

Clifford Hart

020 8489 2920

clifford.hart@haringey.gov.uk

20 November 2015

To: All Members of the Full Council

Dear Member,

Full Council - Monday, 23rd November, 2015

I attach a copy of the following reports for the above-mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda:

- 10. TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM THE FOLLOWING BODIES (PAGES 1 - 12)**
- a) Cabinet Report No 1 2015/16 – **TO FOLLOW**
 - b) Regulatory Committee Report No 1 2015/16 – **TO FOLLOW**

Yours sincerely

Clifford Hart
Democratic Services Manager

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT 1 OF THE CABINET TO FULL COUNCIL ON 23 NOVEMBER 2015

Chair:
Councillor Claire Kober

Vice Chair:
Councillor Bernie Vanier

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report to Full Council arises from consideration of the following reports by the Cabinet:

- Haringey's Local Plan - 20th October 2015
- Outcome of consultation on revised Statement of Licensing Policy for the Gambling Act 2005 – 10 November 2015
- Council Tax reduction Scheme for 2016/17 – 10 November 2015

2. SUMMARY OF CONSIDERATIONS2.1 Haringey's Local Plan

We considered a report which set out progression of four important planning documents: Alterations to Strategic Policies, Development Management DPD, Site Allocations DPD, and Tottenham Area Action Plan to the next stage of Plan preparation.

We noted the role of each of these documents for the Council, and as the Local Planning Authority, to proactively manage development needs and change in the Borough, ensuring it was directed to where it is best accommodated and being able to resist inappropriate poorly located schemes. This included:

- The Alterations to the Strategic Policies which reiterated the Council's commitment to delivering more housing to meet local needs but targeting this to areas that would benefit significantly from substantial inward investment including better transport services, improved environmental quality, and new jobs.
- The spatial strategy which allowed the Council to recognise and protect its valued local open spaces, the residential amenity and heritage that add to the character of our neighbourhoods, and make the best of employment sites for continued employment uses.
- The role of all the other draft planning documents was to give effect to this agreed spatial strategy.

We noted that, since the consultation period closed in March 2015, the Planning Policy team had sifted through some 600 letters and emails and 6 petitions containing over 6,000 comments. The petitions included one for Lynton Rd with 126 signatures, one for Pinkham Way with 1154 signatures, and 4 separate petitions on Lordship Rec/Broadwater Farm totalling 395 signatures). In addition officers had undertaken meetings and discussions with a range of interested parties on a range of subjects and sites.

The reports included in the agenda pack contained the updated Local Plan documents, along with the Consultation Reports with the comments received and responses to these.

The spatial strategy was updated to reflect Haringey's increased housing target is contained at Appendix A on pages 119 to 214.

The "Development Management DPD" at Appendix C, included a "design charter" for all new development (page 223) and important policies to cover the protection of family homes (page 257), open spaces (Pages 264-269), shops (pages 304-312) and community facilities (Pages 314 -318).

The "Site Allocations DPD" (pages 351 to 573) included designations for key sites such as Alexandra Palace and the Highgate Bowl, and the opportunities in Wood Green, Hornsey and Green Lanes, which translated into allocations for some 7,500 new homes and 75,000m² of new employment floor-space.

Elsewhere within the "Tottenham Area Action Plan" at Appendix G contained detailed site by site development requirements covering the new opportunities in one of London's Housing Zones – as well as reflecting the distinctive heritage, character and economy across Tottenham.

We noted the overview of the tone and feeling regarding the consultation process on the last set of documents. There were a range of comments about the content and the way in which the Council had engaged with communities, members and developers as part of that process. In some cases communities felt that the Council had not engaged with them effectively. In a number of cases, feedback suggested that some of the bold allocations that were promoted should not be progressed. The changes to the plan, set out on pages 7-50 of the report pack illustrated how, having regard to local views, the Council had responded.

The Council's Planning Team would be taking forward the learning from feedback received about the consultation and engagement processes, and the Council were committed to also trying harder to reach out and secure views from more of the community on the "soundness" of these proposals and improving the readability of these documents. The Cabinet Member for Planning had recently hosted a community forum to discuss our Statement of Community Involvement on 14th September. There would be a continuing programme of engagement around these documents to help answer some of the earlier criticisms associated with the earlier round of consultation last spring.

We noted the link between the Corporate Plan ambitions for better homes for everyone, new jobs and improved opportunity for all, a safer and a healthier borough being reflected in an updated Local Plan. It was indicated that the document had an important part to play in realising that ambition – by helping the Council plan for infrastructure, seizing opportunities from development to secure positive economic and housing outcomes or by protecting and preserving important spaces, buildings and places. Despite the challenges of accommodating London's Growth, The Cabinet Member for Planning advocated that the Plan meets the objectives for growth, employment and Housing –and the 4 appendices attached should now proceed to Full Council for approval.

In response to the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture's question on management of the tension in supporting economic as well as Housing growth in Haringey, we noted that local authorities were facing big challenges to deliver employment and housing and were looking at ways in which sites can have both housing and employment use. Brownfield land in the borough was limited and choices were required to be made regarding how the borough best use the land available. The Council had further endeavoured to safeguard employment land and the Brownfield site at Pinkham way

We took into consideration to the recently approved Growth Strategy which would not limit the Council to dormitory businesses and put forward a new approach for how employment sites may exist in the borough, attracting local jobs and locations allowing access to higher skills.

We would not automatically favour residential sites to employment sites as this was short sighted as employment was a key component of growth.

We considered the following deputations:

Deputation 1

Mr Spokes speaking on behalf of the Defend Crouch End group, who objected to the inclusion of Site Allocation 51 [site in between 72-96 Park Road and Lynton road in the Site Allocations development Plan] and asked for this site's removal from the plan. He referred to the lack of proper information provided to local residents and business, earlier this year in the consultation period, about the inclusion of this site in the DPD. Mr Spokes set out the circumstances in which the local residents and businesses had become aware of its inclusion in the DPD which he felt did not reflect the principles of good communication and he questioned if this was indicative of the consultation, as a whole, on all the local planning documents.

Mr Spokes contested the proposed height of the development at this site which would have a detrimental impact on the existing neighbourhood, with an immediate changed physical environment for households living in close quarters to the site. He also highlighted the closure of the existing discreet and unique businesses, currently taking up the site, to make way for the housing which was not in keeping with the boroughs employment commitments. He felt that due consideration had not been given to the impact of having additional housing in the area. This was in terms of parking, environment and schools. There was an obvious bias to housing development but he questioned how any mixed use employment space could be continued at this site.

We provided some assurance, explaining that the Local Plan, at this stage, set out in theory what uses can be made of the site. Any eventual changes to the site would be subject to planning permission where local concerns can also be put forward.

In response to the concerns on height, and the loss of employment on the site, we advised the deputation party that there was already an existing planning consent for the northern part of the site for a 5 storey building providing for 40 net residential units. Therefore, the planning documents of the Council could not discount the existing planning permission, or the principles of development that it has established on this site. Given the significant need for housing and affordable employment space in the borough this site was considered to be one that is able (subject to careful design) to make a contribution towards the borough wide housing and employment need.

We further provided assurance that if, and when, a proposal for development is received it will be subject to policies governing parking, height of development, and impact on surrounding properties on Lynton Rd, Park Rd and the Grove.

We further hoped that local residents would be reassured that the Local Plan will help to manage how this development at SA49 [Previously SA51] comes forward in the future, and ensure that it makes a positive, rather than negative contribution to the urban fabric of Crouch End.

We re-iterated the pressure faced by local authorities to provide more housing and employment for residents and the Cabinet Member for Planning offered to meet with the residents and businesses concerned about SA 51 as part of the Regulation 19 consultation process.

We asked the Assistant Director for Planning to set out the next development phase of these local plans, following consideration at Cabinet and Full Council in November. He advised that, in December, there would follow a further consultation period and an examination in public in spring, testing the soundness of the planning documents. A representative of the Secretary of State would take this forward, inviting local stakeholders and groups to participate and share their views. The Crouch End community group would be given details about the examination exercises and how they can participate.

Deputation 2

We received representations from Mr Secker, speaking on behalf of a number of community groups and projects in and around the Broadwater Farm Estate. Mr Secker was objecting to the inclusion of Broadwater Farm Estate along with the Northern housing areas off the estate

[Somerset Close, Moira Close and Lido square being included in the site allocations development plan [SA62]. He welcomed the removal of the Lordship recreation ground from the Plan and asked for same action to be applied to SA62.

The deputation party felt that there had been inadequate consultation with residents about the inclusion of the estate and surrounding northern housing area in the local plan as potential development areas. The deputation felt the Council had the underlying objective of demolishing the estate and rebuilding private accommodation in its place and Mr Secker referenced extracts of the September Cabinet report on the review of Housing Management [the deputation had tabled a information pack for the Cabinet supporting their deputation] which he claimed supported this underlying Council objective. This September Cabinet report had also highlighted the Council's consideration of a joint venture vehicle for housing regeneration in the borough which the deputation party felt would bring less equality and rights to Council tenants.

We were asked by the deputation party to consider alternative solutions for modernising the estate such as, ensuring the decent homes standards were applied, and physical estate improvements made to buildings. The deputation party had set out fuller details in page 8 of their tabled information pack.

We responded to the deputation by emphasising that the Council had no plans to demolish the Broadwater Farm Estate and replace it with private accommodation. Lack of housing was a London wide issue with no easy solutions and would mean looking at innovative ways to bring in Housing to the borough.

We stressed that the required physical improvements to the Broadwater Farm Estate were undeniable. Also there were structural issues with the buildings meaning there were no easy solutions for upgrading the buildings. Visits had been made to the Broadwater Farm Estate and feedback received from residents who wanted better upgraded accommodation.

We acknowledged the considerable responses received on the issues of Lordship Recreation Ground and the Broadwater Farm area. The Lordship Recreation ground had been removed from the Plan following consultation. However, the housing estate consultation responses were more mixed with request for better housing. We had a responsibility for ensuring high quality homes across the borough – including on the Broadwater Farm Estate. Therefore, the plan proposed that we work together with the local community groups, residents and stakeholders on new supplementary planning document to set out how to secure improvements to this housing estate to improve stock, design of the site, and routes through the area.

We further clarified that there were no detailed plans yet for how this will be achieved, and certainly no agreed plan for demolitions. We would work with local residents and stakeholders in identifying options for improvements to the estate in the future.

2.1.5 WE RESOLVED

To note the comments of the Regulatory Committee at Paragraph at 6.7; and

To note the comments received to consultation on the preferred option draft Local Plan documents (the draft Schedule of Alterations to the Strategic Policies DPD; the draft Development Management Policies DPD; the draft Site Allocations DPD; and the draft Tottenham Area Action Plan DPD) and the Council's proposed response to these as set out in the Consultation Statements at Appendices B, D, F and H respectively of the report.

To recommend to Full Council that it approve the following:

- I. The Schedule of Alterations to Haringey's Local Plan: Strategic Policies: Pre-submission version;
- II. The draft Development Management DPD: Pre-submission version;
- III. The draft Site Allocations DPD: Pre-submission version; and
- IV. The draft Tottenham Area Action Plan: Pre-submission version (attached at Appendices A, C, E and G respectively), for publication and submission to the Secretary of State for independent Examination in Public.

2.2 Outcome of consultation on revised Statement of Licensing Policy for the Gambling Act 2005 – 10 November 2015

We considered a report which put forward an updated Gambling policy for 2016-2019. We noted the outcome of the consultation and the implications for the next review in 2016, where it would be a requirement in future to create Local Area Profiles. These profiles will provide a good evidence base of gambling in the local area and help identify any future risks, which will inform the decision making process.

WE RESOLVED

1. To note and agree the responses to the consultation as set out in paragraphs 6.9 -6.12 and at Appendix 2.
2. To recommend to Full Council the draft Statement of Gambling Policy at Appendix 1 for adoption.
3. To take into account the EQIA set out at Appendix 3.

2.3 Council Tax reduction Scheme for 2016/17 – 10 November 2015

We considered a report which set out the recommendations for Haringey's Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) for 2016/17, taking into account the outcomes of an Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA).

We noted the final scheme must be approved by 31st January 2016, ready for implementation, on the 1st April 2016. The report recommended continuing with the current Council Tax Reduction Scheme without revision or amendment.

We were asked to approve an additional recommendation to provide the Chief Operating Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture, delegated authority to make some final amendments to appendix C and D before submission to Full Council. We noted that the amendments to appendix C were required to ensure that the scheme was up to date with the latest regulations from Government. These were minor and would not affect the principles of the scheme in any way. Amendments to appendix D were required to make the justification for not extending the scheme to other groups clearer and for the financial information in the section on, options to protect specific groups, to be enhanced.

Following a vote of Cabinet Members -

WE RESOLVED

To make the following recommendations to full Council for consideration:

1. That having taken into account the Equalities Impact Assessment at **Appendix B**, the Council resolve not to revise the Council Tax Reduction Scheme agreed for 2015/16 and to continue this scheme for 2016/17;
2. That accordingly, the scheme which is summarised in **Appendix A** and set out in full at **Appendix C** continues to be implemented for 2016/17. The principles of this are that:
 - (a) pensioners remain protected from any increase in the amount of Council Tax which they are liable to pay following the abolition of Council Tax Benefit (as prescribed by Central Government). Pensioners will continue to receive the same level of support for the payment of Council Tax as compared with 2012/2013 and the original Council Tax benefit.
 - (b) those in receipt of certain disability benefits are protected from any increase in the amount of Council Tax which they are liable to pay following the abolition of Council Tax Benefit. Those in receipt of certain disability benefits will continue to receive the same level of support for the payment of Council Tax as compared with 2012/2013 and the original Council Tax benefit.
 - (c) all remaining working age claimants not covered by (b) above will continue to have their Council Tax Support capped at 80.2% of Council Tax liability. In other words, working age claimants will continue to receive the same level of Council Tax Support as 2015/16, this amount representing a 19.8% reduction in the level of Council Tax Support available.
3. That the Council is asked to give authority to the Chief Operating Officer and Head of Shared Services to take all appropriate steps to implement and administer the Scheme.
4. That delegated authority be provided to the Chief Operating Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture to make amendments to appendices C and D as outlined in the final paragraph of CAB 120 before submission to full Council.

**+REPORT OF THE REGULATORY COMMITTEE TO FULL COUNCIL ON 23
NOVEMBER 2015**

Chair:
Councillor Peray Ahmet

Vice Chair:
Councillor Vincent Carroll

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report to Full Council arises from consideration of the following reports by Regulatory Committee:

- Consultation on revised Statement of Licensing Policy for Gambling Act 2005 – 21 September 2015
- Local Plan Preparation – 21 September 2015
- Outcome of consultation on revised Statement of Licensing Policy for Licensing Act 2003 – 9 November 2015

2. SUMMARY OF CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 Consultation on revised Statement of Licensing Policy (SoLP) for Gambling Act 2005 – 21 September 2015

2.1.1 We received the report on the statutory three year review of the borough's SoLP for the Gambling Act including the proposed draft for consultation.

2.1.2 We sought clarification on the Council's position regarding the operation of any future casinos within the borough. Officers advised that a Full Council resolution had been passed to ban any prospective casino, a position which was reflected within the SoLP. Details of the resolution would be circulated to Cllr Carter.

2.1.3 We sought an update on progress made in establishing closer working relationships between the Planning and Licensing Services to facilitate, as far as possible, a cohesive approach to dealing with licensed premises under the separate legislative regimes. Officers advised that closer working practices were being developed including checking planning conditions related to licensing hours. A briefing report would be provided to the next meeting.

2.1.4 We were advised of the recent reclassification of betting shops and pay day loan shops to sui generis use class. The draft DMP document would set out a position regarding the clustering of betting shops which would be adopted subject to the consultation process.

2.1.5 WE RESOLVED

That the draft Statement of Licensing Policy for the Gambling Act 2005 be noted.

2.2 Local Plan Preparation – 21 November 2015

2.2.1 We considered a report setting out the responses received to the public consultation on the four draft Haringey Local Plan documents including Local Plan; strategic policies, development management DPD, draft site allocations DPD and the draft Tottenham Area Action Plan. The report included a draft Council response to the points raised in the 650 written representations submitted.

2.2.2 We received a question asked from the floor by a member of the public contesting the designation of the Pinkham Way site as open land. Officers advised that a set process had been followed during the consultation period to seek representations. Proposed Council responses to each issue raised had been drafted by officers and which did not in all occasions concur with consultee's views. It would be the role of an independent planning inspector to test the soundness of the Plans and thereby act as ultimate arbitrator.

2.2.3 Officers advised that the key themes raised during the consultation period included questioning the unrealistic level and potential harm from the quantum of housing growth to be made provision for; that development was unfairly weighted towards the east of the borough and Tottenham; concerns that new housing would not be affordable for local people; the selloff of Council estates to private developers to fund estate renewal; increasing pressure on public services and infrastructure; height of buildings and the consequences of redevelopment plans on existing businesses.

2.2.4 We asked the following questions of officers in consideration of the report:

- Whether officers had undertaken an analysis of responses received broken down by area. Officers advised that predominantly responses had been received by email which restricted the ability to analyse on this basis. The issues receiving the most representations included BWF and Lordship Rec and in Wood Green, the intensification of the town centre and Haringey Heartlands. A significant number of responses were received regarding issues wider than the remit of the Local Plan.
- Clarification was sought as to whether plans were included to build on Lordship Rec. Officers advised that there had been initial plans to allocate a proportion of the Rec as a 'swap out' to allow the redevelopment of the BWF estate but that following the level of objections received, this allocation had been removed.
- The concerns of the Friends of Finsbury Park group were reiterated including opposition to any plans to build on MOL within Finsbury Park and direct overlooking of the Park from surrounding new developments and any loss of trees to make way for new entrances. Officers confirmed that this representation had been received and a draft response provided within the report. Plans to improve the reconfiguration of access to the Park through the Rowans site had now been omitted from the Plan documents.
- The use of the terms social housing and affordable housing needed to be set out within a glossary. Officers confirmed that a glossary was included within the full Cabinet report but agreed to review the consistency of use of these terms within the summary of comments.
- Clarification was sought on how recent changes to the definition of Travellers would impact on provision for Traveller's sites within the borough. Officers confirmed that changes pertained to assessments of need and also could not be applied

retrospectively. To this end, existing Traveller's sites would require re-provision if subject to redevelopment.

- Assurances were sought from the Committee that the inclusion of sites within the Site Allocations SPD did not presuppose the award of planning permission. Officers confirmed that inclusion did not confer any planning consent but did set out clear aspirations for sites. Planning Committee would have to have regard to Plans when determining planning applications coming forward.

2.2.5 WE RESOLVED

- To note the summary of the main consultation comments received to the draft Local Plan documents (the draft alterations to the Strategic Policies DPD; the draft Development Management Policies DPD; the draft Site Allocations DPD; and the draft Tottenham Area Action Plan DPD) as set out in the tables at Appendices A through D of this report.
- To recommend to Cabinet that it adopt the Council's proposed response to the comments received, including proposed further amendments, as set out in the tables at Appendices A through D of this report and report the same for consideration and approval to Full Council.
- To note that the report provided only a summary of the consultation responses received, and that the full list of responses was available to view on the Council's website.

2.3 Outcome of consultation on revised Statement of Licensing Policy for Licensing Act 2003 – 9 November 2015

2.3.1 We considered a report updating on responses received to the consultation on the revised Statement of Licensing Policy (SoLP) as part of the statutory five year review required under the Licensing Act 2003. The draft policy would progress to Full Council in November seeking approval for adoption. Regulatory Committee had considered the draft policy prior to its release for consultation at the last meeting on 21 September.

2.3.2 The Licensing Officer outlined the responses received during the 6 week consultation period. The two representations received from interested parties in response to the consultation were set out within the report including the proposed Council response. The first submission proposed that real ales and beers above 6.5% ABV (alcohol by volume) that appeal to the higher end market be exempt from licence conditions restricting high ABV products. Officers proposed to change the wording within the Policy to reflect this to emphasise the primary focus on cheap high strength products. We expressed some concern that this distinction could be counterproductive and emphasised that clear definitions of the terms 'cheap' and 'premium' in this respect would need to be set out as well as clearly couching this consideration in terms of preventing binge drinking. The consultee also proposed that the policy covered all premises types in relation to framework hours and which officers confirmed was the case and therefore no Policy amendment was required. The second representation proposed that the policy set out an expectation that premises should have the correct planning use in place prior to making a licence application. Officers proposed that this be added to the Policy although this could only constitute guidance as it was not a legislative requirement.

2.3.3. We raised concern over the low number of representations received during the consultation period, including limited input from Councillors. Officers outlined the methodology used including notifications sent out, meetings held with licensees etc and confirmed that a link to the consultation had been circulated to all Councillors. Confirmation was also provided that input had been provided by all responsible authorities in the drafting of the Policy. We proposed as a learning point for future consultations that a concise summary of proposed policy revisions be circulated to Councillors to encourage a greater level of response. In light of identified issues with street drinking in parts of the borough, it was also suggested that future consultation be expanded to cover groups such as HAGA (Haringey Advisory Group on Alcohol) involved in providing alcohol support services in the borough.

2.3.4 We sought clarification on whether reference was made within the Policy to promoting the Pubwatch initiative. It was advised that Pubwatch was active in the borough but was an initiative led and run by licence holders and as such could not be imposed under the Policy. It was however recognised that engaging with smaller licence holders such as those running off licences remained an ongoing issue and the licensing service would be looking to improve this going forward.

2.3.5 The Council's position regarding the potential imposition of a late night levy within the borough was questioned. The Licensing Officer advised that consideration had been given to imposition of a levy in 2013 but that the management team had decided not to proceed at that time. As the government were currently reviewing the levy initiative due to concerns over its efficacy, Cllr McNamara as Cabinet Member for Environment advised that consideration of imposing a levy was currently on hold but could be revisited in the future accompanied by a detailed piece of work.

2.3.6 We questioned plans to implement a Cumulative Impact Policy within the borough. Officers advised that currently there was not sufficient evidence to support imposing such a policy but that this position would be kept under review, including keeping a watching brief on LB Hackney in their efforts to impose such a policy in Shoreditch and which was proving controversial.

2.3.7 We sought clarification on whether the SoLP would take into account any variation in approach across the borough to licensed premises to reflect differing characteristics of the town centres. The Licensing Officer advised that responsible authorities had a duty to consider licence applications on a case by case basis.

2.3.8 Cllr Carter sought assurances on any plans for the future licensing of casinos within the borough. The Licensing Officer outlined that this issue fell within the Council's Statement of Gambling Policy and not Licensing Policy. Confirmation was however provided that presently no Full Council resolution had been passed to prohibit any future casino within the borough and that no discussions were currently underway with any parties regarding the issuing of a future casino licence in the borough.

2.3.9 WE RESOLVED

- To note the outcome of the consultation, there were two responses to the consultation. A summary of the responses and effect if any on the policy are shown in paragraph 6.10 and also in Appendix 2 of the report.

- To approve the draft Statement of Licensing Policy at Appendix 1 for recommendation to Full Council for adoption in November 2015.
- In coming to their decision to note and take account of the EQiA set out at Appendix 3 of the report.

This page is intentionally left blank