

Ken Pryor

020 8489 2915

020 8489 2660

Ken.pryor@haringey.gov.uk

29 November 2007

To: All Members of the Council

Dear Member,

Full Council - Monday, 26th November, 2007

I attach a copy of the tabled papers for the above-mentioned meeting:

2. **TO ASK THE MAYOR TO CONSIDER THE ADMISSION OF ANY LATE ITEMS OF BUSINESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 100B OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 (PAGES 1 - 2)**
9. **TO ANSWER QUESTIONS, IF ANY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE NOS. 9 & 10 (PAGES 3 - 24)**
11. **TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING MOTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE NO. 13 (PAGES 25 - 26)**

Yours sincerely

Ken Pryor  
Deputy Head of Local Democracy and Member Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Item 2

## COUNCIL MEETING – 26 NOVEMBER 2007

### LATE ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

#### **The Chief Executive**

Mr Mayor, there is one late item of business, which could not be available earlier, and which will need to be dealt with at this meeting. The reasons for lateness and urgency are given in the report laid round.

#### Item 9 – Questions and Written Answers

Notice of questions is not requested until 8 clear days before the meeting, following which the matters raised have to be researched and replies prepared to be given at the meeting.

#### Item 11 – Emergency Motion

An Emergency Motion was received on Friday 23 November and, with the Mayor's consent, will be considered tonight.

This page is intentionally left blank

**COUNCIL QUESTIONS – 26 NOVEMBER 2007****ORAL QUESTIONS****Oral Question 1 – To the Leader of the Council from Cllr C Harris:**

Can the Leader comment on the recent unveiling of the statue marking the life of anti-apartheid activist Oliver Tambo?

**Oral Question 2 – To the Chair of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board from Cllr Williams:**

Why has the Council refused to let interested parties see copies of the AP lease – even with key financial details removed?

**Oral Question 3 -To the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Wellbeing from Councillor Bevan:**

Can the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Wellbeing report on improvements in the performance of adult social services since the CSCI report last year?

**Oral Question 4 – To the Chair of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board from Cllr Whyte:**

Why did the AP Trust incur costs in the recent High Court case when it was neither the claimant nor the defendant in the legal action?

**Oral Question 5 - To ask the Cabinet Member for Housing Services from Cllr Vanier:**

Can the Cabinet Member for Housing Services outline what assistance Haringey is providing to residents of the borough to help them make their homes more energy efficient?

**Oral Question 6 - To the Chair of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board from Cllr Davies:**

Why does the chairman of the Board claim that that the TV studios are riddled with asbestos when this was removed years ago?

**Oral Question 7 – To the Cabinet Member for Environment and Conservation from Cllr Patel:**

Can the Cabinet Member for Environment and Conservation comment on the success of the recent cleansweep in Bruce Grove?

**Oral Question 8 - To the Cabinet Member for Resources from Cllr Gorrie:**

How much money, since January 2007, has the Council had to use to 'top up' the accounts of the APP?

**WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

**Written Question 1 – To the Leader of the Council from Councillor Aitken:**

How could the Leader of the Council assert that the process of consultation regarding the Alexandra Palace lease can be concluded by January when no such agreement has been reached with the Charity Commission?

**ANSWER**

I gave no specific comment or commitment on when the Charity Commission would conclude the consultation process. The Charity Commission originally gave no initial indications that the consultation process could not be undertaken reasonably swiftly having already gone through the process recently. However the Commission has now concluded that it would be appropriate to take extensive legal advice and this is likely to lead to further delays in the process.

**Written Question 2 – To Cabinet Member for Children and Young People from Cllr Alexander:**

When was the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) building programme meant to start and when will it commence. Given the delay on a fixed budget programme will BSF deliver the same physical improvements as originally hoped?

**ANSWER**

The programme is already well underway. The construction components of the BSF programme commenced formally on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2007 following initial kick-off design meetings with schools. Five architectural practices were appointed to our Design Team Partner (DTP) framework in January 2007 and six construction firms were appointed to our Contractor Partner (CP) framework in March 2007.

We currently have all 12 schools in the Design Phase of the programme, each at different stages. The Design Stage for each school is programmed to last approximately 61 weeks after which each school will transition into their respective construction programmes.

There are 4 schools currently running behind plan, i.e. St Thomas More 16 weeks, Gladesmore 11 weeks, John Loughborough 8 weeks, Park View Academy 10 weeks. These are the earlier projects from the first wave of the programme and time has been expended carrying out further surveys, updating curriculum analyses to reflect changed requirements since the initial work was done some eighteen months ago and updating cost information. The outcome of this work has led to some re-designing of the schemes to ensure that delivery can be achieved within the budget. The lessons learnt from these exercises are being applied to the remainder of the programmes. We are working towards remedying the delays, and hope to regain at least part of the lost time during the Design and Construction phases. These inflationary consequences are budgeted for in the schools cost plan.

Recognising these shortcomings, as well as the constraints posed by the Cash Limit Budget, we have worked with the Design Partners and Schools to modify their designs to ensure that their schemes continue to:

1. Deliver within the overall affordability envelope laid down by the budget brought on by the additional inflationary charges that apply; and
2. Meet the educational transformational objectives as articulated down in the Individual School Visions (ISVs)

We remain confident that the schemes that will be delivered at each school will represent significant improvements in line with the aspirations of each school and be delivered within the cost parameters.

**Written Question 3 – To the Cabinet Member for Housing Services from Cllr Baker:**

What are the figures for the number of Houses of Multiple Occupation in Haringey over the last 10 years?

**ANSWER**

Prior to the Housing Act 2004, a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) was defined as a house or flat that is occupied by persons who do not form a single household. Based on that definition, it was estimated (in Haringey's last House Condition Survey of 2001) that there are 3,077 HMOs in Haringey.

Although the exact number of HMOs is not known, it is possible that this is higher than 3,077. Each year, Officers deal with around 250 HMO cases; the work ranges from simple issues of minor disrepair to more severe problems such as overcrowding, poor management, and the lack of fire protection and/or amenities. Some relate to new HMOs; others relate to existing HMOs that have developed problems.

Under the Housing Act 2004, the definition of a House in Multiple Occupation was changed, to include other types of occupation that were not previously deemed to be in multiple occupation. The Act also introduced a Mandatory HMO Licensing Scheme covering properties of 3 storeys and over that are occupied by at least 5 people who form more than 2 households.

We estimate that, in Haringey, there are approximately 480 properties of this type and, to date, we have received 270 licence applications. Of these, 150 licenses have been issued, 60 are at various stages of processing and 60 remain to be progressed. All properties are inspected, the number of occupants permitted is recorded on the licence, and a series of conditions are attached to the licence to ensure that satisfactory management standards are met. Although licensing does not cover disrepair, our inspections do address issues of disrepair, informing landlords of items of disrepair

When we have dealt with the initial licence applications, we will chase the owners of the unlicensed HMOs, requiring them to license the property. Some of these will be known to the Housing Service, but others will not.

Each year, the Service inspects 57 hostels. Some of these have been licensed.

### **Written Question 4 – To the Cabinet Member for Housing Services from Cllr Beacham:**

How many people are considered by the Council as homeless and how many people have the Council helped to rehome in the last year?

### **ANSWER**

In 2006/07, Haringey Council accepted a housing duty to 479 households who were deemed to be unintentionally homeless and in priority need.

During the same year, 2,584 households approached the Council's Prevention and Options Service for housing advice and support because they were at risk of becoming homeless or required help in resolving their housing difficulties.

The Prevention and Options Service does everything it can to prevent homelessness occurring and, where this is not possible, it offers a range of housing options (including shared ownership and private rented housing) as an alternative to a lengthy stay in temporary accommodation.

Since April 2007, some 1,835 households have approached the Prevention and Options Service for advice and assistance and 234 households have been accepted as unintentionally homeless and in priority need. A further 150 households have been helped to access private rented accommodation.



**Written Question 5 – To the Chair of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board for from Cllr Beynon:**

Is Firoka earning revenue from its current presence in Alexandra Palace and how much of this is being paid to the Charity?

**ANSWER**

There was an orderly transition process agreed by APTL to transfer its operations over to Firoka once it had been advised by the charity that its licence could not be maintained once the lease had been granted. The purpose was to transfer on-going financial risk arising from the limited commercial business contracted with APTL in the first half of the financial year. This does mean that for some events the revenue together with operating costs for delivery of those events, fall to Firoka within the current financial year.

This is a very unfortunate situation but it is a direct consequence of the campaign by those who wish to undermine the development proposals and the associated investment in the building and commit the council tax-payer to provide even more funding from the already overstretched resources of the council.

**Written Question 6 –To the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Enterprise from Cllr Bloch:**

How many planning applications have been made for brownfield sites in each of the last 5 calendar years, how many were granted, how many refused, how many subsequently allowed on appeal; for each category are they aware how many of them were back gardens ?

**ANSWER**

The number of planning applications granted, refused and allowed on appeal for minor residential development (i.e. new build, conversions and extensions) on previously developed (“Brownfield”) land over the last five years is as follows:

	<b>Planning applications</b>	<b>Number granted</b>	<b>Number refused</b>	<b>Number allowed on appeal</b>
<b>2002/03</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2003/04</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2004/05</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2005/06</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>2006/07</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1364</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>752</b>	<b>64</b>

Rear private gardens are defined as Brownfield land and the extent of development of private gardens is difficult to quantify. The Council recently responded to a London Assembly investigation into the development of gardens for residential use and stated that, over the last five years, 11 planning applications were granted for new dwellings on land previously used as residential gardens.

**Written Question 7 – To the Cabinet Member for Resources from Cllr Butcher:**

Considering the £100,000 extra electricity charges spent on River Park House and following the Council's own heat seeking initiative that showed that the Council has some of the most un-environmentally friendly premises in the borough what steps have been taken to set an example to residents to reduce the carbon footprint of Council owned offices and buildings?

**ANSWER**

The £100K higher electricity charges at River Park House do not relate to an increase in consumption but the correction by the electricity supplier to an undercharge that had been occurring.

The Council is taking action to lower energy usage in its offices and buildings. In River Park House we have introduced low energy light fittings and zone controls to switch off the lights during off peak times or when areas are not in use.

IT equipment with thin clients and flat screen technology is being used. In addition, we are intending to introduce voltage optimisation technology which will reduce the voltage used from 240 volts to 218.

As another example, the Council has installed a power perfector device at a trial site. This equipment is designed to even out power consumption and regulate load and demand. The trial will be monitored over the next 6 months and if successful similar measures will be rolled out across appropriate premises within the corporate estate.

The Council is also implementing an accommodation strategy which is resulting in the reduction in the number of buildings that the Council occupies, in particular for its office accommodation.

Plans are in place to install new control equipment in Alexandra House to enable greater flexibility to control the heating system and so reduce energy consumption.

**Written Question 8 – To the Cabinet Member for Resources from Cllr Davies:**

Does the Council consider that the Technopark is an asset to Haringey? How many businesses left the premises in the past 5 years and how many moved into the premises in the past 5 years? What is the capacity (in business units) of the site? At present how many sites are occupied and by whom and how many are vacant?

**ANSWER**

Technopark was developed in 1992 as part the Council's priorities for social, economic and physical regeneration of Haringey. It continues to be retained as an important asset to provide suitable accommodation on flexible terms together with premises related services that support and encourage enterprise development to tackle worklessness within Haringey. Technopark currently provides a base for 42 organisations occupying spaces of varying sizes ranging from the under 100 Sq. Feet to just under 6,000 sq. feet. In addition Technopark also provides spaces for some Council led projects and short term accommodation.

In the past five years 24 businesses have left Technopark and 12 businesses have moved in. There are currently 24 vacant units which the Council is actively marketing.

**Written Question 9 – To the Cabinet Member for Resources from Cllr Demirci:**

Could you confirm how many Council employees have ceased employment over the last twelve months and of that number how many were terminated by the Council for poor performance?

**ANSWER**

Poor performance is dealt with under the councils Capability and Disciplinary procedures. Poor performance can be classed as failure to meet the standards required of the job role and by the council.

In the year 1 October 2006 to 30 September 2007 664 employees left the council. Of these 28 (4.2%) were dismissed for poor performance.

**Written Question 10 – To the Cabinet Member for Housing Services from Cllr Edge:**

How many properties used by the Council as temporary accommodation are considered sub-standard? How many reports, in the last year, have there been of properties with infestations of

- a) Cockroaches
- b) Mice
- c) Rats

What is the council doing to improve the situation?

**ANSWER**

Most of the properties that the Council uses as temporary accommodation are self-contained, privately owned flats and houses that have been taken on by the Council or a Housing Association, under a lease or licence agreement, to provide homes for homeless households.

Properties should be of an acceptable standard of repair, and safe and habitable; this is checked through inspections.

Although repairs will sometimes be required during a household's occupation of the property, these will normally be attended to, as a matter of routine, by the relevant property managers.

Where a property falls into such disrepair that it is no longer of an acceptable standard and the repairs cannot easily be carried out while the property is occupied, the household will be moved to alternative accommodation and the property will not be re-used until it is made habitable.

During the past year, a total of 210 orders were placed for the treatment of a variety of infestations. Unfortunately, we cannot guarantee that there will be no infestations, since an infestation may occur for a variety of reasons, including the condition of a neighbouring property or a property in the same building that is owned or managed by others.

Infestations may also occur because of other external factors (such as poor hygiene standards in nearby shops or properties) or as a result of internal factors (such as the lifestyle of tenants). If the tenant's lifestyle is the cause of the infestation, they will be provided with advice on how to store food and dispose of rubbish safely and responsibly.

Where a property suffers from problems which give rise to repeated infestations (such as flats that are situated above poorly maintained food shops) the Council will stop using the property.

**Written Question 11 – To the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People from Cllr Engert:**

Will the Cabinet member instruct her department to conduct a feasibility study to look at the possibility of expanding Rhodes Avenue primary school given the shortage of reception places in Planning Area 1? How much will the section 106 Education contribution monies be from the development of the former Lynx Depot site in Coppetts Road N10 and how is this sum going to go towards the provision of local school places for Planning Area 1, given that it

already has a shortage of reception places and that the additional estimated child yield from the development is 77?

**ANSWER**

It was determined by Cabinet in July 2007, when the school place planning report was presented, that officers will monitor & review the shortage of school places in Planning Area 1 with any recommendations arising from this work being presented in July 2008. Officers are currently undertaking this review.

Regarding s106, the Education contribution from the Lynx Depot was £264,081. Cllr Engert will be aware that s106 funds are not hypothecated to specific areas or projects. However, in the previous 2 years £396K of s106 funding was used in planning area 1, to fund land purchase for school expansion.

**Written Question 12 – To the Cabinet Member for Resources from Cllr Gorrie:**

In the answer to my question at Overview and Scrutiny on 30th July 2007 the Cabinet Member for Resources said "I do agree that average days on suspension of 118 days is not satisfactory" and "the Council still aims to lower the average number of days taken per case to 70 days" and "The average number of days taken per suspension case has fallen by 65 days since last year, showing the benefit of the extra scrutiny and focus on management action in the last year." Since these remarks the statistics for the most recent two quarters show performance worsening by 30 days to an average of 122 days. What management action has produced this worsening performance and could the Cabinet member confirm the total cost to the Council of these suspended days, including pension contributions and employers NI?

**ANSWER**

The indicator is calculated with reference to the number of cases involving suspension. Between the March and September 2007 periods the number of cases reduced by 7 which influenced the average. The length of suspension has remained broadly the same between the reporting periods. I am pleased to confirm that in the last two months a further 6 cases involving suspensions have been resolved which will reduce the average suspension duration in the next quarterly report.

The total cost of suspension days including on costs for those cases reported to audit committee in the last quarter July to September 2007 was £345,920.

**Written Question 13 – To the Cabinet Member for Environment from Cllr Hare:**

Would Haringey take part in a pilot to charge households according to the rubbish they throw out if that power is awarded to Councils in the Climate Change Bill?

**ANSWER**

The Council is developing comprehensive recycling services across the borough that will enable all residents to recycle a significant proportion of their household waste. This includes the expansion of the Mixed Recycling Service, the introduction of a new service for blocks of flats, and the proposed extension of the trial Estates Recycling Service. All of these services will be supported by an extensive communications campaign.

Once the recycling services across the borough are fully established, we may look into other methods to promote recycling.

**Written Question 14 – To the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Lifelong Learning from Cllr Hoban:**

Could the lead member please confirm what action has been taken to repair the fabric of Alexandra Park Library since the boundary wall was pulled down in late 2006?

**ANSWER**

Alexandra Park Library suffered significant issues of vandalism last year when the boundary wall was gradually dismantled by local young people. Because of the risk to the public, the Libraries Service had the remainder of the wall dismantled. Since then, the Libraries Service has consulted with the Friends of Libraries and with other library users about the wall. Local residents do not wish for the wall to be rebuilt, but would like some delineation of the library's boundary. It is planned to undertake this work in conjunction with other building work scheduled by Corporate Property Services in 2008/09. Further work is scheduled in this library for 2009/10.

**Written Question 15 – To the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Enterprise from Cllr Mughal:**

What actions has the Council taken to respond to concerns expressed in the press about the possibility of Tottenham FC relocating their stadium outside the borough? Have any meetings on this specific topic taken place between officers or council members and the management of the club?

**ANSWER**

Whilst there have been a number of speculative press reports over a possible relocation I can confirm that constructive discussions have taken place recently between the Council and the Club regarding their ambitions and

desire to remain in Tottenham. To this end Council officers have met with the Club to give advice on how to progress any potential proposal they may be considering. The Club has been advised in writing that any plans for developing their White Hart Lane site are best achieved by working in partnership with the Council and the local community. The Club have responded positively to this advice and have indicated a willingness to work within an agreed framework.

**Written Question 16 – To the Cabinet Member for Environment from Cllr Newton:**

- Please state the gross turnover generated by each of the Pay and Display scheme in Crouch End and Muswell Hill from the time they went "live" until 31st October this year
- What was the predicted annual turnover at the time of implementing the schemes?
- What is the revised, projected turnover for 07/08 and 08/09?
- What are respective surpluses that will be available to the Council for spending?
- What will the surpluses used for?
- Will local people be asked to prioritise or nominate projects for spending this revenue on?

**ANSWER**

- Gross income received during this period for Crouch End is £56k and for Muswell Hill £64k. This income will initially be used to off-set any relevant implementation and running costs for the schemes. Net income will accrue to the Council's parking account.
- If this is sustained it will be above the projected annual income.
- Income projections for 2008/9 will be based on 07/08 outturn for the whole year.
- There will be no additional surpluses as the parking account is looked at borough wide and income from enforcement activities varies each year. An overall income shortfall is currently projected for the 07/08 parking account budget, which is being made up from cost savings to balance the account.
- Use of any surpluses on the parking account is governed by Section 55 of the Road and Traffic Regulations Act 1984. Any net surpluses on the account can be used to make good any previous deficits, to fund off-street parking provision, to meet the costs of public passenger transport services (concessionary fares) and highways improvement works.

- Highways improvements and maintenance are prioritised based on local condition surveys and inspections, as well as reports from local residents.

**Written Question 17 – To the Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion and Involvement from Cllr Oakes:**

Given that Haringey's post offices will be reviewed early next year what measures are the Council considering to support the Borough's Post Office network?

**ANSWER**

The council has spoken to Postwatch (the independent watchdog for Post Office Services) on this matter and a six-week public consultation will take place in Tottenham, Hornsey and Wood Green beginning on April 16 2008. The council will only be informed of the Post Offices plans on April 15.

The Post Office presented their closure plans to London local authority representatives on 13 July 2007 at a meeting organised with Postwatch and stated that the majority of closures would take place in isolated rural areas and London would probably be unaffected. They have since stated that:

“The majority of branches - more than 80% - will not change as a result of the Network Change Programme, and we are seeking to implement these changes as sensitively as possible”

The Post Office must also ensure that services adhere to the minimum access criteria outlined by the Government that states:

- 99% of the total population in deprived urban areas across the UK to be within 1 mile of their nearest Post Office outlet
- 95% of the total urban population across the UK to be within 1 mile of their nearest Post Office outlet.

Based on this information we would not expect that Haringey will be affected by the planned closures.

**Written Question 18 – To the Cabinet Member for Environment and Conservation from Cllr Oatway:**

The Mayor of London's Energy Strategy published in February 2004 includes the proposal 'To achieve at least one zero-carbon development in every borough in London by 2010, the Mayor expects each borough to identify at least one suitable site for such development, use their powers as landowners or partners with others to bring about its development, and include the site(s) identified in the next Unitary Development Plan. Can the Cabinet Member



please tell us what steps Haringey has taken to identify a site for a Zero Energy Development and bring about such a development?

**ANSWER**

Energy Strategy by Mayor of London is a non-statutory document which includes policies and initiatives that local authorities may want to consider reducing energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions. We have not yet identified a site for zero carbon developments in Haringey. We are considering whether there are potential council-owned sites where zero carbon development can take place.

In the meantime, the Council has been responding to climate change concerns and the environmental impact of additional housing by updating its planning policies and guidance to help promote energy efficiency and renewable energy in buildings and reduce the amount of energy used based on fossil fuels. One of the key areas of action for reducing CO2 emissions in Haringey is through controlling the emissions in new built, and the Council has planning policies in place to achieve low carbon developments:

The Haringey's planning policies which relate to climate change are contained in Unitary Development Plan (UDP) adopted in July 2006 after two statutory public consultation stages and a public inquiry. For instance:

Sustainable Design and Construction (UD2) policy requires developers to take, where appropriate, a number of environmental sustainability considerations into account including energy efficiency, renewable energy, pollution effects, waste recycling facilities, use of environmentally friendly materials, sustainable drainage systems, biodiversity potential, ecological benefits and enhanced wildlife. We want to see extensive use of passive heating features and solar panels, ground source heat pumps and photovoltaic panels. It has also advocated so-called "rainwater harvesting" and sustainable drainage systems (SUDSs).

The policy on "Mitigating Climate Change - Renewable Energy" (ENV10) requires energy assessments for 'major' development schemes. The policy also requires developers to show an on-site provision of 10%, where feasible, of their projected requirement from renewable sources. Major development are those residential developments involving the creation of 10 or more units, or where number of units is not known, those with a site area of 0.5 hectares or more; or other developments with a floorspace of 1000m<sup>2</sup> or more or with a site area of 1 hectare or more.

Haringey's major growth areas are identified in the Unitary Development Plan. These are subject to planning policies contained in the UDP –some of which are described above, and the relevant Masterplan such as the Tottenham Hale Masterplan. Recently, the Council has approved a scheme for 1200 homes with other mixed uses with Combined Heat, Power and Cooling system which will partly run on biomass.

Central Government has already published the Code for Sustainable Homes and put forward its intention to improve the Building Regulations with a target for all new homes to be zero carbon by 2016. The Government is expected to publish its planning policy supplement on climate change which will specify further the roles, initiatives and planning policies that local authorities need to have in place to achieve low-zero carbon developments.

Haringey's UDP will be reviewed soon in line with the requirements of Planning and Purchasing Act (2004); and climate change mitigation and adaptation will be one of the key areas of focus for the review.

**Written Question 19 – To the Cabinet Member for Resources from Cllr Portess:**

What grades of Council staff qualify for a "Personal Assistant", how many staff are there that have such a person working for them and, how many individuals are employed by the Council presently in the role of personal assistant?

**ANSWER**

The Council does not employ a generic Personal Assistant role. Instead various jobs include duties that might be ascribed to such a role.

Typically the managers that would benefit from such support are graded Senior Manager grades and Chief Officer grades. There are 50 such management posts in the Council. Some of the support posts are staffed on a part time or job share basis and so there are approximately 58 people employed in a support role including personal assistant duties.

**Written Question 20 – To the Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Safer Communities from Cllr Rainger:**

What is the current caseload in Planning Enforcement; how long is the backlog; how is casework prioritised; and what, if any, are the prospects for improvement?

How many Planning Enforcement Officers are employed by Haringey Council and how many of them are in post at the present time? When does she expect that this department will be fully staffed? What is the average waiting time over the last month for a visit from a Planning Enforcement Officer?

**ANSWER**

The current caseload for open cases for Planning Enforcement is 1012 this is made up of 711 cases from the project and 301 cases from the regular cases.

In February 2007 there was a reported 1531 open cases, these cases dated back to 2001, due to the back log a proposal was put forward to the Planning Application Sub Committee (PASC) for a project to reduce and manage the backlog of open cases. Part of the proposals was to employ up to three additional staff and a team leader dedicated to reducing and managing the backlog of open cases. The proposals were agreed.

The original objective of the project was to reduce the number of active cases by two-thirds from 1531 to below 500 by June 2007. The project has progressed steadily closing cases each month, but due to the number of cases that required enforcement action the closure rate has decreased. The decrease in closures in the latter stage of the project was envisaged. In order to manage the open cases the project was broken into three phases.

### PHASE 1 - Four Year Rule

Cases that could be closed under the four year rule. This meant that any case where work was carried out over four years ago is immune from legal action. In phase 1 of the project 495 cases from 2001 – 2003 were addressed out of these cases 311 closed by planning development control under the four year rule.

- cases received (2001 – 2003) 495
- closed (immune) 311
- cases requiring further enforcement investigation 178

### PHASE 2

Phase 2 addressed the cases that were received from 2004 – 2006. As the project moved into phase 2 there was a reduction in the amount of cases referred for closure. This was due to cases requiring further investigations into the alleged breach.

- Cases received (2004 – 2006) 1036
- Cases closed 437
- Open cases 559
- Enforcement Notices served 100

### PHASE 3

Phase 3 addressed the remaining cases, and would effectively incorporate the regular cases received on a daily basis. These cases are the new complaints received from January 2007 until present.

### Regular cases

Since January 2007 Planning Enforcement has received 759 cases and to date 458 cases have been closed. Currently there are a remaining 301 open cases. These cases are new complaints which are received daily. These cases will be incorporated into the final phase of the project once the project caseload has become more manageable.

• Cases received	759
• Cases closed	458
• Cases open	301

Total received / closed on project

• Outstanding cases at the start of the project	1531
• Total cases resolved to date	820
• Current outstanding cases	711
• Enforcement notices served	100

The remaining 711 open cases require enforcement action this has inevitably resulted in the closure rate falling, however the rate of enforcement action has risen. We are continually reviewing the project to ensure that the cases are being managed effectively. We have prioritised the remaining open cases in order of the level of impact on the amenity.

The remaining open cases being reviewed have been put into three categories of priority, namely:

Priority 1

- Breaches which have the most detrimental effect to the environment / amenity i.e. those that breach planning control regulations in relation to Article four areas, conservation areas, and listed / protected buildings.

Priority 2

- Breaches which are unlikely to be granted permission without substantial modification to the development. These breaches could effectively be of a similar nature to the types currently being addressed in priority one.

Priority 3

- Breach of Planning Control of a minor / temporary nature with limited planning concerns. These types of breaches would only require minimum remediation in order to comply with planning regulations and have a very limited negative impact on the local amenity.

In 2004 planning enforcement was moved from PEPP to join the enforcement service. To date service improvements have been carried out including, in August 2007 due to restructuring of the enforcement service, planning

enforcement joined a newly created service called “enforcement response” which joined licensing enforcement and out of hours enforcement together, as often planning enforcement issues are linked with licensing and noise issues.

Planning enforcement is currently undergoing a performance review where the recommendations amongst other things will be based upon best practice discovered whilst visiting a number of other local authorities. An action plan based on the recommendations of the review will be developed and implemented by planning enforcement.

How many Planning Enforcement Officers are employed by Haringey Council and how many of them are in post at the present time? When does she expect that this department will be fully staffed? What is the average waiting time over the last month for a visit from a Planning Enforcement Officer?

The establishment of planning enforcement is 6 FTE. 1 team leader, 1 monitoring officer, and 4 planning enforcement officers.

Currently there is 1 interim team leader, 1 permanent member of staff (1 permanent member of staff on long term sick leave) and 7 temporary members working between the project and regular cases.

It is envisaged that the recommendations of the review will include, future recruitment practices of planning enforcement officers based on the findings of the visits to other local authorities.

What is the average waiting time over the last month for a visit from a Planning Enforcement Officer?

The procedure for initial site visits is broken down into 3 priorities with the most urgent cases being given the highest priority.

#### Priority 1

The officer carries out an initial site visit within three working days of receipt of the complaint. A priority one case is an unauthorised development which causes immediate and irremediable harm to the locality such as works to listed building, works to protected trees in conservation areas. 100% of cases requiring a visit within 3 days was achieved last month.

#### Priority two

The officer carries out the initial site visit within 10 working days of receipt of the complaint. Priority two cases are unauthorised developments such as building works which have been carried out without planning permission, changes of use, including residential conversions, breaching Planning conditions, works to form roof terraces. 95% of cases requiring a visit within 10 days was achieved last month.

#### Priority Three

The officer carries out the initial site inspection within 15 working days of receipt of the complaint. Priority two cases are unauthorised developments such as satellite dishes, estate agent boards, advertisements, fencing, boundary walls and other means of enclosure (unless causing immediate harm other than visual) 100% of cases requiring a visit within 15 days was achieved last month.

**Written Question 21 – To the Cabinet Member for Environment and Conservation from Cllr Reid:**

When was the Council made aware that the City private equity and buyout firm 3i were taking control of Haringey Accord? How do the Cabinet expect that 3i's taking of control of Haringey Accord in September 2007 will impact on the conditions of the ex-Haringey Council staff who still work there and the interest of the business in investing social capital in our borough and the services to residents given 3i are private equity buyout specialists who openly state that even before making the investment they have done detailed work on "identifying potential routes to exit" their investment?

**ANSWER**

The Council were made aware that Enterprise Plc were in the process of considering making an offer for Accord Plc in July 2007. Whilst I cannot personally comment on 3i's business ethos or on the contractual relationship between Enterprise Ltd and its employees, I can assure you that we will continue to monitor the Council's Integrated Waste Management Contract to ensure that all the contractual standards are met.

**Written Question 22 – To the Cabinet Member for Environment and Conservation from Cllr Weber:**

- How many residents have written to him or signed petitions about parking issues in Crouch End Ward since the introduction of the Stroud Green; Hillrise and Highgate CPZ extensions?
- What short-term solutions will the Council provide to alleviate the parking distress?
- How much funding is required for the parking consultation?
- How much funding is required to implement the solution(s)?
- What have you learned from Haringey CPZ implementations?
- When will a solution be implemented?

**ANSWER**

- How many residents have written to him or signed petitions about parking issues in Crouch End Ward since the introduction of the Stroud Green; Hillrise and Highgate CPZ extensions?

The council has received over 70 representations in emails and letters and two petitions.

- What short-term solutions will the Council provide to alleviate the parking distress?

I am currently considering suggestions made in my meeting with Crouch End and Highgate residents on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2007 and will discuss these further at the follow up meeting in December.

- How much funding is required for the parking consultation?
- How much funding is required to implement the solution(s)?

The average cost of CPZ consultations is £2500-£3500, based on a distribution of 5000 documents. The boundaries of any proposed consultation for Crouch End are yet to be confirmed and will be discussed further at the meeting in December.

The cost of implementing measures to alleviate parking pressures will depend on the design of the final scheme once consultation is completed.

- What have you learned from Haringey CPZ implementations?

There are two learning points:

a) That residents in a CPZ area are often satisfied with a CPZ after it has been implemented

For example: The feedback from the review held in November 2006 for the Highgate Station CPZ suggested that:

- 86% of respondents are either Very or Fairly Satisfied with the CPZ.
- 85% of respondents are either Very or Fairly satisfied with the days of operation of the CPZ.
- 85% of respondents are either Very or Fairly satisfied with the hours of operation of CPZ.

b) That residents living on the periphery of a zone often experience parking pressures due to displacement parking from commuters and residents within the zone parking their vehicles just outside the zone.

- When will a solution be implemented?

Subject to resources and consultation, it is hoped to implement a scheme during the next financial year, 2007/8.

**Written Question 23 – To the Cabinet Member for Resources from Cllr Whyte:**

Could the Cabinet member provide an update on the timetable for the Hornsey Depot Development and the likely start of any meaningful consultation between local stakeholders and the preferred developer? Can he confirm that Inner Circle is still the preferred developer and whether the development agreement has yet been signed?

**ANSWER**

The Council, together with Sainsbury's, have progressed negotiations with Inner Circle, the preferred developer, to an advanced stage.

Inner Circle is actively developing scheme options taking account of the landowner's brief, planning guidance and other requirements. It is anticipated that this process will complete during December and the Development Agreement will be signed in January 2008. Following this, the developer will commence full public consultations to enable the proposals to be finalised. The target date for submission of the planning application is March 2008.

**Written Question 24 – To the Leader of the Council from Cllr Williams:**

Does the Leader of the Council think it acceptable to 'pack' the membership of the APP board with three Labour and one Lib Dem member, as was attempted at the last board meeting, and will he give a commitment that he will ensure the rules around political balance are adhered to on this body.

**ANSWER**

I believe that Councillor Williams intended to ask about the membership of the Alexandra Palace Trading Limited (APTL) rather than the APP Board.

The Council do not appoint Company Directors to the APTL Board. The APTL Board is not a body to which the political balance rules under the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 apply. The Charity Trustee Directors to the APTL Board are appointed by the APP Board. After discussions between Councillor Cooke and Councillor Hare on Friday 23 November 2007, I understand that Councillor Cooke intends to bring proposals to the next meeting of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board to the effect that the Opposition should have another place on the APTL.

The Non-Executive Directors and Managing Director are appointed by the APTL Board.

**Written Question 25 – To the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Wellbeing from Cllr Wilson:**

How many individuals are currently on the waiting list for respite care?

**ANSWER**



There are not usually any delays in securing respite so there is no waiting list. At present we are seeking 1 nursing respite place and there is a delay due to there being a shortage in provision. There is also one person waiting for residential respite and that is because they want a specific home which has no vacancies at present. We are able to meet the need so it is client choice.

**Written Question 26 – To the Cabinet member for Leisure, Culture and Lifelong Learning from Cllr Winskill:**

Following the welcome announcement that Haringey Libraries will receive £1.1m of Big Lottery money, will the Cabinet Member tell us how residents will benefit from better services and how they will be consulted on the use of the money?

**ANSWER**

The big Lottery Fund recently announced the award of £1.1m under the Community Libraries Programme for the redevelopment of Coombes Croft Library. This is an extremely popular library and customers were consulted during the process of developing the bid to identify the facilities which they would like to see improved. The bid reflects customers' requests for a larger children's library, a section specifically for teenagers, additional toilet facilities and a redesigned entrance. Further consultation will take place as the project proceeds and our customers will be closely involved in the redevelopment of their local library.

This page is intentionally left blank

**TABLED****Item 11**

COUNCIL MEETING – 26 NOVEMBER 2007

**EMERGENCY MOTION F (2007/08)**

This Council;

- Deplores the ending of party proportionality by the Alexandra Palace board over the appointment of board members of Alexandra Palace Trading Limited
- Expresses grave concern over the escalating additional costs to the Council of the recent high court decision in relation regarding the Alexandra Palace, now estimated at £1 million to March.

And therefore undertakes to:

- Write to the board of trustees expressing the Council's dismay at the ending of proportionality asking the board to restore it.
- Set out to councillors in detail how the £1 million additional costs have arisen and undertake to report to councillors on a monthly basis on this grave financial situation for the Council.

Proposed: Cllr Williams

Second: Cllr Whyte

This page is intentionally left blank