



Haringey Council

Environment and Housing Scrutiny Panel

TUESDAY, 28TH JANUARY, 2014 at 18:30 HRS - .

MEMBERS: Councillors Alexander, Bloch, Bull, Gibson, McNamara (Chair), Stanton and Weber

AGENDA

1. WEBCASTING

Please note: This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. The images and sound recording may be used for training purposes within the Council.

Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However, by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the Scrutiny Support Officer at the meeting.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of urgent business. Late items will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items will be dealt with at the end of the agenda.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a prejudicial interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered:

(i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, and

(ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must withdraw from the meeting room.

A member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Members' Register of Interests or the subject of a pending notification must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.

Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal interests and prejudicial interest are defined at Paragraphs 5-7 and Appendix A of the Members' Code of Conduct.

5. DEPUTATIONS

To consider any requests received in accordance with Part 4, Section B, paragraph 29 of the Council's constitution.

6. TRUST FOR CONSERVATION VOLUNTEERS

Chris Speirs & Clif Osborne on the work of this environmental charity in Haringey (This is the second of three environmental community groups to present to the panel)

7. CABINET Q & A

Cllr Ejiofor Cabinet Member for Planning and Enforcement

8. REGISTERED HOUSING PROVIDER - PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

To note and comment on the proposed partnership agreement between the Council and local Registered Housing Providers. To follow

9. UPDATE ON STRATEGIC ENFORCEMENT PROJECT (PAGES 1 - 30)

To note and discuss:

- 1) Evidence and outline recommendations collected to date (sessions 1-4 attached)
- 2) Future evidence gathering sessions
- 3) Developing conclusions and recommendations

10. UPDATE ON COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT WITH PLANNING PROJECT (PAGES 31 - 32)

To note and discuss:

- a) Work completed to date
- b) Future plan of work
- c) Conclusions and recommendations

11. MINUTES

Minutes of 19th November - to follow

Minutes of 2nd December – to follow

12. FEEDBACK FROM AREA CHAIRS

13. FORWARD PLAN (PAGES 33 - 34)

To note planned meeting schedule for remainder of 2014.

14. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Bernie Ryan
Assistant Director – Corporate Governance and
Monitoring Officer
Level 5
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Martin Bradford
Scrutiny Officer
7th Floor River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Tel: 0208 489 6950

Email: martin.bradford@haringey.gov.uk

Tuesday, 21 January 2014

This page is intentionally left blank

Environment & Housing Scrutiny panel
Strategic Enforcement – Work Schedule

7th November 10.00 - Enforcement Officers - Group 1	
Eubert Malcolm (Regulatory Services Manager)	
Daliah Barrett (Lead Officer -Licensing)	
Derek Pearce (Noise)	
Alison Bell (Pollution)	
Felicia Ekemezuma /Rebecca Whitehouse (H& S and Food Health)	
Karen Tillett (Trading Standards)	
7th November 14.00 - Enforcement Officers - Group 2	
Gary Weston (Highways and Parking Enforcement)	
Andy Briggs (Parks and Open Spaces)	
Bob McIver (Building Control)	
Mike Bagnall (ASBAT)	
28th November 14.00 - Enforcement Officers - Group 3	
Myles Joyce (Planning Enforcement)	
Denise Lapompe (Revenues Benefits and CS)	
Steve Thomas (Audit & Risk Management)	
Mike McNicholas (Neighbourhood Action Team)	
3rd December 14.00 - Enforcement Housing- Group 4	
Sharon Morgan (Homes for Haringey)	
Steve Russell (Housing Improvement (Private sector licensing scheme)	
31st January 10.00 - Corporate support Group 5	
Anita Hunt – Data Governance	
Julia McClure - IT	
Ann Woods – Audit and Risk Management	
George O’Neil - Communications	
Other local authorities– TBA Group 6	
Hackney tbc	
Merton tbc	
Another tbc	
External enforcement – TBA Group 7	
Mark Wolski –Metropolitan Police tbc	
David Green London Fire Service tbc	
Heather Watkinson, TFL – Completed 10 th December	

This page is intentionally left blank

**Environment and Housing Scrutiny Panel
Evidence Gathering Session – Strategic Enforcement
7th November 2013 (Haringey Civic Centre)**

Session 1

Present: Cllr Brabazon, Cllr Bull, Cllr McNamara (Chair) and Cllr Weber

Also in attendance: Eubert Malcolm (Regulatory Services Manager), Daliah Barrett (Licensing Officer), Derek Pearce (Noise enforcement), Karen Tillett (Trading Standards), Felicia Ekemezuma (Food Hygiene And Health & Safety), Alison Bell (Pollution).

Key emerging issues and recommendations:

1. Possibility of developing a red flag system for those properties or premises where there are persistent enforcement problems should be considered as this may help to prioritise and coordinate enforcement action among multiple services. This would however need to be underpinned by the installation of a new core Gazetteer property database.
2. There is evidence that some services are actively profiling of the most prolific offenders and working with other services to deliver joined up enforcement action. The top 20 premises across 10 regulatory services are identified in monthly meetings to coordinate action.
3. Communications was central to the function and operations of enforcement services – particularly in the way that the public are made aware of services, how enforcement services operate, how successful enforcement issues are publicised (as preventative) and most importantly, how local residents can report enforcement issues. Needs further examination so that services become more proactive rather than reactive.
4. Transience (high geographical turnover) is a significant barrier for local enforcement services and is experienced in both public and commercial spheres. For example, it is estimated that there are over 300 number of new food premises each year – which should be registered and inspected. This is a significant challenge to the EH service.
5. Numerous services have contact with new businesses, possibility of developing a 'welcome pack' be explored, highlight services, advice and support in the area as well as duties and responsibilities (e.g. to register with appropriate regulatory services such food health etc).
6. The Council has many officers out on the streets which could form the eyes and ears of the organisation, helping to develop intelligence that could assist and direct the work of enforcement officers across the Council. Insufficient use is made such officers or intelligence that they may obtain.
7. Member interaction with enforcement services was also seen as critical importance.

- Local Councillors represent a significant resource in respect of the knowledge of a local area (new businesses, problems) though not enough is made of this. Some mechanism to utilise local knowledge;
 - Members also indicated that they needed to understand more about what properties and businesses were of concern (so they could respond to public concerns), though what information is required needs to be clearly articulated (in respect of licensing, there are 800+ licensed premises).
 - Members could be encouraged to identify local hotspots for enforcement action which would benefit from a holistic enforcement approach from a range of services (e.g. waste, planning, licensing etc);
 - Members accompany officers in inspection to develop awareness of issues;
 - Centralised circular could be an option to improve member interaction with enforcement and regulatory services.
8. A number of services described how public communication and education function had become less of a priority in times of financial restraint. Services could do with further communications support to help build and extend links with the public as this was critical in developing local intelligence to support enforcement work.
9. It is clear that there are a number of enforcement operations which take place which are not always communicated to members or the local community (e.g. Operation Tailwing, Autumn Nights). Improved communication of enforcement ops would assist public understanding and reassurance of work being undertaken by Council and its partners.
10. In the issuing of council grants (and where possible other public money) individual and businesses should be compliant with enforcement action, otherwise it is seen to be reinforcing poor compliance and lack of adherence or suggest that the Council is not consistent or coherent in its approach. The example here is that there a number of businesses that have been given grants which have other outstanding enforcement actions (shop fronts in Tottenham).
11. A key to more joined up and effective enforcement was the need for a core database to record events, actions and locations.
12. Tottenham Regeneration: there was a perception that there needs to be improved assessments as to the possible impact of the regeneration of Tottenham may have on regulatory and enforcement services. For example, making Tottenham Centre a leisure destination 365 days a year will undoubtedly have implications for local regulatory services – regulation of night time economy.
13. Police Tasking Group is a multi-agency enforcement group led by Community Safety and local police (with all regulatory services). Police bring along data to the meeting to inform coordinated enforcement approach. (Example of good practice)
14. The current programme to reform and improve Customer Services should acknowledge the role this plays as a front line for enforcement services and effective notification and reporting. Any reforms of current model needs to incorporate – does the current customer service model have enough information to refer to appropriate enforcement service.

15. Both members and officers were in agreement that improved public engagement is central to more effective enforcement, particularly in respect of managing local residents expectations about what can and what can't be enforced.
16. Where possible, and accepting the broader financials constraints and demands of the Council, additional ring fencing of enforcement income should be explored.
17. Services identified the need for an accurate and up to date list of local community organisations residents associations to support evidence gathering, consultation, notification and engagement processes. It was noted that members could be consulted in drafting list.

Commercial Environmental Health

- 1.1 Inspections are generated by public complaints, employee notifications and intelligence from other services (extended network of other officers).
- 1.2 Service connects to pan London and other sub regional groups to share information and best practice.
- 1.3 All data is recorded in M3 database alongside other regulatory services, so there is an element of shared data and approach to enforcement.
- 1.4 The service operates an inspection regime on a risk rated approach, those business rated as poor are inspected every 6 months – and low risk businesses every 3-5 years. Subsequent audit at time of Olympics however, found that many of those businesses identified more high risk businesses in those that had been categorised as low risk. This has led to a zero tolerance approach which has seen a threefold increase in enforcement.
- 1.5 Database indicates that there are over 1200 food establishments in the borough. There is however significant transience in this sector (300 new businesses each year) and registrations of new businesses and subsequent inclusion in any inspection regime – could be improved through:
 - Access to council tax and business rates records would help correlation in the identification of new food premises
 - Better notification of new businesses by other contact services (e.g. property services, planning applications for food businesses) of their responsibility to register with Environmental Health Food Safety;
 - Regeneration service visits new businesses where there is also an opportunity to notify of responsibility to register with local regulatory services.
- 1.6 Whilst it was acknowledged that there is no difficulty in getting publicity for enforcement work success (e.g. closures and seizures) there was a need for more 'public traction' to assist in enforcement work.
- 1.7 It was noted that there is systematic registration of those premises seeking a license and food registration with HMRC.

Key messages:

- Improved public engagement is critical to support the work of the service.
- The volume of enforcement work (inspections) together with staffing levels inevitably means that work needs to be prioritised.
- Lack of staffing support (administrative) also means there instances where highly qualified officers are undertaking administrative tasks instead of other more qualified duties – representing a waste of knowledge, time and resources.

Licensing

- 1.8 A issue was manpower resources available to support licensing and regulatory responsibilities. Although it was difficult to compare alike services (and the duties they performed) and the needs exhibited in individual boroughs, there was a sense that some regulatory services in Haringey were under resourced compared to neighbouring boroughs. It was noted that both Hackney and Waltham Forest have greater numbers of licensing officers.

Key message:

- here is good joined up work with Public Health – Drink Aware (Reducing the Harm Annual Public Health Report).
- There is an information gap for new businesses in respect of civic obligations and duties (e.g. registrations etc)

Noise

- 1.9 Service receives over 8,000 calls per year. There are distinct patterns here: enforcement requests are seasonal (mostly in summer), predominantly at weekends between hours of 8pm and 3am. The service is no longer 24 hour – no service between 4am and 8am (police should be notified at these times).
- 1.10 There has been a change in the way that Enforcement Response works to secure compliance. Catching individuals or businesses in the act of noise contraventions is difficult and resource intensive, thus the service is more proactive approach in seeking to visit offenders for more educative approach (e.g. seeing noisy builders in the day).
- 1.11 Members noted the problems with a small number of barbers which were staying open late Tottenham (sometimes until 2-3am). It was noted that these premises had been visited by there was no action to be taken as the noise was on the street rather than on the premises (there is no legal power to for noise response to act, this is a police matter).

Key message:

- Enforcement response outcomes are different because this service has had to work differently and more creatively.
- Outcomes are not always that tangible, for example in terms of numbers of prosecutions.
- Mental health issues of those people involved was a significant inhibitor of effective enforcement action.

Pollution

- 1.12 This regulatory service covers a range of issues including air monitoring, contaminated land and part B industrial processes (dry cleaners). Also deals with asbestos notifications.
- 1.13 Possible joint working with 40:20 team (carbon reduction) was inhibited by separate regulatory frameworks from DEFRA and DECC. Possible opportunities to work together identified with local services.
- 1.14 An improved public interface was identified as key to improved enforcement outcomes. Public engagement can lead to improved understanding of regulatory services, the work they undertake and critically, the intelligence and reporting that they receive to underpin and direct work. Of particular note, was improved web access, layout and promotion of the regulatory services.

Key messages:

- IT systems need to be developed to encourage and support information sharing
- More cross departmental working would be beneficial..
- Communications interface with the public needs a thorough reassessment.

Trading standards

- 1.15 The service deals with customer complaints in respect product safety, pricing, descriptions of good services. The service is jointly managed with Waltham Forest though the services are not joined. There are 3 officers in Haringey and 5.8 in Waltham Forest.
- 1.16 Local Authorities do not provide consumer advice anymore, the national Citizens Advice helpline provides this service and does refers on local enquiries.
- 1.17 There is a top 20 scheme in Waltham Forest for trading standards input and to prioritise and target worst offenders and coordinate action
- 1.18 It was noted that in the experience of officers at other local authorities, Members do accompany officers on inspections to premises. As a large proportion of TS work is project and enforcement based, Member attendance may be problematical as they could end up as potential witnesses in Court proceedings.

Key messages:

- There are good examples of work with external partners such as HMRC
- Public engagement has suffered through budgetary pressures, this is not just a Haringey issue, but generally within Trading Standards. But the public are an important source of information and intelligence for work of enforcement services. There needs to be a corporate approach to how services can engage public and encourage reporting.
- Engagement with Councillors is important for work;
- Links with regeneration and new businesses need to be improved to ensure that there is a planned and prepared response for new business and that there is appropriate information sharing between services.

Head of Regulatory Services

Key messages:

- Enforcement is central to corporate objectives
- There are numerous teams and numerous information systems and there must be concerted effort to ensure that these systems relate to each other
- Not enough use is made of M3 and there is scope to use this to better capacity and to extend to other services (not everyone is fully trained)
- There is potential to develop and extend existing good practice elsewhere in the organisation or include other enforcement services (Partnership Taskign Group)
- There is a need to promote the enforcement projects and good news more across the organisation and with the public (and members)

DRAFT

**Environment and Housing Scrutiny Panel
Evidence Gathering Session – Strategic Enforcement
7th November 2013 (Haringey Civic Centre)**

Session 2

Present: Cllr Brabazon, Cllr Bull, Cllr McNamara (Chair) and Cllr Weber

Also in attendance: Mike Bagnall (ASBAT), Andy Briggs (Parks and Open Spaces), Bob McIver (Building Control) and Gary Weston (Highways and Parking Enforcement)

Key emerging issues (recommendations):

1. New technology is assisting the reporting and enforcement functions of the council with the development of the new reporting app. A range of enforcement issues can be reported from potholes, dumped rubbish, street lighting and street furniture. This is primarily a public reporting app, though there is the potential for other front staff to use this (though not with current Blackberry platform).
 - Recommended that this is supported by training to allow and enable staff to make the cultural change necessary to ensure the app is used to its potential.
2. Enforcement data mapping within the organisation, what data is held, where it is held, who has access to this. Such an exercise would help provide a framework for collaborative partnerships and may assist operational and strategic (intelligence) enforcement work.
3. To what extent are there data protection statements (or notification usage and sharing within the organisation) across all council documents (e.g. on forms, licences and applications etc). Would this support further data sharing across the organisation? Would help to notify public that we do share information where possible across the council? Standard information sharing statement / policy?
4. Parking Service is about to commence procurement for a new IT system as the current contract with Civica will expire in 2015. Therefore there is an opportunity to ensure that new system can integrate with other relevant enforcement or regulatory services which could help coordinate enforcement action. Coordinated enforcement and data sharing should figure within procurement?
5. Access to information was only the first step, there is an evident need to support this with appropriate officer training to use specific databases or software so as to ensure data viewed or extracted can be interpreted correctly and meaningfully.
6. There is a common theme of services not utilising current software or databases to their optimum capacity (e.g. M3), mainly as a result of staff training staff. The full capability and potential of existing software or IT is being fully utilised for the service it was designed, let alone for other services use for intelligence or information sharing.
7. There was a perception that the Council was risk averse in developing new technology or systems to support services. Whilst the need to deliver stable and secure systems was acknowledged, it was felt that more could be done to update

and renew existing technology. This being said, it was also acknowledged that in some fields (such as planning) software company's were not developing as many new systems and there were not many new systems coming on to the market.

8. Staff groups that have front line access to the community and local residents could be the 'eyes and ears' for a number of services to develop local intelligence and inform practice (e.g. carers). There are opportunities for selective and appropriate training of specific groups who could be made more aware of more aware of what to look for, record and report.
9. Parks are often presented as the 'crown jewels' of boroughs assets and worth preserving, yet are overlooked in enforcement issues. More concerted effort to link and recognise enforcement issues in parks is needed to reflect the status and value to the community in general.
10. Securing positive enforcement outcomes is problematic when involving people with mental health problems and a more supportive or holistic approach may be needed. How can Council enforcement services work with local MHT services to develop balanced but effective approach?
11. M3 database used for regulatory services, there are a number of issues around this particular database which is used for all of regulatory services:
 - Not enough use is being made of this database by existing regulatory services
 - it is clear that a number of services would benefit with access to this service
 - more training is needed for its use.

2

Parking enforcement and highways

- 1.1 CEOs are currently equipped with analogue radios and although these are not digital (and multi channel), reporting of wider enforcement issues can still be supported through the current system. It is clear that parking envisages a role in using the APP to report issues and enabling CEOs to report and monitor other enforcement issues is practicable, though this should not detract from officer's core activity and that training and guidance is given to support this change.
- 1.2 There was some concern that the use of multiple front line officers to report enforcement issues may generate duplicate reports which may overload the system.
- 1.3 It was noted however, that in the experience of other Local Authorities, the development of joint reporting arrangements has brought improvement in job satisfaction for CEOs. Such an arrangement may also improve the public perception of CEOs role of community enforcement rather than solely parking enforcement.
- 1.4 Picture and location (GPS) facilities are available on the new APP, though it was clear from a traffic enforcement perspective, this could not be used as evidence to support any enforcement action as this is not part of the statutory base.
- 1.5 There is a good relationship between SNTs and local CEOs.

- 1.6 Legislation has recently changed to allow more extensive checking of Blue Badges used in the borough. This will allow Blue Badges issued in other boroughs to be inspected by local enforcement officers.
- 1.7 The parking service provides information to a number of other services and is broadly happy to do so long as the relevant AD line management is copied in to the request (to ensure that the information is being used for a work role).
- 1.8 There were questions about the practicability of enforcement of 8.30 to 6.30 CPZs across the borough and whether other hours such as 10.00-12.00 and 12.00-2.00 would offer a similar deterrent to commuters and be easier to police/ enforce. It was noted that the current hours 8.30 to 6.30 offer more effective use of enforcement officers.
- 1.9 The Parking service links with pan London and sub regional parking groups, London Councils and North London Parking Managers Group respectively.
- 1.10 Parking in parks and open spaces was highlighted as an area of recent collaboration between these two services. This had previously been operated by parks dept but through a service level agreement, enforcement and back office support (administration of penalties etc) is now provided through the parking service.
- 1.11 Parking on Homes for Haringey and other RSL estates was known to be an area of local contention in the management and enforcement of parking options. Haringey provides administrative support for the visitor permits.

Building Control

- 2.1 All information is stored on a (iLAP) Northgate software systems.
- 2.2 Building Control is a Responsible Authority and is routinely consulted on planning and licensing matters.
- 2.3 It would be useful to have access to Electoral Register and Council Tax records to assist in the identification of building owners. There was a perception that Data Protection was a barrier in the access to this information.
- 2.4 It was noted that whilst there was more dialogue between services nowadays (Council Tax, Planning etc.) these relationships were predominantly informal and centred on individual staff within the service.
- 2.5 There have been examples of where access to data would have improved response. A derelict house came to the attention of building control, however, access to land registry and council tax records would have shown that this was actually occupied by a 98 year old lady, who may have needed other support other than house repairs. More shared access to databases.
- 2.6 iLAP system is an old DOS based system which feels antiquated – also does not help the ability to integrate this system with other systems and databases.

- 2.7 It was felt the number of Haringey Council staff that visit homes locally and failure to record other data (such as state of house repair, safety issues etc) that there were real opportunities missed for improved working and enforcement. For example, carers go in to elderly peoples houses on a daily basis and could be the eyes and ears of Building Control (or indeed pte rented sector housing) to ensure that accommodation is safe.
- 2.8 Building Control does not have access to M3 - the regulatory services database. Access to this would help develop and extend service.

Parks and Open Spaces

- 3.1 Manage 152 green spaces ranging in size from Finsbury Park to small micro-green spaces across 6 zones and employs approximately 50 staff. 14 parks are locked overnight.
- 3.2 The public use parks in great numbers, in summer on a hot weekend, in excess of 8,000 can access the park in a day. The public are the main source of information for enforcement issues arising from parks.
- 3.3 There are three key enforcement issues for parks:
- Litter – over 600 bins are emptied daily or weekly by the parks service. There is lots of rubbish left at the end of the day in the summer. Enforcement is in operation as a visible deterrent.
 - Dog fouling - new Dog Control Orders are now being used
 - ASB – 225 crimes reported in the park, the perception is that there is a significant level of under reporting in local parks. 25% of all crimes reported relate to Finsbury Park.
- 3.4 Two enforcement issues that are of concern for parks and open spaces for which more coordinated enforcement or support is needed are:
- Rough sleepers - growing number using the park and there needs to be more coordinated support for such people to ensure that they are safe, well and getting appropriate support. The service will link up with A&H.
 - Encroachment – appropriation of land where property owners whose property backs on to parks or other council owned land. In parkland Walk there were 55 cases alone.
 - Responsibility for particular green spaces is not always clear in public perception , which can give rise to enforcement issues where problems occur (e.g. fly tipping, poor land management etc)
- 3.5 Parks are often presented as the ‘crown jewels’ of boroughs assets and worth preserving, yet are overlooked in enforcement issues. More concerted effort to link and recognise enforcement issues in parks is needed to reflect the status and value to the community in general.
- 3.6 The panel noted that the service operated in partnerships with local community groups, residents and local businesses for the maintenance and upkeep of certain green spaces e.g. Green Lanes Traders Association and hanging baskets, partnerships with schools and local older peoples groups (Elizabeth Place).

3.7 There was a concern that the Council was under valuing the use of the park for private hire, and these charges did not reflect the work needed to clear up afterward or the loss amenity by local residents. £130k was gained from letting our 28% of Finsbury Park for the Stone Roses gig, though parts of the park was out of usage for 10 days in summer when people most want to use it. Loss of amenity is more palatable if residents can see where income is being reinvested.

ASBAT

- 4.1 Although the volume of referrals has gone down, there has been a 6 fold increase in the number of higher level ASB reported (e.g. Violence, threats, hate crime etc).
- 4.2 Coordinated enforcement is central to ASBAT team operation as frequently numerous agencies are involved in finding solutions for ASBAT problems. It was noted that up to 10 agencies can be involved with working to find a resolution for some ASBAT cases.
- 4.3 ASBAT role is different in a number of ways, its role is to stop behaviour which is anti-social, and secondly there is a responsibility to the wider community rather than any individual eliminate the ASB. Enforcement action may not be the only remedy available to the team to secure behaviour change – joint working can also achieve similar outcomes
- 4.4 A particular challenge that the service has to face is engagement and response of mental health services. The MHT is part of the [partnership of local services that deals support coordinated action, but is less responsive than other agencies or timely in providing reports. It was noted however that this was not a Haringey specific problem.
- 4.5 ASBAT service Data is recorded on the Open housing Management System (OHMS) which is used by HfH, which accounts for 80%v of referrals.
- 4.6 ASBAT service does not have access to M3 the regulatory service, though it would be useful to have access to this database.
- 4.7 Registered Housing Providers have the same powers as the Council in respect of ASB. There is a local RSL ASB Forum (Community Safety) to help develop and share good practice. But perhaps more could be done to work with local tenancy officers (training) to support effective ASB action.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Environment and Housing Scrutiny Panel
Evidence Gathering Session – Strategic Enforcement
28th November 2013 (Haringey Civic Centre)**

Session 3

Present: Cllr Brabazon, Cllr Bloch, Cllr Bull, Cllr Gibson, Cllr McNamara (Chair) and Cllr Weber

Also in attendance: Steve Thomas (Audit & Risk Management), Denise Lapompe (Revenues Benefits and CS), Myles Joyce (Planning Enforcement), Mike McNicholas (Neighbourhood Action Team)

Key emerging issues (recommendations):

1. A number of officers have highlighted the how practical and useful smart-phones would be for front line officers. With multiple inbuilt technologies (apps, picture messaging, internet) these could be of great assistance to front line staff in reporting and recording processes.
2. Providing more effective enforcement is clearly in the interest of the council has this may also help to secure additional income for the service (where this is ring-fenced) and for the Council as a whole where this goes to general funds.
3. There is examples of coordinated action and services to meet to prioritise (red flag) particular cases which are of concern across numerous council departments. This was happening with particular landlords operating in the borough.
4. Members were keen to ensure that the review reflected the need to invest in current staff and that there was sufficient training (IT, systems, data gathering intelligence) and corporate support (communications, IT,) and resources to enable them to carry out their enforcement role effectively.
5. Opportunities to develop Memorandums of Understanding with key organisations (such as utility companies) to share data and cooperative working (enforcement) should be explored further. The Neighbourhood Action Team is in the process of setting up a MoU (follow up with Mike M). It is clear that a MoU can provide a mutually beneficial arrangement to pursue local transgressors.
6. There was some consensus of the need to improve the accuracy of the current property base record on which many services were dependent, including council tax, planning, NAT, benefits (and others). It was suggested that a property audit, would help to improve effectiveness of enforcement services. Such a development would need to be assessed for viability (how practical this is, have other authorities undertaken this), cost (this is a substantial undertaking) and how it may interact with other similar suggested developments (e.g. the creation of a core database).
7. Utility companies hold important local data to cross check and validate ownership or residents of local properties. Cooperation is however variable, this is dependent on the officer who takes the call and information can take a long time to materialise when agreed. Duty of utility companies and similar to cooperate for information

sharing in pursuance of fraud detection or crime? Do we need to verify this with the Information Commissioner (Anne Woods/ Anita Hunt).

8. There are issues among a number of services with the Valuation Office and the designation of multiple units in houses: are separate even though they are separate flats or HMO - test is can they be sold as 1 contained unit (do they have shared facilities). This is important as it will determine who is liable for council tax (residents if separate and owner if HMO) and eligibility for HB. It is not clear why this is happening and it should be recommended that the Cabinet member writes to appropriate body – to seek clarification, and to ascertain if this is an issue with representative bodies (e.g. London Councils / GLA). Representations be made with local MPs to help clarify this issue.
9. Veolia undertook a street audit of properties to assist the roll out of the waste and recycling collection system. This could be made available to other departments which may assist in property identification.
10. The establishment of a core data base would be important to take a more coordinated approach to enforcement across the Council. This would link to existing databases used by individual enforcement services and create a centralised record of events or actions relating to a specific property reference or NI number.
 - In the short term this could possibly utilise existing AFD system as this has a Document Imaging Process System (DIPS) and is capable of data warehousing (data matching and mining);
 - Should be linked to gazetteer to ensure that there is accurate and consistent property referencing;
 - Be supported by a small dedicated unit (Enforcement Task Force) who can provide expert analytical input who can add value to the core data. This expert input will help develop a proactive approach, target worst offenders.
11. The panel recommended that representation should be made to local MPs, London Councils and national policy makers concerning the problems with Right to Buy legislation, the potential for fraud and the potential loss of local housing stock.
12. There are examples of good partnership work with local utility companies. A recent joint enforcement approach with EDF on a property in West Green involved waste services, environmental health, building control. The outcome of this joint approach secured benefits for all services, including EDF, which underlines the possibility of more coordinated action in the future.(especially as EDF and other utility companies do not have the right to enter as some council enforcement services do).
13. Partnership Tasking Group – is an example of good local partnership working among enforcement services. How can this work be developed and supported further?
14. Proceeds of Crime Act. There was a consensus amongst the panel that more need to be undertaken to develop the POCA capacity of the organisation to assist investigations and to potentially increase income derived from it.
15. Improved partnership working across enforcement will help to develop the capacity for enforcement as this may help to extend knowledge, skills and tools (legislation

etc) through which to support enforcement action – may also extend enforcement options from civil to criminal.

16. There was a consensus within the panel that the council should invest to secure improved enforcement services. The panel noted that a number of individual cases could be made for investment which would at worst be cost neutral, or indeed, the potential to deliver increased income for the Council (licensing scheme, POCA, HMO etc).
17. The panel noted that there was some further work needed on the current customer services model which provides generalised service and first point of contact for many services. Does this create an additional barrier to effective handling and support of resident complaints, enquiries, information requests and could these be more effectively handled in house (respective teams).
18. It was apparent that in order for enforcement services to work more effectively, that there was a need to develop a more strategic approach to this across the council. There is a need to further resource information gathering, information analysis, triage and assessment.
19. There was a perception among the panel that Magistrates may not be fully aware of the situation with 'rogue landlords' and the problems that poor housing management causes in the community. It was felt that there should be more dialogue with local Magistrates or judiciary to perhaps promote in service training of how such cases are handled in the courts, how costs were recovered, penalty regime etc.
20. The panel noted that there was a high churn rate in the business community as well as among local residents. In this context, there needed to be improved links with Economic Development and Regeneration to ensure that new businesses were equipped with appropriate advice, information and support to ensure that it was compliant with local requirements (e.g. trading, H&S, environmental, waste). It had been suggested at a previous meeting that a welcome or introductory pack for new businesses could assist.
21. The panel noted that there was a large scale enforcement issue under investigation at present involving the use of industrial units for residential purposes. There were a number of industrial units being used including the Omega Works (dress factory) site and Arena site in Seven Sisters Road. It was estimated that up to 1,000 people are living across these sites (see 3.7 below).
22. The panel noted that there was an inherent tension between regeneration and enforcement, and whilst new business and regeneration opportunities should be encouraged, these should be compliant to local and national enforcement standards. The panel were particularly concerned around the issuing of grants (from various sources) to businesses, particularly when these were not fully compliant with other enforcement services. It was recommended that where possible conditions should be put in place for enforcement compliance and appropriate checks are made before grants are issued.

23. A key issue for NAT is that it is difficult to respond to all enforcement requests given the he volume of contacts received in to the service. In this context, it would be helpful if the review by scrutiny could help to provide some guidance or process where there are clear defined priorities to better guide and inform enforcement work.
- Members should be involved in helping to guide and inform priorities for local areas;
 - That there needs to be some level of public and resident engagement around enforcement to help identify local priorities for enforcement. The panel recommended that such a process should be undertaken annually/twice yearly if practicable. The key issue was to help generate some wards specific data which may help to inform, guide and prioritise local enforcement action.
24. It was noted that there were a number of NAT officers who work across the borough with whom members should be familiar within their ward as these may be a key point of referral, advice and information on a range of enforcement issues. Panel members reported differing levels of engagement across the borough and felt that this was a key community link, which would benefit from improved member engagement. How can this be achieved?
25. The panel recommended that an A5 flyer is developed for members that outlines key enforcement contact details which may assist in the resolution of local casework and other resident enquiries (NAT, waste, traffic, SNT, Housing etc).

1. Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services

- 1.1 Covers areas of Council Tax, Housing Benefit and Non Domestic Rates. There is considerable reliance on local residents and other data held by other services to support the effective collection of these revenues. The service works with and uses data from HfH, Parking Services and Planning Enforcement to identify residents and properties and support income collection.
- 1.2 The service can obtain a liability order which can give powers for invoke attachment of benefits, attachment of earnings, bailiff action, bankruptcy or agree personal arrangement.
- 1.3 A charging order is also used which is placed against the property against an outstanding debt to the Council. It was felt that there could be more coordination of charging orders placed by the council, with more services cooperating to support this (check with Denise).
- 1.4 There is clearly a grey area between what is a wrongly assessed benefit/tax which may be the fault of the Council and fraud, where mi- information has been deliberately provided by the applicant/claimant.
- 1.5 The department is reliant on a wide range of sources to help build up database of what properties there are in the borough and liable to Council tax or business rates. Planning and Building Control supply data, but many of the conversion have been done so illegally and therefore properties, and potential council tax payers are not always included within the system.
- 1.6 There was some agreement that there needs to be an audit of the all the properties in the borough to ensure that there is an accurate and up-to-date base with which Council tax, and many other services, can work with. It was acknowledged that this would incur expenditure to undertake, but this would be recouped through more extensive data and more accurate billing. This could also be used across other services.
- 1.7 The service uses a number of information sources to help validate ownership or residents for billing purposes. This includes land registry, credit reference searches, letters, visits and general internet searches.
- 1.8 It was suggested that improved access to local databases may also help this validation process. In addition, improved ad hoc access to utility company data and TV licensing would also help. Access is not straightforward at present and it is dependent upon the individual contact made. This could be an area of where a Memorandum of Understanding could be beneficial.
- 1.9 National Anti_Fraud Investigation NAFN - The National Anti-Fraud Network runs a website www.nafn.gov.uk hosted by 2 Local Authorities. It collates information on sanctions and enforcement actions for Local Authorities in order to provide data and intelligence services. Currently, its Local Authority membership is extensive and all Authorities are being encouraged to share relevant information. The NAFN forms 'Penalties, Cautions and Prosecutions PCP1' and 'Request for Information about

previous Cautions and Penalties PCP2' are located on RIAMS as documents in the Enforcement module, Reporting and Processing Offences sub-category.

- 1.10 Council Tax and Business Rates are a significant source of income for the Council and is likely to make up an even greater proportion of income in the future as central government and grants funding continues to decline, in this context, it was suggested that the Council should invest to provide a sound base/method/process for identifying both residential and commercial properties and ensure that they were appropriately billed for local council tax and business rates.
- 1.11 The panel noted that there were 110,000 properties paying council tax and that between 1,500 and 2000 reminders were issued each month to non-payers. This is done automatically by computer systems. It was noted that there was insufficient capacity or resources to review each of these individual responses and which necessitated a computer operating system.

2. Audit and risk management

- 2.1 There is an approximate 40,000 caseload of housing benefit claimants. It was suggested that fraud, to some degree, is widespread within the system and could be present in a significant proportion of cases. There are 4 officers working in this area of fraud investigation.
- 2.2 One of the key challenges for the borough is to keep up with local churn, to know what properties there are and who resides in these. This is a common problem across many services and would be more effective to have a corporate response to ensure that there are sufficient resources / systems to meet this challenge.
- 2.3 The establishment of a core data base would be important to take a more coordinated approach to enforcement across the Council. This would link to existing databases used by individual enforcement services and create a centralised record of events or actions relating to a specific property reference or NI number.
 - In the short term this could possibly utilise existing AFD system as this has a Document Imaging Process System (DIPS) and is capable of data warehousing (data matching and mining);
 - Should be linked to gazetteer to ensure that there is accurate and consistent property referencing;
 - Linked to GIS
 - Be supported by a small dedicated unit who can provide expert analytical input who can add value to the core data. This expert input will help develop a proactive approach, target worst offenders
 - (it was noted that other LAs have similar systems)
- 2.4 The creation of the core database would facilitate a more strategic approach to enforcement across the council as this would:
 - Encourage a more holistic approach – where individual services can identify where other services are involved and develop a more coordinated approach from the Council

- Facilitate a more proactive response – use as intelligence from the database to guide preventative work in properties or areas where common/multiple problems were identified;
- Enable the council to prioritise the approach to enforcement across the council e.g. safeguarding, crime, and social and environmental nuisance.

2.5 Right to Buy was an area of potential fraud given the large amount of monies involved, that is, up to £100k discount is now available to long standing tenants to help them buy the property. The department is currently looking at over 150 applications under the right to buy scheme (790 more widely). Fraud is suspected in cases where long term recipients of benefits suddenly are able to find sufficient income/ capital to apply for right to buy.

- The council has limited rights to refuse this except where it is proved that the tenant is not resident (i.e. sub letting) or is involved in benefit fraud.
- There was a concern that this would lead to a substantial erosion of the housing stock.
- Mortgage companies are lending in this context as there is no risk, i.e. £100 capital in the mortgage;
- Representations need to be made to local, regional and national agencies (e.g. London Councils, MPs etc).

2.6 Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 is an example of where legislation has changed which does give more power to local authorities to act and enforce upon transgressors.

3. Planning Enforcement

3.1 The panel noted that there were three ongoing Proceeds of Crime cases which were totalling £120k. Once these cases were eventually settled this could lead to an 18.5% settlement for the council. This would represent a significant source of enforcement income. However, if there were trained POCA officers involved from the council this would rise to 37% of POC. It was the view of the panel that the Council should explore ways to develop POCA capacity of the organisation.

- POCA course is 12 month accreditation
- Possible recommendation that 6 people are trained by the Council – along the lines of SW training and development – complete course and stay for two years – need further exploration (i.e. cost of course offset against potential income).
- Explore possibility of running the course in house.

3.2 Planning enforcement is primarily a civil issue as these relates to unauthorised development. However, it becomes a legal issue when there is a failure to comply with notices issued by the Local Planning Authority (the Council).

3.3 The panel noted that in some instances, the penalty regime in planning control and enforcement was not operating as an appropriate deterrent, where in some quarters at least the prospect of £10-15k fines being perceived as an ‘acceptable business’ hit or expense.

- 3.4 There are also many potential delays in the planning enforcement process which can sometimes see enforcement cases go on for many months if not years. These include Right of Appeal which suspends and enforcement notice for 9 months.
- 3.5 Planning enforcement always goes first in enforcement hierarchy as this enables the issuing of a stop notice. Although there are many hoops to go through in getting a planning enforcement notice, this is permanent. A breach of the planning enforcement notice is a breach and a confiscation order can follow.
- 3.6 The service uses ILap and IBuild information systems to support its work. The service also has read only access to Council Tax and benefits data bases. It was noted that there is a training issue here to make sure that full and best use of information systems available to the service.
- 3.7 The panel noted that there was a large scale enforcement issue under investigation at present involving the use of industrial units for residential purposes. There were a number of industrial units being used including the Omega Works (dress factory) site and Arena site in Seven Sisters Road. It was estimated that up to 1,000 people are living across these sites, for which there are a number of enforcement issues:
- There were approximately 35-40 enforcement notices on both sites;
 - Sites not equipped for residential use in respect of waste, sewage, utility provision
 - There were noise enforcement issues and ASB issues involved as there was a propensity for large parties to take place
 - Possible fire and H & S risks of the buildings
 - Units in multiple occupation and related requirements and risks
 - Links to HB payment and Council tax collection
 - It was apparent that a number of landlords associated with these developments maybe 'profiteering' from the rental of these units;
 - The need for a balanced approach – some residents may be being exploited, but others were clearly there by choice (as artist / studio use)
 - The panel noted that this was a complex issue which involved multiple enforcement agencies including Private Sector Housing Management, Planning Enforcement, Building Control, Fire Service
 - The panel noted that additional resources had been committed to tackling this issue in budget proposals set out for 14/15.

4. Neighbourhood Action Team

- 4.1 There are two tactical enforcement officers who work in partnership with other services and external partners. There are also 4 trade waste enforcement officers who work with local businesses to ensure that they have appropriate and sufficient waste collection systems in process. Local traders can make their own arrangements, but have to demonstrate that they are have appropriate waste collection for their business.
- 4.2 NAT officers undertake a wide range of inspections and enforcement activities which covers both waste and highways and includes a wide range of activities which are

important to the local community including: fly tipping, waste in front gardens, highways (skips), street trading licenses.

- 4.3 A key issue for this service is that it is difficult to respond to all enforcement requests given the he volume of contacts received in to the service. In this context, it would be helpful if the review by scrutiny could help to provide some guidance or process where there are clear defined priorities to better guide and inform enforcement work.
- 4.4 It was noted that there were a number of NAT officers who work across the borough with whom members should be familiar within their ward as these may be a key point of referral, advice and information on a range of enforcement issues. Panel members reported differing levels of engagement across the borough and felt that this was a key community link, which would benefit from improved member engagement.
- 4.5 Members reported that in some instances, NAT officers undertook local walkabouts to help identify enforcement issues of concern in particular community areas. This was felt to be successful in developing communication and awareness and in helping to resolve local issues of concern. It was noted that NAT officers work across wards and were not always available and may not be able to respond to issues immediately (which may be problematic in gathering evidence to support any enforcement action).
- 4.6 It was noted that NAT had issued over 800 FPNs in the past year, which provides some indication of the volume of enforcement undertaken by NAT service, particularly as these are only issues once all other forms of engagement have failed.
- 4.7 NAT is a Responsible Authority and applications are sent for comment from respective planning and licensing authorities (e.g. adequacy of waste facilities and arrangements).

This page is intentionally left blank

**Environment and Housing Scrutiny Panel
Evidence Gathering Session – Strategic Enforcement
3rd December 2013 (Haringey Civic Centre)**

Session 4

Present: Cllr Bloch, Cllr Bull, Cllr McNamara (Chair) and Cllr Weber

Also in attendance: Sharon Morgan (Deputy Director of Housing Operations, Homes for Haringey) Steve Russell (Housing Improvement Manager, Haringey Council)

Key emerging issues (recommendations):

1. There were a number of liaison issues were highlighted in respect of estate policing and local partnerships with SNTs (1.10-1.14). It was recommended that:
 - Further work with the police to help develop staff continuity within local SNTs would improve liaison;
 - A more strategic approach to policing on local estates was needed to ensure that there is policing parity with areas encompassed within street patrols;
 - Reinvigoration of local SNT priority setting with local stakeholders (Councillors, police and local residents).
2. The panel requested an update on the planned estate inspection process changes and how local councillors would be involved. In addition, the panel suggested that there could be some additional developments should be considered:
 - The addition of a pre-post discussion to estate visit/inspection to improve identification and monitoring of estate issues;
 - It was suggested that local SNTs as well as Veolia Village Managers could also be invited (along with local ward Councillors) to promote a more joined up inspection approach.
3. The panel were of the view that local residents associations were a vital link to community engagement and development. It was therefore noted that in areas where local residents associations were not present, an enhanced estate inspection grouping (involving key partners) could represent the 'kernel' to such a community group and help to kick start community engagement and action in the area.

1. Homes for Haringey

- 1.1 Homes for Haringey manages about 18,000 properties in Haringey in various estate and street settings. It carries out a number of enforcement functions on local estates and the critical issue is how this enforcement work links with council run services. There are two key enforcement activities undertaken by Homes for Haringey (HfH):
 - Those conditions relating to individual tenancies
 - Social and environmental nuisance such as waste, fly tipping, ASB.
- 1.2 The panel noted that HfH had good working enforcement partnerships with a number of services including Noise Team (enforcement response) and the ASB Team. The organisation works well with these services to in support of housing management

services. In respect of ASB there are two levels of enforcement, lower orders of ASB (those that do not involve threats, violence etc) are dealt with by HfH tenancy officers. More serious cases are dealt with by the ASBAT which can offer more expertise in handling and managing such cases.

- 1.3 There is also a fraud team within HfH which aims to identify and take action against those committing tenancy fraud, those tenants who are illegally subletting their property and claiming income from this. This work has grown over the past 18 months.
- 1.4 In respect of environmental services, it was felt that there was also positive relationship where waste problems (such as dumping and clear up) were generally dealt with quickly. What was less robust, particularly in the estate setting, was identifying and taking action against those who were causing the environmental nuisance (i.e. those people dumping). Unless there was direct evidence within the rubbish itself, or where CCTV was available or had been witnessed by another resident, the probability of identifying and taking action was low. (It was also noted that whilst CCTV was available in some estates, this was by no means common to all). In respect of rubbish dumping, it was perceived that many of the offenders were not estate residents.
- 1.5 It was noted that there are a number of services involved in waste and other environmental services such as Environmental Enforcement, Veolia as well as the HfH estate services staff. It was acknowledged that perhaps in some circumstances, coordination between these services could be improved.
- 1.6 There are two main routes in for problem notifications these being:
 - Those reported by estate service staff - which can vary from daily visits to weekly visits (depending on the size of the estate). Staff monitor and assess to ensure that estates are clean and tidy etc.
 - Residents also notify of problems.
- 1.7 It was also noted that internal IT systems could also be improved to monitor and identify repeat or common 'offenders'. Could any enforcement data be supplied?
- 1.8 It was noted that incidences of ASB and other enforcement issues (such as noise, environmental dumping) are linked to tenancy rules and could in theory jeopardise this if contravened. However, this is the ultimate sanction and HfH would need to convince a court that the nature of the contravention is so serious to warrant eviction. The degree of severity of the offence will determine whether a repossession order would be granted by the court.
- 1.9 HfH use the legal service team at the Council to support such enforcement action and there is a Service Level Agreement (SLA) for this. There is also a small SLA with the ASBAT team.
- 1.10 The Metropolitan Police are clearly important partners for enforcement activity in HfH and, where priorities coincide, this partnership usually works very well. It can be more challenging to engage police where requests do not link in with local policing priorities.

- 1.11 The panel noted that on the whole, there was a good relationship between SNT and local Tenancy Management Officers. There was however, a high turnover of officers in local SNTs which presented a challenge to ongoing liaison and local partnerships. It was felt that improved staff continuity within SNTs would further encourage and develop reporting among both officers and more so residents.
- 1.12 The police are involved in the local Partnership Tasking Group as well as HfH, and this appears to work well as it helps to bring coordinated action to common problems.
- 1.13 There has also been a reluctance for police to get involved where there is perceived to be no criminality. This is not always straightforward though, a case in point being Love Lane which had major problems with criminal activity and ASB with people not resident in the estate. Local residents were too afraid to report any problems (intimidation) so outwardly to the police there appeared to be few problems. Problems on this estate are now being involved. It was noted that there is a general reluctance for residents to give reports to police which may inhibit enforcement activity.
- 1.14 It was noted that whilst police patrolled neighbouring areas, it was difficult to get police patrols within estates. It was felt that there should be a more strategic approach to policing on estates, to ensure residents were provided with the same police presence and reassurance as those encompassed within street patrols.
- 1.15 It was noted that there had been a change to the estate inspection process at which local ward councillors were invited (walkabout) with the recruitment of more specialised Quality Assurance Officers to ensure that identified work is completed. The new system will:
- Establish four Quality Assurance Officers who will:
 - Monitor client contracts (e.g. Veolia, Wing, caretaking, cleaning)
 - Lead estate walkabouts (greater consistency and more accurate specification of work required and completion)
 - Dedicated estate environmental budget for housing management
 - Increase capital funding from £250k to £500k for small / medium environmental improvements
 - Establish a mobile operative team (2 operatives and vehicle) to undertake small works (e.g. chute clearance, graffiti removal, removal of signage)
 - Estate service officers will be provided with appropriate equipment to undertake minor repairs without recourse to a more formal works order.
- 1.16 The panel requested an update on the planned estate inspection process changes and how local councillors would be involved. In addition, the panel suggested that there could be some additional developments should be considered:
- The addition of a pre-post discussion to estate visit/inspection to improve identification and monitoring of estate issues;
 - It was suggested that local SNTs as well as Veolia Village Managers could also be invited (along with local ward Councillors) to promote a more joined up inspection approach.

1.17 The panel were of the view that local residents associations were a vital link to community engagement and development. It was therefore noted that in areas where local residents associations were not present, an enhanced estate inspection grouping (involving key partners) could represent the 'kernel' to such a community group and help to kick start community engagement and action in the area.

1.18 In relation to enforcement partnerships the following issues were raised:

- Planning Service produce a spreadsheet of planning applications which are routinely sent to HfH, to identify if these affect any properties they manage and if this constitutes any breach. It would be helpful if this was in a more accessible format.
- There were potential opportunities for mutual training of enforcement teams with HfH estate officers (need to specify)

1.19 In relation to IT and enforcement the panel noted that:

- All tenancy data is recorded on OHMS (which is also used by community housing, ASBAT)
- Access to framework-i – (Sharon – I am not sure if you have access to this or not)
 - though there are data protection issues,
 - there is/ or should be a memorandum of understanding to support this use
- No public health flagging at the moment.

2. Private Sector Housing

To be completed.

Environment & Housing Scrutiny Panel

Community Engagement with Planning – Work Schedule

Stage	Aim	Purpose / Activity	Time line
1.	Scoping	A. Meeting with AD Planning	July- October 2013
2.	Local Policy & Practice	A. Panel Meeting with Officers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ransford Stewart, AD Planning - Emma Williamson (Head of DM and Enforcement) - Alison Blom Cooper (Project Manager) - Sule Nisancioglu (Team Leader Planning Environment and Transport) - Clodagh McGuirk (Planning Policy Officer) B. Evidence / Report from Planning Service C. Assessment of Haringey Statement of Community Involvement (Planning)	November 2013
3.	Comparative Policy and Practice	A. Evidence from other planning officers in other London boroughs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment the Statement of Community Involvement of other boroughs. Hackney TBC Camden Islington (Kevin Henson and Jonathan Gibbss) B. Other specialist agencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning Aid For London (Pat Castledine) - Planning Advisory Service (Simon Ford, AMEC) 	January 31 st 10.00
4.	Community feedback on current process	A. Involvement of those consulted in recent decisions? B. Survey? C. Case Studies?	18.30 February 18 th 2014
5.	Reporting	A. Interim findings in January (with Cabinet Member) B. Final report to Panel meeting in February 2014	March 2014

This page is intentionally left blank

Environment and Housing Scrutiny Panel

Forward Plan 2014

Date	Meeting	Item and lead officers
24/01/14 10.00 Civic	Evidence	<u>Strategic Enforcement</u> Julia McClure – IT George O’Neil – Communications Anne Woods – Audit
28/01/14 18.30 Civic	Panel	<u>Cabinet Q & A</u> Cllr Ejiiofor – Cabinet Member for Planning and Enforcement <u>Partnership Agreement</u> To comment on the proposed agreement between the Council and Registered Housing Providers (Michael Kelleher) <u>Strategic Enforcement Update</u> Work completed – preliminary recommendations (Martin Bradford/Panel) <u>Community Engagement with Planning - Update</u> Work completed – next stages (Martin Bradford/Panel) <u>Environment Group</u> The Conservation Volunteers
31/1/14 10.00 Civic	Evidence	<u>Community Engagement with Planning</u> (Comparative Policy & Practice): Planning Advisory Service Planning Aid for London Camden Council Islington Council
18/2/14 Civic	Evidence	<u>Community Engagement with Planning</u> (Local stakeholders): Community Groups TBC Developers / Planning Agent TBC
24/02/14	Panel Meeting	<u>Cabinet Q & A</u> Cllr Bevan – Cabinet Member for Environment <u>Parking in Tottenham</u> Update on previous scrutiny report (Ann Cunningham) <u>Waste and recycling part 2</u> Update on previous scrutiny report (Stephen McDonnell) <u>Environment Group</u> Friends of Parks tbc

To schedule 2014:

- 1) Evidence gathering for enforcement**
 - (a) External partners - TBA
 - (b) Public consultation - TBA
 - (c) Round table – conclusions TBA

This page is intentionally left blank