

KP  
Ken Pryor

020 8489 2915

020 8881 2660

Ken.pryor@haringey.gov.uk

05 January 2007

To: All Members of the Council  
c.c. All Other Persons receiving Council agenda

Dear Councillor,

Full Council - Monday 8 January 2007

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:

**11. TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM THE FOLLOWING BODIES**

- a) The Executive – Report 11. 2006/7
- c) Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Report 1. 2006/7

Yours sincerely

Ken Pryor  
Member Services

This page is intentionally left blank

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE. No. 11/2006-07  
COUNCIL 8 JANUARY 2007**

Chair:  
Councillor George Meehan

Deputy Chair:  
Councillor Lorna Reith

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The Council has reserved the power to approve policies, plans and strategies that are specified in the Council's Policy Framework. (Part F.6 of the Constitution – The Budget and Policy Framework Schedule).
- 1.2 The Council's Policy Framework means (i) the plans and strategies required to be approved at full Council under the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 (as amended) or (ii) those plans and strategies that the Council itself has determined shall be reserved to the full Council for approval.
- 1.3 This report covers three matters relating to the above-mentioned decisions which we considered at our meeting on 19 December 2006.

## **ITEMS FOR DECISION**

### **Enterprise and Regeneration**

#### **2. NORTH LONDON JOINT WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**

- 2.1 We reported to the Council on 9 January 2006 our decision to agree in principle to the production of a Joint Waste Development Document (JWDPD). We also reported that we had authorized the Director of Environmental Services, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment and Conservation, to approve a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) in order to agree detailed arrangements for the production of the joint document. The MoU was approved under delegated authority on 7 July 2006.
- 2.2 We have now considered a report which advised us that under the Local Authorities (Function and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 [as amended] the decision to take part in a Joint Development Plan Document with other authorities could not be a function of the Executive and it therefore needed to be considered and determined by the Council so that work on the JWDPD could be formally started.
- 2.3 We noted that there were two main reasons for carrying out the JWDPD -
  - The need to be in conformity with national planning guidance and with the London Plan; and
  - The need to identify sites where recycling and waste management could take place in order to avoid fines under the EU Landfill Directive.
- 2.4 London Boroughs as waste planning authorities needed to prepare waste plans in order to be in conformity with national planning guidance and with the London Plan. We were advised that Planning Policy Statement 10 stated that planning authorities should provide a framework in which communities took more responsibility for their own waste, helped

drive waste management up the waste hierarchy, and helped implement the national waste strategy, including obligations required under European legislation. The Mayor's requirements for planning authorities were becoming clearer following the publication of the Early Alterations to the London Plan, the report of the Panel of their Examination in Public and in the recent Further Alterations.

- 2.5 European and national policy aimed that most waste was treated or disposed of within the region in which it was produced. The Landfill Directive set targets to significantly reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal waste land filled over the next 14 years. Where targets were breached waste disposal authorities would face fines of £150 per tonne of waste as well as a share of an EU fine of £0.5million per day. These fines would be passed onto boroughs and could have significant implications for borough finances.
- 2.6 The seven boroughs in the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) had prepared a Joint Municipal Waste Strategy but without a JWDPD, the future of the North London Waste Authority would be at risk because the JWDPD was the identified means for the NLWA to secure sufficient sites for its Joint Municipal Waste Strategy. It was the considered view of all the boroughs that a joint DPD was the best way forward. This was in line with Government guidance set out in Planning Policy Statement 10, it enabled waste and recycling facilities to be shared across boroughs in a sub-region where the boroughs involved had a long history of collaboration over waste and it enabled boroughs to share out the limited expertise available on waste planning. A joint DPD would also result in cost savings for individual boroughs.
- 2.7 We were informed that extensive work had been done to prepare for the JWDPD. The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), which had been agreed by all the boroughs, set out a framework for decision making and project management for the North London JWDPD -
- A Programme Manager had been employed by Camden as lead authority. His role was to co-ordinate activity and act as the main point of contact for the plan. The Programme Manager was to be responsible for ensuring that the timetable and budget was adhered to, for managing the performance of consultants and the consultation and communication activity
  - The Planning Officers Group (POG) would meet approximately every six weeks to steer the work on the production of the JWDPD. Each borough would be represented and these officers would report back to their boroughs.
  - The Planning Members Group (PMG) would review progress on the JWDPD, the issues arising and other matters referred to them by the POG. It was intended that the PMG would meet at the key statutory stages of the JWDPD. Each borough would be represented by the cabinet member with planning responsibility, or their nominee.
- 2.8 We were also informed that the estimated cost of production of the Joint Waste Disposal Planning Document was approximately £111,000 per constituent Council phased over the period 2006/07 to 2008/09. It was uncertain at this stage how the cost would be profiled over this period but it was likely that significant costs would be incurred at the examination stage towards the end of process. These costs would include payments to the Inspector, a Barrister and a Programme Officer to organize the Inquiry. A bid for additional resources to meet the cost was unsuccessful as part of the 2006/07 to 2008/09 budget process.

Therefore any appropriate costs in connection with the JWDPD would need to be managed within the approved cash limit for Planning Policy and Development for the relevant financial year.

### **WE RECOMMEND**

That the preparation of the Joint Waste Development Plan Document be approved.

### **3. CENTRAL LEESIDE AREA ACTION PLAN**

- 3.1 We considered a report which advised us that Central Leaside was the collective name given to the strategic employment areas that lay on the border between the London Boroughs of Enfield and Haringey. Central Leaside was identified in the current London Plan and in the Haringey UDP as one of the key strategic employment sites. The area comprised a mixture of brown field opportunity sites, older industrial estates which were being rejuvenated and new industrial accommodation. The majority of the Central Leaside business area was contained within the London Borough of Enfield, hence Enfield was the lead authority and commissioning body for an area action plan jointly to be developed by Haringey and Enfield.
- 3.2 The primary challenge for the Central Leaside Area was to identify investment and improvements required to ensure the long-term viability of the area as an employment location. London Boroughs of Enfield and Haringey intended to work jointly to produce an Area Action Plan (AAP) in order to provide a planning framework for future development and investment. The AAP was expected to be adopted by June 2008. The Local Authorities (Function and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 [as amended] required that the decision to take part in a Joint Development Plan Document with other authorities could not be a function of the Executive but needed to be considered and determined by the Council.
- 3.3 The AAP would need to reflect the statutory planning policy framework at national, regional and local level and take into account key strategies and evidence based studies. In particular, it would need to reflect its regional and sub-regional context as set out in the London Plan, the Mayor's Industrial Capacity SPG, the North London Strategic Alliance's Vision for North London, the draft North London Sub-Regional Development Framework, the Lee Valley Regional Park Plan and the emerging Upper Lee Valley Vision and Opportunity Area Planning Framework, both the Council's current and emerging Community Strategy.
- 3.4 We noted that a Memorandum of Understanding was being drafted between Enfield and ourselves and that a project manager had been employed by Enfield as lead authority. Her role was to co-ordinate activity and act as the main point of contact for the plan. The Project Manager would be responsible for ensuring that the timetable and budget was adhered to, for managing the performance of consultants and the consultation and communication activity. We also noted that preparations were underway by Enfield to let a contract for consultants to carry out much of the work. A Development Plan Document would require carrying out a sustainability appraisal, and a draft scoping report for the appraisal was in consultation with the statutory bodies. A steering group of officers from both boroughs was being set up and an AAP was expected to be adopted by June 2008.

Area Action Plan development would be subject to consultation at various stages and each local authority would ensure that appropriate decision-making processes would be applied throughout the plan making process.

- 3.5 We were informed that the estimated cost of producing the joint plan was £150,000 in total phased over the period 2006/07 to 2007/08. The bulk of this cost would be incurred by Enfield but with Haringey's share estimated at about £10,000. There would be further additional costs in 2007/08 for the Examination in Public process which would again be shared between the two Boroughs. The Council's budget process for 2006/07 allocated additional resources of £75,000 in each of the 2 financial years 2006/07 and 2007/08 in respect of the UDP/LDF processes and the Council's share of the above costs would be mainly met from within these resources.

## **WE RECOMMEND**

That the preparation of the Central Leaside Joint Area Plan Document be approved.

## **Housing**

### **4. RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT STRATEGY AND RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT AGREEMENT**

- 4.1 We considered a report which advised us that since 1999, the Government had required all local authorities to have a tenant participation compact in place. This must follow Government guidance in the *National Framework for Tenant Participation Compacts*. The document was not short but aimed to be comprehensive. Other compacts that had been cited as best practice were of a similar length and it was intended that it would be produced in a ring-binder folder with index tabs, so that revisions could be issued and versions updated.
- 4.3 We noted that the full version of the final document was to be sent to all involved residents, such as those on panels and groups, residents' associations, advocates, and estate inspectors. It would also be sent to Board members, Councillors, and managers in Homes for Haringey and key partners in Haringey Council. Residents would also be encouraged to access the document through the Homes for Haringey website.
- 4.4 A summary leaflet would be produced for all residents, to be distributed with Homes Zone. There had also been a promotion strategy for both the Resident Involvement Agreement (Compact) and the Strategy. All documents would be Crystal Marked by the Plain English Campaign and would be given an easy read status.
- 4.2 We also noted that the draft Resident Involvement Agreement and Resident Involvement Strategy had been circulated to all involved residents, Homes for Haringey Board members, officers and Councillors for comment. The following resident groups had also been consulted:
- All Homes for Haringey Resident panels (Leaseholders Panel, Tenancy and Estate Management Panel, Repairs Panel, Finance Panel, Communications Panel, Asset Management Panel and Procurement Panel)

- Members of the Residents' Consultative Forum
- Turkish Speaking and Kurdish Speaking Forum and the Somali Speaking Forum
- Stonebridge Youth Group and the New Deal for Communities (NDC) Youth Forum. Consultation documents were also sent to 250 non involved residents (residents identified from the recent individual needs survey)
- Community groups (voluntary organisations) on the Resident Involvement Teams community contacts database

In addition, consultation documents had been posted on the Homes for Haringey website.

- 4.3 Overall feedback had been positive and the draft document had been well received by all groups. Two special open meetings had been arranged for panel members, resident association members and advocates and a workshop held at a Residents Consultative Forum. Minor improvements had been made to the text where residents asked for more clarification and some residents had asked for more detailed information on the election of Homes for Haringey Board Members. However, residents were aware that the agreement set out the basic principles and they understood that the details of the election process were yet to be agreed.
- 4.4 The Tenant Participation Advisory Service (TPAS) carried out an assessment of the draft documents and their report was very positive, describing the Resident Involvement Agreement review process as robust with the wishes of residents clearly taken into account. TPAS concluded that the new resident involvement agreement was a comprehensive document which demonstrated a clear commitment to resident involvement. TPAS recommendations had been discussed by the residents' compact group and many of them would be incorporated into the finished document.
- 4.5 We were advised that the need for there to be effective tenant and leaseholder involvement in the way in which Homes for Haringey carried out its management duties on behalf of the Council was written into the management agreement. Furthermore, Homes for Haringey was obligated to honour the Council's Tenant Compact, and to periodically (annually) review and consult on it. The draft Resident Involvement Agreement circulated with the agenda for our meeting and posted on the Council's web site met the obligations on Homes for Haringey under the agreement. A copy of the Resident Involvement Agreement (Compact) and Resident Involvement Strategy has also been placed in the Member's Room. The costs of producing the Agreement and the Strategy would be £25,000 which would be funded from within the Homes for Haringey budget.
- 4.6 Having agreed the principles set out in the Resident Involvement Agreement (Compact) and Resident Involvement Strategy and that a summary of the Compact should be produced

## **WE RECOMMEND**

That the Resident Involvement Agreement (Compact) be launched in March 2007.

This page is intentionally left blank



**REPORT OF THE  
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE No. 01/2006-07**

**COUNCIL 8/1/2006**

Chair:  
Councillor GIDEON BULL

Vice-Chair:  
Councillor MATT COOKE

**INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This report to Full Council arises from a report at the Overview & Scrutiny committee meeting of December 18<sup>th</sup> 2006. This report proposing the setting up of a joint scrutiny committee with the London Boroughs of Barnet and Enfield and Hertfordshire County Council. This joint committee would consider the forthcoming NHS consultation exercise on the Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Clinical Strategy.

**ITEM OF REPORT**

**Arrangements for Joint Scrutiny of Clinical Strategy**

2.1 The Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Clinical Strategy is a major NHS reconfiguration and will determine how the NHS spends its money locally in the next few years. It involves all the major NHS trusts in Barnet, Enfield and Haringey and could have significant implications for local residents.

2.2 A full public consultation exercise was to be undertaken, beginning in January. Local Overview and Scrutiny Committees need to be consulted as part of this process. Where NHS bodies were required to consult with more than one Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the relevant local authorities were required to set up a joint scrutiny committee to respond.

2.3 The Committee agreed in principle to the setting up of this joint scrutiny committee, with Councillors Bull and Newton being appointed Haringey's representatives, and with Councillor Jones as nominated Deputy.

2.4 Appropriate individuals with necessary expertise were encouraged to write to the Joint Committee upon its establishment, with a view to becoming Co-optees.

**RECOMMENDED**

3.1 That a joint scrutiny committee with the London Boroughs of Barnet and Enfield and Hertfordshire County Council be set up. This joint committee will consider the forthcoming NHS consultation exercise on the Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Clinical Strategy.

3.2 That Councillors Bull and Newton being appointed Haringey's representatives, and with Councillor Jones as nominated Deputy.