

Ayshe Simsek,
Democratic Services
and Scrutiny Manager

020 8489 2929

ayshe.simsek@haringey.gov.uk

19 July 2021

To: All Members of the Full Council

Dear Member,

Full Council - Monday, 19th July, 2021

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:

14. TO ANSWER QUESTIONS, IF ANY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE NOS. 9 & 10 (PAGES 1 - 10)

Response to written questions

15. Amendments to Motion A and Motion B

Yours sincerely

Ayshe Simsek,
Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager
0208 489 2929

This page is intentionally left blank

Written questions		
1. From Cllr Morris to Cllr Hakata	We all want the school streets programme to be a success, and that means keeping residents on board. Some parents, who missed communications from their child's school, have racked up multiple, crippling fines before being made aware of the existence of the school street. Will the cabinet member therefore commit to a stationing officers and volunteers at the new school Street boundaries informing drivers of the changes?	<p>Fundamentally, we do not want anyone to be issued Penalty Charge Notices who has a right to access the zone. We want a minimal number of cars outside our schools, to create safe spaces, address air pollution, and encourage our children to walk and cycle - helping lower obesity levels.</p> <p>The Council has a detailed Communication Plan for all the School Streets. This goes beyond expected good practice and legislative requirements. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A communications pack to the schools with key messaging. Including drafted letters, newsletter articles, social media and text templates. The school use these to promote the coming School Street. Schools have used this pack as a basis for communications in the weeks and months before the School Street goes live supported by their WhatsApp and Twitter networks. It is worth noting that these schools have been actively asking parents not to drive their children to school for a number of years. Parents should be well aware of these issues. • We have met and exceeded the requirements set by the DfT for traffic signs. This includes traffic signs on the entrance to the School Streets and on the roads leading into the School Streets. It is a legal requirement that drivers observe and respond appropriately to all traffic signs.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have written to all residents within the zone twice as well as residents in the surrounding areas. • We have installed promotional banners on the school's fences - including a QR code to a webpage and a URL for contact. • We have lamp column wrap arounds on the school street setting out details and web pages. • We have updated navigation systems (Google Maps / Waze) to prevent routing motorists down closed roads <p>Motor traffic, the majority being car traffic, is the biggest contributor to emissions in the country. Congestion is often at its worst during school pickup and drop-off times. If we are to bring about the rapid and significant change needed, we need to accept that we need to initiate monumental behaviour change. School Streets are proving to bring about this change. It is simply a fact that the enforcement element of these schemes is a key driver of this change. However, in the initial stages we do need to take an empathetic and pragmatic approach. The additional employment of stewards would make the cost of a school street too onerous.</p>
2. Cllr Chenot to Cllr Hakata	I was glad to hear of the new cabinet member's commitment to rewilding our borough. One easy way of doing this would be to replace as many of our grass verges as possible with wildflowers. This would be good for pollinators, and, as they wouldn't need mowing, would save the council huge sums of money. Will you commit to looking at this idea?	We are actively exploring the creation of a patchwork of urban wildflower meadows and bee corridors across the borough. We want to increase biodiversity and revitalise disused and unloved stretches of land. There is potential for this programme to reduce overall management costs, breathe life into barren areas, as well as engage communities.
3. Cllr Ross to Cllr Chandwani	Children and parents going to Tetherdown Primary and St James Primary who use the	Officers are aware of residents' concerns regarding the safety of families and their children who use the private road

	<p>alleyway, belonging to Thames Water, between Woodside Avenue and Lauradale Road are suffering from the illegal parking of cars and speeding lorries. Is there anything the council can do to pressure Thames Water to understand the risks this presents and resolve the situation?</p>	<p>off Woodside Avenue to walk to school. Officers from the Highways Service are meeting with Thames Water to try and resolve the situation. They will be asking Thames Water to consider traffic management and parking controls, including letting pedestrians know that the private road off Woodside Avenue is a road rather than an alleyway or path and that they should therefore take care when walking there.</p>
<p>4. Cllr Hare to Cllr Hakata</p>	<p>Many residents have told us that street trees are being removed and not replaced. Some roads have recently lost their last street tree. You recently said that you wanted to see a “massive expansion in canopy cover”, but can you assure residents that this will include street trees, and not just mean more trees in parks, and that in future any Street trees removed will be replaced in the same location or, where impractical, very close by?</p>	<p>The Council’s new Parks and Greenspaces Strategy will include an updated Tree and Woodland Plan and this will set out the Council’s ambitions to expand the tree canopy cover borough-wide. Of course we want to focus on areas where there are fewest trees in the borough, but that doesn’t mean we won’t continue planting street trees. The aim is to increase overall cover, recognising the importance of trees for carbon sequestration, urban cooling, tackling pollution, flood management, crime reduction and increasing a sense of wellbeing and improving mental health. Not only will we be replacing lost trees we will be aiming to make sure we are planting a lot more new trees everywhere.</p>
<p>5. Cllr Connor to Cllr Hakata</p>	<p>An old horse chestnut tree on the Rookfield Estate was almost cut down last month, after the council failed to recognise that it had a tree protection order. How will you ensure that systems are more robust in future, ensuring that TPOs are picked up before any works are carried out, and trees removed forever?</p>	<p>The tree in question was never at risk of being cut down, the applicant applied for removal through the incorrect process for a TPO tree. When Tree officers reviewed their application they found it had a TPO and asked that they reapply through the correct procedure. This application has been found to be unacceptable and likely to be refused or withdrawn.</p> <p>An address-based search was carried out to check whether the tree was protected by a TPO but the tree was listed on the adjacent street. In future further searches will be carried out to avoid this.</p>

<p>6. Cllr Emery to Cllr Hakata</p>	<p>I was very disappointed to hear that installation works for electric vehicle charging points did not commence on 5th July as planned due to ‘unforeseen circumstance’ with the contract. What were these circumstances, and when will installation of these charging points commence?</p>	<p>Unfortunately, this delay has occurred as a result of the current supplier of charging points Source London, changing ownership. Source London is now under the ownership of TotalEnergies, and this company is finding a new contractor for the installation of charging points. This delay was communicated by Source London to ward members on 1 July 2021. The new implementation date for the works will be published once we can get it confirmed and the Highways team are working to make it happen as quickly as possible. This is a fast-evolving sector and we are currently exploring long-term sustainable solutions which will enable widespread coverage of electric charging points across all wards in the borough.</p>
<p>7. Cllr Rossetti to Cllr Chandwani</p>	<p>We all know that Haringey’s recycling rate is very poor. What plans does the new administration have to turn this around?</p>	<p>We are currently completing the usual submission of waste data to the government for the past year and Haringey’s household recycling rate for 2020/21 stands at 31.2% making us 4th highest in our recycling rates compared to our NLWA neighbouring boroughs (the NLWA North London household recycling rate is currently reported as 28.4% and the London rate is reported as 34% for 2019/20).</p> <p>In the past year we recycled more than 2,500 tonnes more ‘dry recycling’ from homes than in the previous year and an additional 700 tonnes of organic waste (food and garden waste).</p> <p>Haringey has a Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan (RRP) in line with all London Boroughs as part of the Mayor of London’s requirements. The plan details how we will continue to promote recycling to residents and businesses through a range of communications work that aims to address our high rates of transience and the challenging housing mix in the borough and increase use of the garden waste service. We will also take part in innovative trials to encourage greater participation and reduce contamination. The Mayor of London has confirmed that Haringey’s RRP is</p>

		<p>in general conformity with the waste provisions of his LES (London Environment Strategy) and approved it in 2020.</p> <p>As Councillors may be aware, there have recently been a number of consultations which could significantly change the future landscape and methodology of waste and recycling collections. These include the Deposit Return Scheme (DRS) Consultation, the Extended Producer Responsibility Consultation (EPR) and the Consistency in Household and Business Recycling Consultations.</p> <p>The timescales proposed to implement any legislation arising from the consultations start from 2023 and it is not clear yet how any resulting legislation will impact on Local Authorities in terms of collection systems. Once further clarity is provided by the government, it will allow LAs to effectively plan their future waste and recycling strategies.</p>
8. Cllr Ogiehor to Cllr Ahmet	Last month we all heard of the awful attack on a woman in Finsbury Park, and in response the council is considering installing additional lighting. Will you look at doing this in other parks in the borough, to ensure Haringey is as safe as possible at night?	<p>Women’s safety is a priority for the council. The attack in Finsbury Park took place on 23rd June and a man has now been arrested.</p> <p>Alongside the Police and other local partners, Haringey has a 10-year Violence Against Women and Girls strategy, focusing on prevention, support for survivors and accountability for perpetrators.</p> <p>The council is installing CCTV cameras in Finsbury Park and low-level lighting has been installed between the Manor House and Endymion Road entrances. Generally the Council does not support the provision of lighting in parks as the goal is to keep them as “dark sky” areas to support biodiversity in the borough. There are certain circumstances where lighting is provided such as on footpaths that run through parks. Bats are also a major consideration and therefore lighting can only be provided where we have clear</p>

		<p>evidence that the proposed lighting route is not on a bat flight path or adjacent to bat roosts.</p> <p>The council is considering additional lighting at Finsbury Park between Finsbury Gate and Endymion Road, as part of a holistic approach to safety. A meeting was held with the Leader of the Council, ward councillors and council officers on 13th July to discuss safety in Finsbury Park and a follow-up meeting will be held in August.</p>
<p>9. Cllr Dennison to Cllr Davies</p>	<p>At next week’s cabinet, the council is due to begin consultation on bringing Homes for Haringey in-house. Putting aside the ideological commitments this administration has to insourcing, what concrete benefits would there be to tenants, given the staff and processes of an in-house service will be largely unchanged?</p>	<p>The report coming to Cabinet on 22 July sets out the policy objectives and aims of bringing the ALMO back in-house. The emphasis is on integrating housing and other Council services so that residents experience a more joined-up response.</p> <p>We intend to tackle duplication, inconsistencies between both organisations and all the disbenefits of what has become an artificial and now outdated way of working. The intention is to remove the barriers that exist between both organisations and thereby improve performance.</p> <p>The key reasons for an inhouse service are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing legal landscape - Since the Grenfell Tower tragedy, our legal responsibilities are in sharper focus, with new Building Safety rules making the council the “accountable person”. Tighter housing regulation is bringing back inspections of council landlords by the Regulator for Social Housing. Taking back direct responsibility for management will demonstrate that the council takes this role seriously, will make sure it is well resourced and well managed, with a clear reporting line through senior council managers to elected politicians. • Stronger Voice - Providing a stronger voice for residents in how their homes are managed and

		<p>maintained. We want to work with residents to design and create new ways for them to have your say, giving them a direct dialogue with council staff and elected politicians. This will align with how the council is engaging and involving communities across the borough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joined up Services - The council sees taking back control as an opportunity to join up housing with other services that our residents rely on in their daily lives. For example, a safe and secure home can help make sure families and vulnerable adults get the care and support they need. Housing staff can be the first to contact people experiencing domestic violence or anti-social behaviour and then get the right help and support to them quickly. • Value for Money - Running a separate organisation to manage your homes can mean extra costs. For example, having separate teams looking after IT or HR, and having a council team to monitor what HfH is doing. Joining up housing and other council services will get rid of duplication and save time, effort and energy. We think that running services in-house can be more efficient and free up money to spend on improving your homes and estates. • Service improvement - HfH back in-house will join up the way we provide services and how we transform our organisation. For example, making better use of new technology and supporting our staff to work in new ways, such as outside the traditional office spaces.
10. Cllr Dixon to Cllr Hakata	Can we expect a significant increase in the amount of play streets, road closures, and activities for this year's Car Free Day and will	Car Free Day helps to improve air quality, create safe spaces and bring communities together. The pandemic unfortunately meant that last year's events nationally, regionally, and locally were either cancelled or significantly

	there be a codesign approach to the locations and events?	reduced. We hope that this year we can support more Car Free Day initiatives and back schemes such as School Streets and LTNs, working with our Play Streets Groups and community groups such as Living Streets.
11. Cllr Hinchcliffe to Cllr Hakata	It was recently announced that the London e-scooter trial was being exchanged to include even more boroughs, but Haringey was not one of them. The council is also still preventing dockless e-bikes from parking in the borough. Given it's council policy to promote and increase active travel, when can we expect to see dockless e-bikes, and e-scooters, as alternative forms of active travel for Haringey residents	<p>The Haringey Transport Strategy (adopted March 2018) sets out the council's support for bike hire schemes. Consistent with this, the Council was one of the first in London to agree in principle to the making of a pan-London bylaw to regulate dockless vehicles on the highway and/or public places. The Council's Draft Walking and Cycling Action Plan, which is due to be consulted on this year, contains a commitment to a shared bike trial. It is important however that any scheme that does come forward in the borough is properly managed, safe for all road and pavement users including pedestrians and supports the Council's wider aims of fairness, affordability and prioritising an 'active' element to travel. Haringey participates in an all borough working group, along with TfL, observing the operations of trials across the capital. This is providing important learning about how a successful scheme could work in Haringey in the future.</p> <p>The Council is supportive of e-scooters as a sustainable solution for discouraging car use in the borough but is currently concerned about the safety of e-scooters for pedestrians and people with disabilities, as well as the potential for the scooters to be littered and unsafely parked. The Council remains an active partner in pan-London planning of e-scooter trials and will observe the trials in other boroughs and review its position once it is clear how the existing issues can be mitigated and e-scooters can be operated safely.</p>
12. Cllr da Costa to Cllr Hakata	Will you commit to a new policy that will allow for residents and businesses to apply for the implementation of parklets in the borough,	We believe parklets can and should play an important role in the borough. They underline the reprioritising of road space as well as acting as focal points for renewed community

	which will not cost more than the annual cost of parking a vehicle on a Haringey road?	cohesion and we working on a strategy for how to implement and encourage them. As part of the aim of making the borough one in which walking and cycling are seen as primary forms of travel we are developing a whole range of policies to enhance the public realm, making it more walkable and more sociable.
13. Cllr Barnes to Cllr Bevan Diakides	Why has the council not brought forward any plans for the Civic Centre car park yet, such as new council housing, or a new leisure facility?	Plans for the Civic Centre car park will be considered by Cabinet in autumn 2021. A cross-party member working group, led by Cllr Pete Mitchell, has been created for the Civic Centre renovation.
14. Cllr Palmer to Cllr Gordon	In May the council committed to undertake a feasibility study on two “streateries” in Crouch End. Given we are now well into Summer, when will we get an update on this?	As a council we recognise the enormous challenges that businesses have faced over the last 16 months and we are committed to helping businesses get back on their feet. The council approved a High Streets Recovery Action Plan as part of its COVID recovery response and has put in place a range of measures to support businesses as they reopen. A cross service team has been working with local businesses to enable pavement licenses to be granted and in some cases providing physical interventions to support this. Streateries are a more complex and longer term solution with wider implications for our residents including those with mobility issues, people with visual impairments and those using pushchairs or prams. We are currently working through these implications and what would be needed to support the delivery of these shared outdoor seating and dining areas including the consultation and engagement required to meet the statutory obligations for this type of intervention.

		Additional resource, with experience in the delivery of streateries, has been brought in to help with this task which does include the feasibility of the two sites in Crouch End. An update is expected by the end of August.
15. Cllr Cawley-Harrison to Cllr Ahmet	<i>Last month was Pride month - a really important event for LGBTQ+ communities across the country. What work is the council doing with its LGBTQ+ residents, to tackle the increase in hate crime against the community in recent years, and in particular what special work was done during pride month?</i>	We are working with local charity Wise Thoughts to support LGBTQ+ communities. We are currently doing a piece of work with them to make access to services easier for the community, including reaching out to police and local authorities for help and support. We are working on campaign material about oral stories related to LGBT+ experiences with the support of the borough's communications team. The leader recorded and published a video for Pride Month highlighting the amazing work that Wise Thoughts do and we aim to work all year round to raise awareness of LGBTQ+ needs. We do however prioritise national hate crime awareness week to cover all strands of hate crime including crime against the LGBTQ+ community.

Motion A – Labour Group amendments

Cladding Scandal

Proposer: Councillor John Bevan

Seconder: Councillor Ruth Gordon

Council notes that:

- The tragedy of the 2017 Grenfell Tower fire, which led to the loss of 72 lives, was caused by Aluminium Composite Material (ACM) cladding;
- The government banned the use of all combustible materials on the walls of new high rises in November 2018, extending the problem beyond ACM cladding to buildings clad with other flammable materials;
- The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) and the UK Council of Mortgage Lenders agreed to the industry External Wall System (EWS) fire review and certification process resulting in what is known as an EWS1 form. There are relatively few qualified professional fire safety engineers across the country who can issue EWS1 forms creating a bottleneck across the country;
- There is no legal requirement for owners to produce EWS1 forms or take remedial action, but many lenders are now refusing to provide mortgages without such a form;
- Snagging is largely left as a responsibility of residents to take up with developers post-purchase, and even when covered by new build insurance schemes, leaseholders often suffer poor response and cycles of poor quality repair;
- Remediation costs for cladding are sometimes spiralling to over £100,000 per flat, with many owners forcing these charges back onto leaseholders;
- December 2020 saw the first case of a leaseholder being bankrupted by costs associated with the crisis;
- Government plans for leaseholders to sue developers with no financial support will not help many due to: high legal costs, the issue of dangerous cladding being legal at the time buildings were built, and the possibility of developers having since become insolvent;
- Waking watches, when a person patrols all floors and external areas of a building to give warning in the event of a fire, are being used in buildings at high risk of fire due to cladding, and are costing Londoners an average of over £20,000 per month;
- Residents and leaseholders, through no fault of their own, are being left in potentially ruinous limbo, unable to mortgage or remortgage and therefore unable to buy and sell;
- Conservative government-led deregulation in the building and fire safety industries, as well as part-privatisation of building control in local authorities that took place under Margaret Thatcher, has created a race to the bottom culture regarding building safety and stripped local authorities of much of their powers;
- The Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 places responsibility on the 'Responsible Person' to manage fire risk. The Responsible Person in the case of a block of flats will be the person or organisation who has overall control of the premises, which is usually the owner or managing company working for the owner. The Council cannot fulfil the Responsible Person role for private, non-Council owned buildings.
- No Homes for Haringey properties have been affected by ACM cladding.
- In February 2021, the Parliamentary Labour Party won a commons vote on a motion calling for a national cladding task force to oversee remediation works, and force building owners to take financial responsibility for the safety of their buildings.
- The Council has upskilled its existing Building Control surveyors who are all now qualified as Level 6 Fire Safety Surveyors, the highest competency that Building Control surveyors can attain, to ensure the service to local residents and businesses is of a high standard for safety.

- Cabinet in December 2020 accepted the Scrutiny Review on Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks recommendation to recruit at least two apprentices in the Building Control service to start in the 2021/22 financial year to support the Building Control service in 'growing its own' staff to provide a high standard of service for residents and businesses.
- The Council attaches 'informatives' to planning permissions to inform developers about requirements for building safety e.g. regarding sprinkler installation. As building and fire safety is primarily a matter for Building Control regulations rather than Planning regulations, national planning policy and guidance is clear that requirements relating to EWS1 and snagging issues cannot be attached to planning permissions as 'conditions'. Neither can planning permissions be delayed for such reasons. Nevertheless, the Council is proactive in attaching informatives relating to building safety.

Council believes that:

- The combination of this cladding, EWS1 and snagging scandal is having a devastating impact on many residents;
- The current industry EWS1 process and public funding of remediation works is not fit for purpose and needs rapid attention;
- The funding given by central government towards remediation works is completely insufficient, and costs are still falling on the shoulders of individual leaseholders;
- ~~An independent public inquiry should be set up to look at the government's response to concerns about fire and building safety;~~
- ~~The council has a responsibility and arguably a duty of care to residents who have innocently purchased properties granted planning permission by the council;~~
- ~~The council should not stand by and leave action to the government and should now step in and take action where legally allowed to.~~

Council resolves to request of the leadership that they:

- Sign up to the End Our Cladding Scandal campaign;
- Support any Housing Association residents affected by ACM cladding to contact their MP and the Housing Ombudsman;
- Lobby the government to immediately perform an audit and consultation with resident associations of all habitable buildings in Haringey (regardless of tenure) to establish the potential scope of the cladding, EWS1 and snagging issues, with a report back to Cabinet by the end of 2021;
- ~~Consider options on~~ Lobby government to fully fund advice and support including establishing a Cladding and Snagging Hub by October 2021 to provide assistance to all Haringey residents and residents associations regardless of housing tenure which would support in lobbying developers, building owners and claiming Government funds to urgently rectify their buildings;
- ~~Investigate~~ Encourage government to investigate options ~~such as redeployment and upskilling of staff, supporting and upskilling~~ to increase the number of surveyors or other suitable professionals as appropriate, in order to perform more EWS1 assessments and accelerate remediation and certification;
- ~~Lobby all~~ Work with private building owners and Housing Associations in Haringey to help them act immediately in rectifying issues and achieving EWS1 certification – noting that some of these owners may not be the original developer and may will therefore need the council's assistance to engage and trace developers or find other routes to remedy, thus avoiding any cost to leaseholders;
- ~~Explore ways to delay approving planning applications where the applicant has outstanding snagging or EWS1 certification issues in Haringey and include a condition to be discharged on all future planning applications to provide an EWS1 form before first occupation;~~
- Lobby and work with MPs, MHCLG and the Mayor of London to:

- ~~○ Devolve powers to Haringey Council in order to have jurisdiction over enforcing remediation of housing of all tenures and to obtain local control over the relevant compensation funds from the government, so the council can actively support affected residents in Haringey of all tenures; Encourage government to enforce remediation of housing of all tenures and to improve the compensation funds and actively support affected residents in Haringey of all tenures;~~
- ~~Adopt~~ Support the sensible recommendations of the Housing, Communities and Local Government Select Committee in their report on cladding remediation from April 2021;
- Support the 10 steps set out by the End Our Cladding Scandal campaign.

This page is intentionally left blank

Clean version
Motion A – Labour Group amendments
Cladding Scandal

Proposer: Councillor John Bevan

Seconder: Councillor Ruth Gordon

Council notes that:

- The tragedy of the 2017 Grenfell Tower fire, which led to the loss of 72 lives, was caused by Aluminium Composite Material (ACM) cladding;
- The government banned the use of all combustible materials on the walls of new high rises in November 2018, extending the problem beyond ACM cladding to buildings clad with other flammable materials;
- The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) and the UK Council of Mortgage Lenders agreed to the industry External Wall System (EWS) fire review and certification process resulting in what is known as an EWS1 form. There are relatively few qualified professional fire safety engineers across the country who can issue EWS1 forms creating a bottleneck across the country;
- There is no legal requirement for owners to produce EWS1 forms or take remedial action, but many lenders are now refusing to provide mortgages without such a form;
- Snagging is largely left as a responsibility of residents to take up with developers post-purchase, and even when covered by new build insurance schemes, leaseholders often suffer poor response and cycles of poor quality repair;
- Remediation costs for cladding are sometimes spiralling to over £100,000 per flat, with many owners forcing these charges back onto leaseholders;
- December 2020 saw the first case of a leaseholder being bankrupted by costs associated with the crisis;
- Government plans for leaseholders to sue developers with no financial support will not help many due to: high legal costs, the issue of dangerous cladding being legal at the time buildings were built, and the possibility of developers having since become insolvent;
- Waking watches, when a person patrols all floors and external areas of a building to give warning in the event of a fire, are being used in buildings at high risk of fire due to cladding, and are costing Londoners an average of over £20,000 per month;
- Residents and leaseholders, through no fault of their own, are being left in potentially ruinous limbo, unable to mortgage or remortgage and therefore unable to buy and sell;
- Conservative government-led deregulation in the building and fire safety industries, as well as part-privatisation of building control in local authorities that took place under Margaret Thatcher, has created a race to the bottom culture regarding building safety and stripped local authorities of much of their powers;
- The Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 places responsibility on the 'Responsible Person' to manage fire risk. The Responsible Person in the case of a block of flats will be the person or organisation who has overall control of the premises, which is usually the owner or managing company working for the owner. The Council cannot fulfil the Responsible Person role for private, non-Council owned buildings.
- No Homes for Haringey properties have been affected by ACM cladding.
- In February 2021, the Parliamentary Labour Party won a commons vote on a motion calling for a national cladding task force to oversee remediation works, and force building owners to take financial responsibility for the safety of their buildings.
- The Council has upskilled its existing Building Control surveyors who are all now qualified as Level 6 Fire Safety Surveyors, the highest competency that Building

Control surveyors can attain, to ensure the service to local residents and businesses is of a high standard for safety.

- Cabinet in December 2020 accepted the Scrutiny Review on Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks recommendation to recruit at least two apprentices in the Building Control service to start in the 2021/22 financial year to support the Building Control service in 'growing its own' staff to provide a high standard of service for residents and businesses.
- The Council attaches 'informatives' to planning permissions to inform developers about requirements for building safety e.g. regarding sprinkler installation. As building and fire safety is primarily a matter for Building Control regulations rather than Planning regulations, national planning policy and guidance is clear that requirements relating to EWS1 and snagging issues cannot be attached to planning permissions as 'conditions'. Neither can planning permissions be delayed for such reasons. Nevertheless, the Council is proactive in attaching informatives relating to building safety.

Council believes that:

- The combination of this cladding, EWS1 and snagging scandal is having a devastating impact on many residents;
- The current industry EWS1 process and public funding of remediation works is not fit for purpose and needs rapid attention;
- The funding given by central government towards remediation works is completely insufficient, and costs are still falling on the shoulders of individual leaseholders;

An independent public inquiry should be set up to look at the government's response to concerns about fire and building safety;

Council resolves to request of the leadership that they:

- Sign up to the End Our Cladding Scandal campaign;
- Support any Housing Association residents affected by ACM cladding to contact their MP and the Housing Ombudsman;
- Lobby the government to immediately perform an audit and consultation with resident associations of all habitable buildings in Haringey (regardless of tenure) to establish the potential scope of the cladding, EWS1 and snagging issues, with a report back to Cabinet by the end of 2021;
- Lobby government to fully fund advice and support including establishing a Cladding and Snagging Hub by October 2021 to provide assistance to all Haringey residents and residents associations regardless of housing tenure which would support in lobbying developers, building owners and claiming Government funds to urgently rectify their buildings;
- Encourage government to investigate options to increase the number of surveyors or other suitable professionals as appropriate, in order to perform more EWS1 assessments and accelerate remediation and certification;
- Work with private building owners and Housing Associations in Haringey to help them act immediately in rectifying issues and achieving EWS1 certification – noting that some of these owners may not be the original developer and may therefore need the council's assistance to engage and trace developers or find other routes to remedy, thus avoiding any cost to leaseholders;
- Lobby and work with MPs, MHCLG and the Mayor of London to:
 - Encourage government to enforce remediation of housing of all tenures and to improve the compensation funds and actively support affected residents in Haringey of all tenures; Support the sensible recommendations of the Housing, Communities and Local Government Select Committee in their report on cladding remediation from April 2021;
 - Support the 10 steps set out by the End Our Cladding Scandal campaign.

Amendment to Motion B**Proposed by Cllr Hare****Seconded by Cllr Morris****Protecting local involvement in planning decisions**

This Council notes that central government's proposed planning reforms will allow developers to receive automatic planning permission in designated "growth zones", completely bypassing public objections from local residents.

This Council notes that the Housing, Communities, and Local Government Select Committee has concluded that the government's plans will not produce a quicker, cheaper, and more democratic planning system.

This Council believes that this is a "developers' charter" that side-lines local communities, depriving the public of the power to shape our future, protect our past, and conserve our local environment.

This Council believes that placemaking, the collaborative process by which we can shape our public realm and reinvent public spaces as the heart of our communities, is essential to the future of our Borough. With community participation at its centre, placemaking cannot be successful without the active participation of our residents in decision making, including the right to object to planning applications that do not create or allow for quality public spaces that contribute to residents' health, happiness, and wellbeing.

This Council believes that there is a pressing need to build more good quality and affordable homes. The average house price has doubled since 2009, and the level of council housing is at an all-time low. However, more than 1.1m homes that received planning permission in England over the last decade are yet to be built, therefore the barrier towards meeting this need is not posed by the current planning system.

This Council believes planning works best when developers and the local community work together to shape local areas and deliver necessary new homes. This Council calls on the government to protect the right of communities to object to any and all individual planning applications.

This Council resolves that the Leader of the Council and Leader of the Opposition should write a joint letter to the Minister for Housing, Communities and Local Government asking him to scrap the planning white paper and to undertake a review of permitted development rights.

This page is intentionally left blank

Amendment to Motion B

Proposed by Cllr Hare

Seconded by Cllr Morris

Protecting local involvement in planning decisions

This Council notes that central government's proposed planning reforms will allow developers to receive automatic planning permission in designated "growth zones", completely bypassing public objections from local residents.

This Council notes that the Housing, Communities, and Local Government Select Committee has concluded that the government's plans will not produce a quicker, cheaper, and more democratic planning system.

This Council believes that this is a "developers' charter" that side-lines local communities, depriving the public of the power to shape our future, protect our past, and conserve our local environment.

This Council believes that placemaking, the collaborative process by which we can shape our public realm and reinvent public spaces as the heart of our communities, is essential to the future of our Borough. With community participation at its centre, placemaking cannot be successful without the active participation of our residents in decision making, including the right to object to planning applications that do not create or allow for quality public spaces that contribute to residents' health, happiness, and wellbeing.

This Council believes that there is a pressing need to build more good quality and affordable homes. The average house price has doubled since 2009, and the level of council housing is at an all-time low. However, more than 1.1m homes that received planning permission in England over the last decade are yet to be built, therefore the barrier towards meeting this need is not posed by the current planning system.

This Council believes planning works best when developers and the local community work together to shape local areas and deliver necessary new homes. This Council calls on the government to protect the right of communities to object to any and all individual planning applications.

This Council resolves that the Leader of the Council and Leader of the Opposition should write a joint letter to the Minister for Housing, Communities and Local Government asking him to scrap the planning white paper and to undertake a review of permitted development rights.

This page is intentionally left blank