

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 21 JULY 2021**

**COUNCILLORS**

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

**ABSENT** Susan Erbil, Margaret Greer and Elif Erbil

**STATUTORY CO-OPTES:** *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:** Sarah Cary, Executive Director, Place Joanne Drew, Director of Housing & Regeneration, Jim Dunn, Housing consultation & Resident Engagement Officer, Doug Wilkinson, Director of Environment & Operational Services, Richard Eason, Healthy Streets Programme Director, Claire Johnson, Head of Governance, Scrutiny & Registration Services and Susan O'Connell, Governance Officer

**Also Attending:** Councillor Ian Barnes (Deputy Leader)  
Councillor Gina Needs (Cabinet Member for Social Housing)  
Councillor Edward Smith (Call-In Lead)  
Councillor Maria Alexandrou (Call-In Lead)  
Councillor Lindsay Rawlings (Call-In Lead)  
Councillor Achilleas Georgiou (Observing)  
Councillor Yasemin Brett (Observing)

**1**

**WELCOME & APOLOGIES**

Due to the absence of the current Chair and Vice-Chair at this meeting, a Chair was elected for this meeting only. Councillor Demirel was elected as Chair for the meeting.

Apologies had been received from Councillors Susan Erbil, Elif Erbil (Substitute Cllr Ayten Guzel) and Margaret Greer (Substitute Cllr Chinelo Anyanwu).

Councillor Demirel welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the process to be followed in hearing the Call-ins.

**2**

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3**

**CALL IN: RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT STRATEGY IN COUNCIL HOUSING**

Cllr Edward Smith was welcomed as the Call-In lead and highlighted the following:

- The reasons for the Call-in are in the agenda papers.
- As background, attempts have been made over the years to engage with tenants and leaseholders in housing matters with a view to improve service matters on their estates with the current arrangements focusing on Customer Voice (CV).
- Members of the Customer Voice used to attend the Housing Board which was a formally constituted body with membership also including the Cabinet Member for Social Housing, the Opposition Lead for Housing and senior council staff.
- The strategy will go out for a 6-week consultation period. Some of the reasons made in the Cal in have been taken into account in the responses but not all of them.
- The response to reason 1 sets up the general principles emerging from the initial discussions. However, he felt that they do not constitute a full analysis of issues facing resident engagement in Enfield nor do they provide details on how matters might be better arranged in future.
- The response to reason 2 on the Housing Advisory Group (HAG) refers to the fact that the meetings were always held in private. However, he felt that the meetings were effective and cross party and independent membership of the group has been changed without sufficient explanation in the report. Noted that the membership was open to review as part of the consultation process, wants to be reassured that the consultation will fully address this matter.
- The proposed 11 new committees are unwieldy and unrealistic. The response does not address this issue just refers to the broad principles on resident engagement set out in the White Paper. The response does admit that the new structure might lack transparency and the means of holding politicians and officers to account.
- More details proposals were required on reason 4 in the final consultation document to show reporting and lines of accountability.
- Reason 5 the response does not address the concerns from the members of Customer Voice and felt that the new membership of HAG will not provide effective challenge to the council.
- In summary reassurance was being sought that all the points raised will be taken on board and dealt with in the consultation document.

The Chair thanked Cllr Smith and asked the Cabinet Member for Social Housing Cllr Gina Needs and officers to respond.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 21.7.2021

- The Cabinet Member provided reassurance that the resident voice will come forward. The points that have been raised will be in the consultation, this is part of the consultation stage which it is important to move to. It is really important to get to the consultation stage to get the views of the residents.
- The change to the membership of the HAG happened prior to the strategy. The council is seeking a broader set of opinions. If residents feel that there are too many groups, then this will be taken on board. The views are needed from the consultation first, but she is happy to discuss what comes up from the consultation.
- The Director of Housing and Regeneration advised that the new arrangements aim to embrace and bring on board all residents from the housing market and reflect the change in the broadening role in providing support to people with their housing needs. To look at the whole issues around housing as well as specific issues related to tenure. It is important that all voices are included.

The Chair invited questions and comments from Members, relevant to the call-in reasons:

- In response to a query on whether other councils are implementing similar strategies and how successful these have been? Officers advised that every authority is looking at their own structures on resident engagement following the Social Housing White Paper. Enfield does work with other boroughs on what is working and will continue to liaise.
- On point 1 on the reasons for call in just under 6,000 people were invited to respond, 60 people took part in focus groups. Is this the numbers expected to form a document going forward Officers confirmed that the council wanted to do a full consultation with all residents, so this was just an initial focus group to frame ideas to put out to the wider group. These numbers were as expected and included a range of residents including those from the CV, HAG, Repairs Stakeholders Group, Tenants and Residents Associations and in Temporary accommodation.
- On point 2 cannot see a response on; no roles for opposition, change downgrading status and reduced ability to provide independent advice. Officers advised in terms of accountability all residents both individually or as part of groups are able to write to the Chair of the Housing Scrutiny Panel with any issues, concerns or comments. The Cabinet Member is also open to feedback. This has been communicated to residents. Many of the issues that the residents may wish to raise can be easily resolved by officers. If the issues are not resolved or there is a policy or financial impact there is a formal route. The membership of whatever structures there will be going forward are subject to consultation. The Cabinet Member has confirmed the question will be asked on member involvement in this groups as part of the consultation.
- On point 2 on the new committees the first paragraph ends whilst offering minimal commitment with a clear improvement output- what

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 21.7.2021

does this mean? Members were advised that not all residents want formality. It is important that residents have choices and that the council wants to adopt a variety of methods for residents to engage. An example was provided of a method where issues-based meeting would take place with a focus group and following these meetings would try to encourage residents to form a tenant's association. However often once the issue is resolved residents do not want to take this step.

- How does this strategy compare to past resident engagement strategies? Members were advised that the extended reach of cover that the new engagement strategy offers is the main difference. A variety of styles are used to allow involvement. The pandemic has brought about the wide use of MS Teams this has seen many more people engaging from many different backgrounds, groups, cultures and ages. There will also be a need for face to face, but online will also continue. More channels allow more people to take part.
- Lots of residents who live in the housing stock fall into the hard to reach groups, is 6 weeks long enough to get input from these groups, is there a danger that different groups want different things. Will direct assistance be given to residents where needed to get a greater volume of feedback. Members were advised that face to face will be needed for example for those without the internet or where English is not their first language, vulnerable or elderly. Councillors and officers should know who may struggle. The consultation is about involving as many people and getting as many views as possible. Felt that 6 weeks should be long enough but could be extended if needed.
- Recruitment of panels- what would this process look like, what is make up of appointment panels to ensure that critical friend approach is retained. How can we get underrepresented groups involved? Members were advised that this is a good time to reach out there is a range of community activities planned over the summer period and surgeries that could also be used to get views. An example was given of working with Somalian women. Where non-English speaking groups will need to ensure consultation with their advocates and community organisations who work closely with them. Recruitment for CV and HAG already have an agreed recruitment process. The process used must be transparent and clear and is dependent on the nature of the group.

Councillor Smith in summing up thanked the committee for the time allowed for the debate. The initial analysis provided by focus groups was too short and too broad. The consultation document should be revised to make it explicit what the issues are and set out in plain English. Still concerned at the membership of HAG felt that this is a crucial part of overall framework and that there are issues on who the membership should be. Residents cannot make a decision if it is not clear. The consultation should be clear on accountability and structures.

Overview & Scrutiny considered the reasons for the call-in and the responses provided.

Councillors Aksanoglu, Anyanwu, Demirel, Guzel and Levy voted in favour of the above decision and Councillors David-Sanders and Hockney voted against. The original Cabinet decision was therefore agreed.

#### 4

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

Cllr Maria Alexandrou was welcomed as the Call-In lead and highlighted the following:

- The many reasons for the Call In are detailed in the agenda papers.
- Failure to consult residents, the perception survey which did not mention road closures had 263 responses and there was a petition of 377 people that was delivered in Parliament that wanted LTN's. This contrasts to the 1600 signatures that opposed the Bowes LTN, plus the demonstrations and other petitions.
- There was no prior debate or consultation that took place and this forced design was delivered to the detriment imposed upon residents' lives.
- The online consultation discriminated against certain groups. There had been a lack of community engagement on the scheme.
- Nitrogen dioxide levels had increased by 20 per cent at Bowes Primary School in the 8 months since the implementation of the LTN.
- Noted that the camera enforcement vehicles have now been switched to electric the cleaner air retentions have been usurped by the traffic fumes. No baseline measure on air quality were taken before the installation of the LTN so how can any meaningful comparisons be made. Traffic data will be put into a model to analyse the impact on air quality
- Failure to address concerns over the impact on people with disabilities, their rights had not been considered and engagement with blue badge holders had been a "tick-box exercise". A survey revealed more than three quarters of those with a disability thought the trial had had a negative impact on them. Multiple road closures act as a physical and psychological barrier between them and their families and carers.
- LTNs had forced traffic into other roads such as the A406. LTN's are designed to push traffic onto the main roads what about the residents that live on the main roads.
- The proposal is to allow the LTN to continue to allow more representative data of normal conditions. However, NO2 has increased despite Covid restrictions.
- In conclusion the drive to make the streets safer has created the opposite effect. The future of LTN's are a political decision pointing that the outcome is a political commitment. The main beneficiaries of the LTN's are all the residents of the borough in particular are children and young people. Yet the congestion is where children walk to school. LTN's have increased traffic and there is no obvious uptake in walking or cycling. LTN's have forced traffic into other roads and divided the community in order to create a few quiet roads in the entire borough.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 21.7.2021

The Chair thanked Cllr Alexandrou and asked the Deputy Leader Cllr Ian Barnes and officers to respond.

- The Deputy Leader asked cabinet for the trial to be extended to allow more data to be collected about typical traffic patterns.
- The traffic cams pollution data responses from TfL on buses on the North Circular in the interim report are all welcomed. This shows no issues on buses or on the North Circular. But this is heavily caveated due to the abnormal traffic patterns due to the pandemic
- Regarding the concern raised on failure to consult residents, the trial had been accompanied by a six-month consultation period, all of this data is in the interim report. The council had followed government guidelines on the scheme's rollout. This timetable came from the government.
- The administration, the government and the Mayor of London are all aligned 39% of emissions come from the roads. Drastic action is needed to encourage people out of cars
- In addition to the perception survey, there was the petition at OSC, numerous Ward Forums, ward councillors were consulted all the way through the process and councillors have been lobbied by several groups. The Deputy Leader and officers have met with several groups both for and against the LTN. There was a Bowes Webinar where questions were answered.
- Bowes was filtered in 2012 but some roads were left behind. This LTN seeks to address these roads.
- The deputy leader suggested the 20 per cent air pollution rise near the primary school had come from social media. Nitrogen dioxide levels typically increase during winter because more people use their cars
- Council enforcement vehicles are now all electric and have been for months.
- Regarding failure to address inequalities impact and rights of disabled the council had carried out a special survey for people with disabilities and held focus groups with them to find out what issues they were experiencing and what could be done to help them.
- Trying to avoid the road becoming gridlocked for those that have to drive. People with disabilities made 32% fewer car trips than other Londoners yet pedestrians are five times more likely to be injured by a motor vehicle.
- Regarding the lack of clear information on funding, the government are clear in their conditions that point closures can be used in LTN's.
- Traffic displacement on Boundary Road, these numbers have gone down not up, heavily caveated due to the pandemic. Rat running traffic has been using residential roads as a pressure valve to avoid main roads. Through traffic should be on main roads.
- The impact of air quality is being measured the results are negligible at present. There 2 places with moderate increases, one is where Haringey are creating their own LTN.
- Finally, 83% of responses from car owners, whereas 50% of residents do not have a car. 52% of non-car owners see scheme as positive whereas

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 21.7.2021

56% see the scheme as negative. This report is not making recommendations on the future of the trial.

The Chair invited questions and comments from Members, relevant to the call-in reasons

- Following a question, it was confirmed that Bowes was one of the first LTN's as Bowes has suffered for a long while with roads being used as a rat run to avoid the North Circular. It will also be in the ULEZ zone.
- Clarification was provided on the disability focus groups. The focus groups were an opportunity during the first consultation to collect information from people with protected characteristics this enabled the council to identify people who may wish to participate further so that officers could understand in more detail; what the issues were. Two focus groups formed part of the EQIA, this is a continuous process. At the start of the project published the first version of the EQIA, the second version formed part of this report. There will be a further version when a decision is made considering the insights and looking into whether an alternative design can address any issues.
- Worrying that 76% of people with disabilities have a negative view of the scheme. What changes are proposed to address these concerns. Members were advised that 75 people saw the scheme as negative. The focus groups are drilling down as to what the issues are and what can be done to mitigate. The council is working directly with Transport for All on continuing to develop the way we approach equalities and engage with protected characteristics. In terms of what can be changed in the current design this work is ongoing.
- Further to a query on whether pollution monitors are included on the monitoring of main roads surrounding the LTN. Officers confirmed the council was not using air quality monitors to gauge the trial's impact on pollution levels. Instead, it is collecting traffic data and inputting it into a model to get an indication of the LTN's impact on air quality.
- How will the LTN in Haringey impact on Bowes LTN? Enfield's LTN has pushed some traffic into Haringey. Enfield are working closely with Haringey on this and felt that this is positive for both sets of residents.
- If the decision stands you want to extend the trial in normal conditions presumably from September onwards. This was confirmed as was that scheme could be left in removed or modified once the trial has finished.
- Disability groups- are you satisfied with what has been done and that you are doing enough. The committee was advised that whilst more could always be done will continue to review what has been learnt so far. The establishment of the Health Strategic Disability Reference Group is a very positive step.
- Officers confirmed following a query that the responses from the feedback are not weighted between car users and non-car users.
- Following a query how many Experimental Traffic Orders have been removed or rescinded officers agreed to come back to Cllr David-Sanders after the meeting.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 21.7.2021

- Officers reassured members that at every stage of the process both legal and counsel advice is taken.
- Following a query on bus gate proposed for Brownlow Road it was confirmed that once Haringey's LTN is installed will look at the potential of putting a bus gate in this road. This could be part of any modified scheme.
- What is the trigger point to remove LTN's as other councils have done? It was confirmed that the government have paid for 100 LTN's and only 3 or 4 have been removed. This was a government election pledge so the number of LTN's is expected to increase. More data is needed to judge whether it was a success.
- Regarding comments on emergency barriers removed as impeding emergency services. Officers advised that the council has worked collaboratively and engaged with emergency services on this scheme. No objections have been received from emergency services. Warwick Road had width restrictions to prevent heavy goods vehicles using the road. This was hindering the London Ambulance service. This scheme enabled Warwick Road to become free flowing from an ambulance perspective.
- Following a query on community engagement the Deputy Leader confirmed that of the groups; 3 were pro LTN's, 2 neutral and one anti.
- The two ward councillors in attendance at the meeting were asked for their views. Councillor Brett commented that while she supported efforts to tackle climate change, she criticised the government timeline for rolling out the trial and said the way the LTN was implemented in Bowes was not helpful. She felt that consulted was not the right word for the prior engagement with ward councillors, who had been presented with a very tight timeline for the trial, and the reason she had agreed was because it was going to be for an experimental period that might contribute to the climate change discussion. She felt that residents were pitted against each other causing diversion. The deputy leader said that all Ward Councillors were consulted, and the community was divided as not all of the road were sorted in 2012.
- Councillor Achilleas Georgiou agreed that the problem went back to 2012 when schemes were introduced. On this issue of those with disabilities there was the opportunity to make changes to make changes to benefit people with disabilities. Can any amendments be made before the experimental orders come to an end? Cllr Georgiou said he did not believe there had been prior engagement with people living on the North Circular, which is on the boundary of the scheme, and asked if the council would hold focus groups and consultation with them. In response, Cllr Barnes advised that the LTN had reduced the number of vehicles going on to the North Circular, and that residents on the road had been free to take part in the consultation on the trial. The council would consider carrying out more engagement with those disproportionately impacted by the scheme adding that it could be modified in response to the concerns raised by people with disabilities.

Councillor Alexandrou in summing up highlighted the following; she felt that the vibrant spirit has been destroyed and the scheme is socially divisive with gridlocked roads, whilst cycle lanes are empty. The council should promote equality and eliminate discrimination, no provision for people with disabilities.



No positive enhancements are provided to improve the surrounding areas to encourage walking and cycling, no alternative green travel options are offered. The scheme does not include public transport, traffic has been deliberately forced on to main roads. People are apprehensive to use North Circular and now feel trapped at home, more work is needed with focus groups.

Overview & Scrutiny considered the reasons for the call-in and the responses provided.

Councillors Aksanoglu, Anyanwu, Demirel, and Guzel voted in favour of the above decision and Councillors David-Sanders, Hockney and Levy voted for against. The original Cabinet decision was therefore agreed.

## **5**

### **CALL IN: ENFIELD HEALTHY STREETS FRAMEWORK**

Cllr Lindsay Rawlings was welcomed as the Call-In lead and presented reasons for issuing the Call-in.

- The Call-in reasons and responses are detailed in the report.
- Activity 1, paragraph 1 the emphasis in the report of most of the activities is on improvements to the cycling infrastructure with pedestrians second best.
- Paragraph 2 if the intention is to increase cycle hubs at stations that the word existing should be removed.
- Paragraph 4 believes that this should be a holistic framework not just about cycling and walking without including public transport. Not sure how many residents are aware of the number of bus routes that can be used. On a number of areas where there is poor connectivity a more joined up approach would allow more people to see where they can get to with public transport.
- Activity 2 paragraph 1, anecdotally that the rise of illegal use of e-scooters, riding cycles on pavements and also through public open spaces does put people off walking around. Rather than look at pure statistics for accidents would rather see data collected on changing habits of pedestrians because of perceived problems on pavements. Even with the increase in safe segregated cycle routes in the borough there does not appear to be less people riding on the pavements.
- Activity 3 thought needs to be given in how to engage with more people need to gain the views of a wider range of residents.
- Activity 4 pleased that the activities are not ranked in order, but this should be made clearer in the report. A wide range of views are needed on this.
- Activity 6 point 10 the response does not give reasons for providing so few references to public transport throughout the report. One of the main thrusts of healthy streets cannot assume that getting people cycling or walking will get them to leave their cars behind some journeys will need to be taken by public transport.
- Point 41 whilst agreed that other improvements can relate to pedestrians they do not do so obviously. Others reading the report may miss these.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 21.7.2021

- Point 55 there should be an indication of much or how little people need to change their mods of travel in order to make a difference such as leaving the car at home one day a week, etc. If residents could see how making a relatively small change could make a difference to climate change, they may be more inclined to do so.
- To sum up not totally against the healthy streets initiative and am pleased that the emphasis has moved away from just cycling to include walking and public transport. This report needs to show residents that it is serious in its support for walking across the borough.

The Chair thanked Cllr Rawlings and asked the Deputy Leader Cllr Ian Barnes and officers to respond.

- With regards to the point favouring cyclists over pedestrians throughout the report it talks about improving conditions for walking and cycling. The overall purpose of the report is to provide a framework for healthy streets. There are 10 indicators, and these achieve a balance between walking and cycling.
- To clarify regarding cycling hubs at stations this is not expansion of the cycle hubs already in place without evidence of demand but an increase in the number of good quality secure cycle parking spaces such as those found at station hubs are needed at other stations that do not currently have this facility.
- The paper relates to public transport as programming to facilitate walking and cycling. Most public transport trips will begin on foot. The focus of TfL's healthy streets approach is walking and cycling journeys.
- With regards to people walking or cycling to Town Centres spending more than those arriving by car or public transport with no data to support this assertion. Links have been put in the response where the evidence can be read.
- Danger from motor vehicles to pedestrians and from the increasing use of e scooters and cyclists riding on the pavement. The response contains data on relative risk from different modes of transport. It was agreed that the use of e scooters and cycles on footways does cause distress to some people, this is a police matter. One of the reasons that Enfield did not take part in the e scooter trial scheme is that we want to see the results first.
- Fear of traffic is a reason that people often give for choosing not to walk or cycle. The National attitude survey is included which has a focus on walking or cycling. Segregated cycle lanes help with safety.
- With reference to where the report states that we will seek to involve those with protective characteristics. Everything will done to try to increase participation across these groups. The report mentions the establishment of a Healthy Streets Disability Reference group (HSDRG) this consists of 15 people with representation from various disabilities.
- Regarding point 10, the administration fully supports public transport and will do everything they can to expand this.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 21.7.2021

- Community engagement a variety of methods are used including leaflets, paper versions of the consultation and documents posted through doors and try to help residents with different languages.
- The comment on the mix of metric and imperial measures is noted.

The Chair invited questions and comments from Members, relevant to the call-in reasons

- In a response to a request for more information on the HSDRG officers advised that they are working with Transport for All which is a pan disability charity focuses specifically on the transport sector. The annex in the report sets out the equalities approach. The report sets out to make a commitment on how the council will engage with those with protective characteristics.
- A comment was made that it is hoped that the points made in the call in will be taken on board. Going forward the linguistics and the way it is being communicated needs to be softened. Softer language is needed to engage people with the behavioural and cultural shift needed. Public transport is a major part of the report. Members were advised that the next step is to look at how this can be communicated in a softer way. Engagement with Councillor Rawlings would be welcomed on this.
- Activity 2 one of the main issues raised with Councillors is road safety. One of the frustration residents raise is that the accident rate is not high enough, and speeding is a policing issue. It is very difficult to get even modest measures put in place. Officers advised that funding is a challenge in order to best determine where to allocate scarce resources on road safety there has to be a tool to prioritise where the greatest need is. It is acknowledged that there are issues in other places and a wider more holistic approach is taken in these areas. The council receives lots of requests for road safety measures.
- How do we engage with groups who do not naturally engage? Members were advised that it will be the role of the HSDRG to reach out, they will be mentored by Transport for All. It was acknowledged that this will be a challenge.
- East of the borough the junction at Hertford Road/ Ordnance Road is challenging with cars parking at junctions, heavy traffic, issues with cycle lanes and the perception that this not safe. This is very confusing and there are also traffic signalling issues which have been raised with TfL. Officers agreed to look at this scheme.
- Following a query, it was confirmed that the putting in good quality cycle storage is resident led.

Cllr Rawlings in summing up said that there is not enough mention of public transport within the report. The links provided in the responses should be in the report. Agree with the data re accidents but need to investigate what stops people walking. Felt that there is too much emphasis on national surveys should focus Enfield specific. Different ethnic groups have their own reasons for not cycling or walking. The report needs to make clear that the points are not in order. Language used to be made gentler and more friendly. Cllr

## **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 21.7.2021**

Rawlings happy to work with officers in making the report suitable for the public.

Overview & Scrutiny considered the reasons for the call-in and the responses provided.

Councillors Aksanoglu, Anyanwu, Demirel, Guzel and Levy voted in favour of the above decision and Councillors David-Sanders and Hockney voted against. The original Cabinet decision was therefore agreed.

### **6 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

The dates of meetings were noted, it was confirmed that the provisional Call in date of the 5 August 2021 is now a confirmed Call in date.