home and private rent is not set by the local authority. We focus on the level of affordable housing, the level on Meridian has gone up from 25% to 50%. Meridian 2 has 100% affordable housing, overall we aim to have 40%.

Q6. The scheme delivers more housing, in planning committee for Meridian 3 it was suggested to have more family update. Is this being incorporated to the plan?

A6. The meridian water project has 3000 homes with the benefit of planning consent approved. On meridian one the number of family homes has gone up. Masterplan version 2 is considering how we can implement more family housing. We consistently seek to get family homes in affordable tenures.

Cllr Smith summarised; We support Meridian Water, the issue is about reporting mechanisms for members. It is not adequate, not relating to the amount of information but about no new additional information. Most of the report is about Meridian 4 which included information which we already knew.

Issues on social infrastructure, public open spaces and the height or density should be overall targets so it becomes difficult to understand what is actually going on with Meridian Water.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee considered the reasons provided for the call-in and responses provided. Having considered the information, the

## **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 20.1.2022**

Committee agreed to confirm the original decision made by the Leader of the Council.

### **5 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

The next meeting will be held on Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2022.