

Chair:  
Councillor Clare Kober

Deputy Chair:  
Councillor Lorna Reith

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This report covers matters considered by the Cabinet at our meeting on 16 December 2008. For ease of reference the Report is divided into the Cabinet portfolios.
- 1.2 We trust that this Report will be helpful to Members in their representative role and facilitate a fruitful dialogue between the Cabinet and all groups of Councillors. These reports are a welcome opportunity for the Cabinet on a regular basis to present the priorities and achievements of the Cabinet to Council colleagues for consideration and comment. The Cabinet values and encourages the input of fellow members.

## **ITEM FOR DECISION**

### **2. SAVING UNITARY DEVELOPMENT POLICIES**

- 2.2 We considered a report which advised us that the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 ('the Act') had introduced a new Local Development Framework system of plan-making. Under the Act, Haringey's Unitary Development Plan (UDP), which was adopted in July 2006, was valid for three years from the date of adoption, until July 2009.
- 2.3 This meant that the policies in the UDP would no longer be saved after July 2009 unless the Secretary of State (SoS) made a Direction to save the policies beyond this date. Without such a Direction, there would be no statutory planning policies applying in the Borough, except for the London Plan, with which to determine planning applications.
- 2.3 We were advised that the SoS has issued a protocol for saving policies which required that each policy in the UDP should be identified and a reason given as to whether or not the policy should be saved. The protocol set out the criteria for assessing whether or not policies should be saved and identified the principles and priorities to which the SoS would have regard when reaching a decision. Requests to save policies would be scrutinised by the SoS and a decision made to approve or not approve the request based on compliance with the criteria.
- 2.4 We were also advised that in drawing up the schedules attached as Appendix 1 to this report, officers had considered the criteria set in the protocol and also whether particular policies were used or referred to in determining planning applications. The schedule was set out chapter by chapter as identified in the UDP. Our officer's recommendations were that most of the UDP policies should be saved. It was generally those policies which were repetitive of London Plan policy or existing UDP policy which were considered unnecessary. Those proposed to be deleted are identified in the following table.

<b>Summary of policies to be deleted</b>	
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Water conservation	Repeats UD2 (j) Does not add anything in terms of policy.
Density Standards	Outdated reference to London Plan - London Plan Density Matrix is Table 3A.2 rather than 4B.1. Parking standards now outlined in Annex 4 of the London Plan. London Plan Policy 3A.3 Maximising the potential of sites - provides for higher density development on sites compatible with local context, design principles and public transport capacity.
Improvements	List of infrastructure is outdated – New list provided in London Plan Table 3C.1
Pedestrians and cyclists	Repetition of M3 (c) which refers to the design and location of buildings on encouraging walking and cycling.

2.5 As our adopted UDP was relatively new, there were very few policies which did not conform to either national guidance or the London Plan. The primary consideration in reaching a recommendation was whether or not a particular policy was necessary to guide development. Where it was considered necessary then as well as being saved it was also likely to be carried forward in some form into the Local Development Framework.

2.6 However, the Greater London Authority (GLA) had identified two policies (ENV9: Mitigating climate change: energy efficiency and ENV10: Mitigating climate change: renewable energy) which were no longer in general conformity with the London Plan, and were therefore not recommended to be saved. Both contained references to a 10% renewable energy target. The 10% renewable target in the London Plan (2004) was superseded by a 20% target as part of the Further Alterations to the London Plan, which were adopted in February 2008. References to a 10% target were therefore no longer in general conformity. In view of the GLA’s objection it was recommended that policies ENV9 and ENV10 be deleted and reliance be placed on the London Plan policies.

**WE RECOMMEND**

1. That the Secretary of State be requested to save the UDP policies as indicated in the Schedule set out at Appendix 1.
2. That the two policies ENV9: Mitigating climate change: energy efficiency and ENV10: Mitigating climate change: renewable energy which were no longer in general conformity with the London Plan, be not saved for the reasons outlined above.

**ITEMS OF REPORT**

## **Children and Young People**

### **3. CHILD POVERTY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN**

3.1 We reported to the Council on 13 October 2008 on a draft child poverty strategy for consultation which advised us that the Government had set itself a target to end child poverty by 2020 and was strongly encouraging local services to take an ever more active role in reducing poverty. As a local authority we had an important role in helping to tackle the issue by:

- delivering key services that are critical to improving children's life chances;
- co-ordinating activities to reduce worklessness and poverty;
- engaging with individuals and groups at risk of being marginalized;
- tailoring solutions to meet the needs of local people

3.2 We reported that we had approved a draft strategy and action plan for consultation and that we would report further to the Council on the outcome of that consultation and on any amendments to the draft strategy and action plan.

3.3 The consultation with our Haringey Strategic Partnership (HSP) Partners took place between late September and early November 2008 and Partners were asked to provide comments. An executive summary of the strategy, which included a link to the full strategy and action plan on the Council's web site, was circulated to all of the HSP theme boards as well as to the Youth Parliament. The strategy was tabled for discussion at the HSP and Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Board.

3.4 We noted that comments had been received from the Well-Being Theme Board, the Children and Young People's Partnership Board and the HSP Board. In addition the Child Poverty Working Group had also given comments. The key issues which had arisen from the consultation were that:

- HSP partners should take responsibility for achieving the strategy's objectives within their own organisations.
- The report was written before the economic turndown and should now reflect the current situation.
- More references to health should be included and mention made of initiatives around employment and health services.
- Reference ought to be made to children acting as carers, children affected by parents with substance misuse problems and children in care.
- Reference ought to be made to the homelessness strategy.

These points had been reflected in the revised strategy and action plan submitted to us.

3.5 We also noted that the Child Poverty strategy was designed to deliver two of the Sustainable Community Strategy's (SCS) objectives, economic vitality and prosperity shared by all; and healthier people with a better quality of life. Delivery of the strategy

would be key to meeting the new LAA target on tackling child poverty, as well as current LAA targets around worklessness and improving educational attainment. The strategy was a step in moving towards closer joint planning and working across the Council and with partner agencies in tackling child poverty.

- 3.6 We report that we approved the revised strategy and action plan and in so doing we were advised that the strategy's objectives would be delivered within existing budgets. However, it was hoped that by encouraging a more co-ordinated and focused approach to child poverty, the strategy would increase the effectiveness of the Council's activity in this area and improve value for money.

## **Regeneration and Enterprise**

### **4. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2007/08**

- 4.1 The Council will be aware that local planning authorities were required to produce an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) under Section 35 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Regulation 48 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. We considered a report which attached an AMR which covered the period April 2007 to March 2008 and had to be submitted to the Secretary of State by 31 December 2008.
- 4.2 We noted that the AMR was used for information purposes to assess the performance and effectiveness of planning policies. It presented available statistical data relating to the planning policies in Haringey's adopted Unitary Development Plan and the emerging Local Development Framework. It contained a monitoring framework that identified targets and indicators, which would be used to assess the performance and effectiveness of the UDP objectives and key policies. The AMR also identified on-going issues of data collection and analysis.
- 4.3 We were advised that on 30 March 2007, the Council had submitted its revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) to the Government Office for London. The LDS was a three year project plan, which set out a programme for replacing the UDP policies with Local Development Documents. The AMR monitored progress on the LDS. For 2007/08, the key milestones were 'Consultation on Issues and Options for the Core Strategy', 'Joint Waste Plan' and 'Central Leaside Area Action Plan' as set out in Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. The 2007/08 AMR set out that these milestones had been met.
- 4.4 We were informed that this was the fourth AMR to be submitted to the Government Office for London. The previous reports in 2004/05, 2005/06 and 2006/07 had presented available statistical data relating to Haringey's UDP policies and information on the Council's development control performance. This version of the AMR took forward many of the indicators used in the previous reports and addressed all the Core Output Indicators identified by the Government. It also included some significant effects indicators which assessed the significant social, economic and environmental effects of policies. These indicators were linked to objectives for the sustainability appraisal of Local Development Documents. A full set of sustainability objectives and sub objectives were identified in the Sustainability Appraisal for the Local Development Framework.

4.5 We report, for information, that we approved the Annual Monitoring Report for submission to the Government Office for London.

## **Housing**

### **5. USE OF INTRODUCTORY TENANCIES**

5.1 We considered a report which advised us that introductory tenancies had been used very effectively by many local authorities and social landlords, and were encouraged as an important measure to tackle Anti Social Behaviour. We noted that an introductory tenancy was for a probationary period of one year for new tenants, at the end of which period the tenancy automatically became secure unless action was taken to bring the tenancy to an end. The probationary period could be extended for up to 6 months.

5.2 We were informed that the introductory tenancy scheme it was proposed to introduce would apply to all new Council tenants from the date that the scheme starts. The introductory tenancy scheme would not apply to the following:

- Council tenants who were already secure tenants and who moved home through a transfer or mutual exchange.
- RSL tenants who were already assured tenants and who moved home through a transfer or mutual exchange.

5.3 To obtain a possession order from a court against a secure tenant the Council had to prove one of the grounds of possession set out in Schedule 2 to the Housing Act 1985 and, in most cases, satisfy the court that repossession was reasonable. To obtain a possession order against an introductory tenant, the Council would simply need to satisfy the court that the correct procedure for ending the tenancy had been followed. This procedure included notifying tenants that they had the right to request that the decision to end their tenancy was reviewed by a panel that included someone who was independent of the person who made the decision to end the tenancy.

5.4 Concerns which had been expressed that secure tenants who were required to leave their accommodation because of domestic violence, serious harassment or hate crime and were then placed in temporary accommodation would be seriously disadvantaged when they were eventually offered settled accommodation as an introductory tenancy had been addressed by a recent amendment to the Lettings Policy which provided for such households to be moved as an urgent management transfer (ideally within 8 weeks) rather than have to spend many years in temporary accommodation. Under these circumstances, the tenant would be given a secure tenancy.

5.5 We report that we supported the use of introductory tenancies and granted approval to the rights that the Council would give to introductory tenancies which were set out as an Appendix the report. We also delegated authority to approve the use of introductory tenancies to the Director of Urban Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and the Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Safer Communities after taking

into account the feedback received from tenants and other stakeholders during the consultation.

## **Resources**

### **6. BULL LANE PETITION**

- 6.1 We considered a report which advised us that two out of borough sites at Bull Lane and Pasteur Gardens had been the subject of dialogue with Enfield Council as a result of which we submitted a planning application in May 2003 for the use of up to 2 hectares of the Bull Lane site for residential development. Enfield Council's Planning Committee in April 2004 approved up to 1.62 hectares for such a development subject to a Section 106 agreement covering various matters.
- 6.2 These proposals involved the Pasteur Gardens site and part of the Bull Lane site being transferred to Enfield Council and the disposal of 1.62 hectares of the Bull Lane site. These proposals provoked public reaction most notably from Community Action Sport (CAS) which made representations and expressed an interest in purchasing the Bull Lane site for retention as a sports ground with a view to providing new sports facilities for the local community. CAS stated that their proposals for Bull Lane would benefit both local schools and sports organizations, one of which was Park View Rangers FC, who suffered from a lack of playing field facilities.
- 6.3 We were informed that CAS had submitted an 'Outline Project for Saving Bull Lane Playing Fields' in October 2008 in which they formally requested that the Council give them 6 months in which to prepare a business plan and secure external funding. As part of their project CAS envisaged re-instating Bull Lane with up to 5 football pitches and associated sports facilities, essentially retaining the whole of the Bull Lane site as a playing field. We noted that a formal response had been sent to CAS agreeing to their request and confirming that the six months would expire on 31 May 2009. CAS had been informed that the negotiations would continue with Enfield Council during this period.
- 6.5 We were also informed that Park View Rangers FC who currently used the football pitches at Bull Lane envisaged continued expansion of their membership and expressed their support for CAS and its proposals. They had submitted a petition to this effect.
- 6.6 We report that we noted receipt of the petition and that the petitioners had been advised that a Cabinet report on Bull Lane and Pasteur Gardens would be considered following receipt and assessment of Community Action Sport's business plan.

### **7. HORNSEY DEPOT**

- 7.1 The Council will be aware that the site of the former Hornsey Central Depot has been surplus to Council requirements for over 10 years and has been designated as a key site for development to promote economic, social and physical regeneration. Together with the adjoining site owned by Sainsbury this scheme is part of the Council's Regeneration programme with the following key objectives:

- A comprehensive development of both sites to provide of a sustainable, high quality, mixed-use development including a food store and housing in accordance with the Council's Planning Policy and Housing Strategy.
- Regeneration of the High Street.
- Capital receipts to support investment in the borough through the Council's Capital Programme.

7.2 We considered a report which advised us that there had been a long history in the development of this scheme and following an assessment of the options in November 2006 the Council decided to market the combined site jointly with Sainsbury. Following an assessment of the bids, pursuant the above Council's objective, a preferred purchaser was appointed in July 2007 to develop the site. The terms of the appointment approved in July 2007 were a conditional sale to Inner Circle for the combined site, subject to contract and planning.

7.3 Since their appointment Inner Circle worked with the landowners to develop the scheme in consultation with Planning and other agencies and also carried out public consultation. Unfortunately, due to the unprecedented change in the economic conditions resulting in the sudden and steep decline in property values, Inner Circle revised their financial offer in October 2008. Having considered the revised offer and following discussions with Sainsbury's, the revised offer from Inner Circle was rejected on 6 November 2008 as it did not demonstrate best consideration to the Council, nor value for money for Sainsbury.

7.4 In order to take the project forward the report proposed an option which entailed securing planning consent for the whole site then its development in phases. This option would ensure a comprehensive approach to the development with all land treated as part of a single integrated master plan creating certainty, albeit phased development. This would avoid a piecemeal development thereby eliminating the risk of creating back land sites. Given the current economic situation and property market, this option was considered the best way forward. Phase 1 could be 'Store with some residential above together with improvements to the High Street and phase 2 could be affordable housing with private housing being delivered as and when the market improves'. The proposal was to treat Sainsbury as a special purchaser for Phase 1, and to competitively market Phase 2 once planning consent has been obtained, and enabling and some infrastructure works were carried out by Sainsbury. This would give the Council an "oven" ready site for development, which would be more attractive in the current market conditions.

7.5 We report that we agreed to proceed with the option as outlined above and approved Sainsbury being given special purchaser status on phase 1 of the development subject to them meeting specified performance targets resulting in an agreed scheme being submitted for planning consent for the whole site. We also approved the Council entering into a collaboration agreement the terms of which are classified as exempt because they contained information relating to the business or financial affairs of any particular person and we authorised the Director of Corporate Resources in consultation with the Head of Legal Services to finalise the agreement.

## **Leader**

### **8. THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE – PERIOD 7 – APRIL TO OCTOBER 2008**

- 8.1 We considered the regular finance and performance monitoring report covering Finance and Performance of the Council for the period April to October 2008 which detailed the Council's performance against agreed targets. Financial and Performance information was based on the financial monitoring reports prepared for the budget and performance management review meetings for period 7.
- 8.2 Performance against 72 monthly reported indicators was indicated all linked to the Council's priorities -
- Making Haringey one of London's greenest boroughs
  - Creating a better Haringey: Cleaner, Greener and Safer
  - Encouraging lifetime well-being
  - Promoting independent living
  - Delivering excellent services
- 8.3 The aggregate projected positions for revenue and capital were also shown as well as proposed budget changes (virements) for which our approval was sought in accordance with financial regulations, and the RAG status of planned savings and planned investments.
- 8.4 While the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) would take account of our performance against all 198 National Indicators (NIs), a significant number of the new national indicators lent themselves to quarterly or annual monitoring rather than monthly. These were shown quarterly to ensure that Members and senior officers were aware of the full list of indicators which would be used to judge the Council and the Strategic Partnership at the end of the year.
- 8.5 Overall, good progress has been made on the indicators monitored in the first seven months of 2008/09. Performance highlights included -
- Thefts of motor vehicles have decreased since last year by 10%
  - Percentage of 16-18 year olds not in education, employment or training (NEETS) is low in September at 8%
  - Visits to the borough's sports centres, are ahead target with 800,000 visits so far this year
- 8.6 However, the report also highlighted areas for focussed monitoring such as recycling and average re-let times and set out the agreed actions to bring performance in line with targets.
- 8.7 In terms of finance, the overall revenue budget monitoring, based on the October position, showed that the General Fund was forecast to overspend by £0.7 million. This projected overspend was within the Children & Young People Directorate and the Corporate Resources Directorate. The reasons for this projected overspend were detailed in the



report as were other budget pressures that services were seeking to contain within the budget. The dedicated schools budget (DSB) element of the overall Children & Young People’s budget was projected to spend £0.2 million below budget, any DSG under spend would need to be carried forward to next year. In relation to the housing revenue account (HRA), the net revenue projection was to spend at budget. This was following estimated savings arising from the letting of the new gas boiler maintenance contracts although these savings were offset by a number of pressures also detailed in the report.

8.8 The aggregate capital projected position in 2008/09 is projected to under spend by £0.5 million. The projected under spends were within Corporate Resources and Urban Environment and the reasons for this are detailed in the report.

8.5 Financial regulations required that proposed budget changes be approved by the Cabinet. These are shown in the table below. These changes fall into one of two categories:

- Budget virements, where it was proposed that budget provision be transferred between one service budget and another. Explanations are provided where this is the case;
- Increases or decreases in budget, generally where notification has been received in-year of a change in the level of external funding such as grants or supplementary credit approval.

Under the Constitution, certain virements are key decisions. Key decisions are:

- For revenue, any virement which results in change in a directorate cash limit of more than £250,000; and
- For capital, any virement which results in the change of a programme area of more than £250,000.

Key decisions are highlighted by an asterisk in the table.

The following table sets out the proposed changes. There are two figures shown in each line of the table. The first amount column relates to changes in the current year’s budgets and the second to changes in future years’ budgets (full year). Differences between the two occur when, for example, the budget variation required relates to an immediate but not ongoing need or where the variation takes effect for a part of the current year but will be in effect for the whole of future years. Proposed virements are set out in the following table.

***Revenue Virements***

Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Reason for budget changes	Description

ACCS	Rev	125	125	Corrective budget realignment	Transfer of Head of Commissioning and Complaints officer posts to Commissioning & Strategy from the Director's budget.
ACCS	Rev*	374	867	New funding allocations	Transforming Social Care Reform grant for 2008/09 and 2009/10.
CR/UE	Rev	63	108	Corrective budget realignment	Agreed budget transfer from Housing Services to Customer Services for dealing with customer enquiries regarding housing registrations and homelessness prevention.
CYP/AC CS/CR	Rev*	291	291	Corrective budget realignment	Procurement efficiency savings for transport and related budget adjustment.
CR	Rev	195	195	Corrective budget realignment	Benefits and Local Taxation – increased court costs income.

***Capital Virements***

Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Reason for budget changes	Description
UE	Cap	206		New funding allocations	North London Sub Regional funding for empty homes.
UE	Cap*	261		New funding allocations	North London Sub Regional funding for private sector decent homes.
UE	Cap*	300		Corrective budget realignment	Additional parking capital investment (amend signs, extend two existing CPZ's and introduce five new pay and display machines) to be funded from the parking reserve.
UE	Cap*	(975)		Corrective budget realignment	Revised TFL funding allocation for bridge works.
UE	Cap	22		Corrective budget realignment	Works at the former Hornsey Waterworks funded by Section 278 income.
UE	Cap	36		Corrective budget realignment	Housing and Planning Delivery grant allocation for 2008/09 for capital.

**9. APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SERVE ON CABINET COMMITTEES AND HARINGEY STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP (HSP) BODIES**

9.1 We considered a report which advised us of the need to make appointments to Cabinet Committees and Haringey Strategic Partnership bodies consequent upon changes to our membership.

9.2 We report for information that we agreed the following changes –

- That Councillor Kober and Councillor Reith (as Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Children and Young People respectively) be appointed to serve on the Procurement Committee.

- That Councillor Kober (as Leader of the Council) be appointed as Chair of the Haringey Strategic Partnership Board and of its Performance Management Board as well as a member of the HSP Children and Young People Strategic Partnership Board.
- That Councillor Reith (as Cabinet Member for Children and Young People) be appointed to serve as Chair of the HSP Children and Young People Strategic Partnership Board.
- That Councillor Cooke (as Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion and Involvement) be appointed to serve on the HSP Better Places Strategic Partnership Board.

***Note by the Head of Local Democracy & Member Services***

There was one other consequential change to the membership of a Cabinet Committee not reported at the meeting –

- Councillor Cooke (as Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion and Involvement) becomes Chair of the Cabinet Voluntary Sector Committee.

**10. DELEGATED DECISIONS AND SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS**

- 10.1 We were informed of the following significant actions taken by Directors under delegated powers -

**Assistant Chief Executive (People and Organizational Development)**

Council Wide Training Programme: Working at the Political Interface – Approval to the award of the contract to SOLACE Enterprises.