

**NOTES FROM THE INFORMAL MEETING OF**  
**ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE ACTION SCRUTINY PANEL**  
**TUESDAY 11<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2022**

**Attendees present:** - Cllr Mahmut Aksanoglu, Cllr Susan Erbil, Cllr Ahmet Hasan, Cllr Andrew Thorp, Cllr Lindsay Rawlings, Cllr Daniel Anderson, Cllr Charith Gunawardena, Doug Wilkinson, Jeremy Chambers, Claire Johnson, Dominic Millen, Ned Johnson, Leslie Currie, Koulla Panaretou

**Apologies:** - Cllr Ayten Guzel

The Chair (Cllr Aksanoglu) welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that this was an informal meeting of the Environment & Climate Action Scrutiny Panel. This means that it is not a formal meeting of the authority and Councillors need to be aware that joining this meeting is not recorded as attendance for the purposes of Section 85 Local Government Act 1972.

The meeting will be managed as if it were an in-person formal meeting. Officers will present reports and answer questions from Panel members in the usual way. A Committee Services Officer is in attendance to take notes. The notes will be presented to the next formal meeting of the Panel for formal ratification as the Panel sees fit.

During the introductions, Cllr Andrew Thorp, expressed his dissatisfaction at the above decision and that the public document pack hadn't been made public. Cllr Anderson requested a new Chair be appointed for this meeting due to a vote of no confidence and asked Cllr Thorp if he would stand in. Cllr Gunawardena seconded this request. As this was an informal meeting, this decision was agreed by the Monitoring Office. At this stage, Cllr Aksanoglu, Cllr Susan Erbil and Cllr Hassan left the meeting. Due to the informality of the meeting, quorum was not relevant, and the meeting continued.

**1. DRAFT AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN**

The Panel received the draft Air Quality Action Plan from Ned Johnson.

The following information was highlighted:

- Air pollution is alleged to be the world's biggest preventable killer, linked to several illnesses including heart disease cancer, stroke and many others.

- Major sources include traffic (burning of fossil fuels), industry, domestic heating installations.
- Monitoring takes place behind the scenes, with 4 real-time monitoring stations in the borough. 10 diffusion tube sites and the use of computer dispersion modelling, where data is used to map the whole of the borough and predict concentration, advising how pollution and air quality is changing over time.
- The Air Quality Action Plan was first issued in 2003 and updated in 2012, and 2015. The new plan is ready for consultation and sets out all the actions the council can and is taking to reduce nitrogen dioxide and PM10.
- The new actions contained in the Action Plan mainly cover traffic and encourage the use of public transport, walking and cycling.
- It must be noted that the Council do not control the major roads, which belong to TfL. (M25 belongs to Highways Agency).
- The risk is to everyone and the responsibility to improve air quality is for everyone too.

The following comments and questions were received:

- a. Should the Council be doing more to monitor small scale pollution locally?

In response: The Environment Agency used to notify the Council for any breaches, but this has not happened for many years now. The emissions from the incinerator (where particles are distributed and is one of the cleanest ones in Europe) are very small compared to the road emissions (concentrated to one area). **Action Ned Johnson: Investigate modelling undertaken by London Waste and report back to the Panel.**

- b. Why has Nitrogen Dioxide levels decreased over time? Is weather a factor for PM10 monitoring?

In response: As technology improves the level of emissions decreases. Cleaner fleets will increase lower emission levels. Summer months generally have less windy days and particles do not disperse as rapidly and there is a higher representation. This significantly lowers in the winter months.

- c. The incinerator is a large building and its position on the A406 where there is already many vehicles driving by only increases pollution levels. Has this been looked at?

In response: Due to the volume of vehicles already passing through the area, it will not make much difference to pollution levels. The emissions disperse with the air and do not linger to cause excessive issues.

- d. How has traffic reducing measures improved air quality as the traffic seems to be relocated rather than reduced? How is it possible to measure air pollution in a road where traffic has been redirected?

In response: Monitoring has taken place since 2018 with the use of diffusion tubes situated at Brownlow Road, Winchmore Hill Road, Warwick Road, on A406 near Bowes Primary School, Fox Lane and on the boundary of Alderman's Hill. There is a drive to get people to walk and cycle in other areas of the Borough. Time will tell once figures have been analysed to consider people working from home during the pandemic and few vehicles on the roads. Also, time is needed to implement changes to fleets and once all cars are electric, there will be significant changes evident. **Action:**

**Ned to provide feedback to the Panel from data collated from diffusion tubes.**

## **2. CORPORATE BUILDINGS EMISSIONS**

The Panel received an update from Dominic Millen, Head of Climate Action and Sustainability, on Emissions from Corporate Buildings.

The following information was highlighted:

- In 2020-21 corporate property emissions (from diesel, gas, oil, electricity) made up 26% of all Council emissions. Emissions indirectly through water heating technology only amounted to 0.4% but still a factor.
- The Climate Action Plan includes the following actions: heating system review, comprehensive refurb delivery, renewable energy capacity on Council sites, light sensors and timer installation, energy sub-metering, water metering installation, staff behaviour campaign and switch to renewable energy supplies.
- General rule is that the larger the building, the higher the emissions.
- Steps are being taken to reduce emissions from buildings by providing fabric upgrades, the use of smart systems and behavioural change.
- Schools are being supported via a specific handbook and climate action forum.
- Council housing communal usage linked to related upgrade programmes.
- Many physical improvements are currently ongoing, including retrofitting, piloting connections with Energetik heat network and development plans for future improvements including decarbonisation.
- Consumption reduction is being encouraged through sensor installations and improved automated controls.
- The Council have now employed a water monitoring officer to actively work on supply management.

The following comments and questions were received:

- a. What impact does staff leaving the computers on Stand-by at the Civic Centre have.

In response: most staff have laptops and tablets but there are other pieces of equipment left on so there is an opportunity to highlight this to staff via internal communications.

- b. As more staff are working from home, has the energy usage shifted from the Civic Centre (including lights being left on).

In response: staff working from home was considered in the [Enfield Carbon Emissions Review for 2020/21](#).

- c. Of the £3m of work planned, are these works intended to be done as part of the retrofit to decarbonise? What impact with these works have across Enfield?

In response: the works had already been identified so were put forward as part of a bid for Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme funding. There have also been complementary works delivered as part of planned improvements. In terms of the impact on carbon emissions, these have to be viewed in the context of the Council's target to be a carbon neutral organisation by 2030. It is also preferable to do something and make use of external funding.

### **3. Meridian Water Panel Report**

The Panel received the Panel report of the Meridian Water Environmental Sustainability Strategy (October 2021).

The Monitoring Office advised that as the meeting was informal, the panel can proceed with discussions at this meeting and formally agree at the next meeting when these notes have been considered and future steps taken.

Cllr Gunawardena made the following remarks:

The Panel's recommendations for Meridian Water had been provided to officers for checking and that no errors had been identified with the report and there was one comment. However, the final report had still not been provided to Members for checking.

The revised minutes of the meeting where Meridian Water was discussed have not been distributed despite the amendments being approved by the Panel at the last meeting.

Cllrs Thorp, Rawlings and Anderson spoke in support of the report and reiterated that Members had serious concerns about the deficit of open space

at Meridian Water, which, amongst other things, will be counterproductive to health and wellbeing.

Cllr Anderson noted that this was not the first iteration of this report and that it had taken 15 months to get to this stage.

Cllr Gunawardena spoke about the previous report that the Panel had written had been an enormous amount of work and was fully referenced and said that he would also like this report to be submitted to officers for checking as this work should not be ignored.

Cllr Gunawardena said that he thought that the Council needs to come up with its own view about the impact of the incinerator and conduct its own risk assessment and not rely on reports from NLWA, particularly in regard to the incinerators impact on Meridian Water and the tall towers proposed. Also that Members should be provided with data for diffusion tubes by locations over the last 5 years.

The panel also agreed to get both the questions and answers from Peter George added to the report.

The following comments and questions were received:

- The minutes of the first meeting have still not been distributed and accepted at this meeting.

In response: a check will be taken and followed up at the next meeting.

**Action: Claire Johnson**

- It was noted that the report covered some significant and important recommendations and clearly identifies that the amount of open space is insufficient for the number of residents envisaged.
- The Panel expressed their wish for this report to be placed on record with the expectation that it is adopted in the future.