

NOTICE OF MEETING

HOUSING AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY PANEL

**Tuesday, 13th March, 2018, 6.30 pm - Civic Centre, High Road,
Wood Green, N22 8LE**

Members: Councillors Emine Ibrahim (Chair), John Bevan, Zena Brabazon,
Vincent Carroll, Gail Engert, Martin Newton and Ann Waters

Co-optees/Non Voting Members:

Quorum: 3

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

Please note that this meeting may be filmed or recorded by the Council for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by anyone attending the meeting using any communication method. Although we ask members of the public recording, filming or reporting on the meeting not to include the public seating areas, members of the public attending the meeting should be aware that we cannot guarantee that they will not be filmed or recorded by others attending the meeting. Members of the public participating in the meeting (e.g. making deputations, asking questions, making oral protests) should be aware that they are likely to be filmed, recorded or reported on.

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.

The chair of the meeting has the discretion to terminate or suspend filming or recording, if in his or her opinion continuation of the filming, recording or reporting would disrupt or prejudice the proceedings, infringe the rights of any individual or may lead to the breach of a legal obligation by the Council.

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 as noted below).

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 Register of Members' 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 interests are defined at Paragraphs 5-7 and Appendix A of the Members' Code of Conduct.

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

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

6. MINUTES - 7 NOVEMBER 2017 (PAGES 1 - 6)

To approve the minutes of the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 7 November 2017.

7. MINUTES - 19 DECEMBER 2017 (PAGES 7 - 16)

To approve the minutes of the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 19 December 2017.

8. HOUSING-RELATED SUPPORT FOR OLDER PEOPLE (PAGES 17 - 30)

9. TA JOINT VENTURE

Verbal update.

10. NEW LONDON PLAN (PAGES 31 - 54)

11. SOCIAL HOUSING SCRUTINY REPORT

Verbal Update.

12. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE (PAGES 55 - 64)

13. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items admitted at item 3 above.

14. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

TBC

Philip Slawther, Principal Committee Co-ordinator

Tel – 020 8489 2957

Fax – 020 8881 5218

Email: philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

Bernie Ryan

Assistant Director – Corporate Governance and Monitoring Officer

River Park House, 225 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8HQ

Monday, 05 March 2018

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HOUSING AND
REGENERATION SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY, 7TH
NOVEMBER, 2017, 6.30 - 8.20 pm**

PRESENT:

Councillors: Emine Ibrahim (Chair), Zena Brabazon, Vincent Carroll,
Clive Carter and Ann Waters

29. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted the information contained therein.

30. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

It was noted apologies for absence had been received from Cllr John Bevan, Cllr Gail Engert (substituted by Cllr Clive Carter) and Cllr Martin Newton.

31. URGENT BUSINESS

None.

32. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

33. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

34. MINUTES - 2 OCTOBER 2017

AGREED:

- (a) That the clerk be asked to check the accuracy of the minutes, especially issues relating to service charges highlighted at minute 22.
- (b) That the minutes be checked, redrafted and reported back to the next meeting on 19 December 2017.

35. BUDGET MONITORING

Rita Bacheta, Senior Business Partner, introduced the report as set out and commenced her presentation by providing an overview of the budget monitoring position for Corporate Plan Priorities 4 and 5.

The Panel was informed, as of 30 June 2017 (Quarter 1), Priorities 4 and 5 were projecting an overspend of £0.959. It was noted the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) was projecting an overspend of £0.4m.

Ms Bacheta provided further information on the overspend of £0.17m for Priority 4, the overspend of £0.80m for Priority 5 (General Fund), and the £0.4m overspend for Priority 5 (HRA).

The following points were noted in relation to Priority 4:

- An overspend of £0.25m was largely due to an unmet saving which had extended employment of a team of commercial property valuers from March 2017 to March 2018. The Panel was informed that the majority of these posts would no longer be required once the HDV was established and when some commercial properties had been transferred.
- It was noted that the overspend in this area had been offset by £0.08m from an overachievement of planning income and an additional contribution from NWLA to staff costs.

The following points were noted in relation to Priority 5 (General Fund):

- There was a projected £0.60m overspend in in-borough private sector leases; £0.70M overspend in bed and breakfast accommodation and a £0.40m underspend in supplier managed private sector leases.
- It was noted the service had identified a number of actions in order to reduce the projected overspend by year end. For example, the Panel was informed that officers were in dialogue with providers in order to deliver further shared facility hostels in 2017/18. Officers also explained they were in dialogue with providers to deliver further shared facility hostels in 2017/18. Work was also underway with various landlords to ensure retaining existing and sourcing future leased accommodation. It was also noted that there were various options being explored to increase supply and acquisitions.

In terms of the HRA, the following points were noted:

- The income shortfall related primarily to income receivable from garage lets. It was noted officers were in the process of drawing up an action plan to address this.
- Waste management costs had increased due to contract inflation. However, it was noted this had been offset by a lower than anticipated charge in landlord insurance costs. The Panel was informed that these charges would be reflected in Tenant and Leaseholders' service charges.
- Outstanding debt remained in relation to water rates. It was noted the contract with Thames Water continued to create financial pressures for the HRA. This was because the HRA had to bear costs of non-payment of bills which could not be passed back to Thames Water.

During the discussion, the Panel was informed of a recent court case which had ruled against Southwark Council for a longstanding agreement with Thames Water. The Panel was informed Southwark had collected water charges along with tenant's rents. As a result, tenants did not deal directly with the water company as the Council had managed both billing and collection of payments. It was noted that a recent court case had challenged this arrangement and the commission the Council received from Thames Water for collecting water charges on their behalf. The court ruled that Southwark had acted as a 'water reseller' and had overcharged tenants. As a result, Southwark was paying this money back. The Panel was informed Homes for Haringey was looking closely at this case and what the decision might mean for Haringey.

In response to questions about the capital expenditure forecast, the Panel was informed that at Quarter 1, the capital programme for Priorities 4 and 5 was forecasting an underspend of £46.6m. As set out on pages 13 – 15 of the agenda, the Panel was informed further scrutiny would take place to ensure any capital programmes were capable of being delivered and that resources were allocated for their delivery.

The Panel raised concerns about the delivery percentage on the capital programme and it was agreed further information should be made available in future scrutiny reports to show the difference between an underspend and slippage on projects. A range of issues were discussed in relation to expenditure and underspend. This included consideration of payments on Alexandra Palace Heritage and underspends in relation to Wards Corner CPO, the Marsh Lane relocation project, acquisitions in relation to High Road West, schemes in Tottenham Hale, Northumberland Park School, and the District Energy Network scheme. In response to questions, officers provided further information on the process for dealing with unspent money and how this would be carried forward. In terms of HRA capital stock investment, the Panel was informed money would be carried forward to help fund stock acquisitions as part of a detailed programme for 2018/19.

Ms Bacheta concluded her presentation by providing information on the MTSF savings targets for 2017/18. The Panel was informed that at Quarter 1, it was projected £1.3m (84%) of the target would be achieved.

AGREED: That the overview of the budget monitoring position for Priorities 4 and 5 be noted.

36. TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION REDUCTION PLAN

Denise Gandy, Executive Director of Housing Demand, Homes for Haringey, and Alan Benson, Head of Housing Strategy and Commissioning, Haringey Council, introduced the report as set out.

Ms Gandy commenced her presentation by informing the Panel that local authorities had a statutory duty to provide Temporary Accommodation (TA) to homeless households in line with the Housing Act 1996. It was noted that TA could take the form of nightly paid self-contained flats, accommodation on longer leases sourced from private landlords or Registered Providers and accommodation within the councils own stocks. The Panel was informed nightly paid accommodation was most expensive,

with an average cost of £44 per night against an average cost of £35 for a longer-term lease.

In response to questions, the Panel was informed there had been a number of significant improvements in work to better manage demand. The following points were noted:

- The steady increase in the number of homelessness preventions achieved.
- The fact homelessness prevention work had been effective. It was noted that a recent review had highlighted that over the last 5 years only 10% of households had returned for assistance.
- Homeless acceptances had decreased from a peak of 762 in 2013/14 to 683 in 2016/17. It was noted this was in contrast to the general London picture of increasing acceptances.
- In terms of year to date 90% of decisions had been made in 33 working days compared to 45% in 2016/17.
- The number of cases “under investigation” had been maintained at less than 50, from over 200 for much of 2016/17.
- To date in 2017/18, the council had accepted a full housing duty to 45% of applicants, reduced from over 60% in 2016/17.
- The average in-flow into TA had reduced from 79 months to less than 50.
- An increasing number of Assured Shorthold Tenancies had been secured in order to prevent homelessness.

In response to questions, concerning initiatives to prevent homelessness, the Panel was informed that in 2016 Homes for Haringey’s Housing Demand team underwent a restructure. It was noted that this had helped to significantly improve performance on homelessness prevention and decision making. It was noted that further changes were planned in order to implement the Homelessness Reduction Act.

Despite these improvements, the Panel was informed the budget situation remained challenging. The following points were noted:

- Although the number of households in TA was reducing the cost of providing TA remained high.
- There was a projected overspend of £800,000.
- There was a need to achieve strong prevention performance and to deliver new sources of supply.

The Panel was informed that the TA management fee had been replaced with a Flexible Homelessness Support Grant. It was noted this had created ring fenced funding which was available to invest in initiatives to reduce homelessness.

In response to questions, Mr Benson informed the Panel that the Council was investigating a range of options to increase the supply of homes to meet the need for TA. It was noted this could include the type of non-for-profit arms-length or charitable organisations, or wholly owned companies, which other local authorities had set up for this purpose and which formed a valuable mechanism for channelling right-to-buy receipts, borrowing and grants into building and acquiring new homes. In addition, it was noted options being investigated also included the types of partnerships with Housing Associations that other boroughs had entered into, which could deliver purchase and repair programme to acquire often badly managed private sector stock for use as affordable housing. It was noted that these new supply options had been listed on the Forward Plan for consideration by Cabinet in January 2018.

The following points were noted:

- The Council had agreed a £16m General Fund direct acquisitions budget. It was noted that this funding was being drawn down by Homes for Haringey, primarily to purchase and repair former right-to-buy stock and to bring it back into use as affordable housing.
- The work that was taking place to convert emergency accommodation into Assured Shorthold Tenancies.
- The work Homes for Haringey was doing to increase the number of lodges available for emergency accommodation, building on the model of Broadwater Lodge.

During the discussion, a range of issues were considered including a number of areas relating to the Haringey Development Vehicle (HDV) and other regeneration schemes. The Panel raised particular concerns about the impact of decanting on waiting times for TA. The importance of mapping these changes was also highlighted.

Ms Gandy concluded the presentation by providing an update on the Homelessness Reduction Act. It was noted further information on this, including the implications for Haringey, would be considered by the Panel in December 2017.

AGREED: That the report setting out the Council's developing plans to reduce the costs of temporary accommodation be noted.

37. HARINGEY DEVELOPMENT VEHICLE - VERBAL UPDATE

The Panel was informed that apologies for absence had been received from Dan Hawthorn, Director of Housing and Growth. As a result, the following update was tabled at the meeting:

“Following the judicial review hearing at the end of October, the Council is awaiting the court’s judgement. It is still the Council’s intention to sign the HDV legal agreement when it is legally appropriate to do so.”

During the discussion that followed, the Panel agreed it was important that they received a copy of the revised Members’ Agreement as quickly as possible.

AGREED:

- (a) That the update on the Haringey Development Vehicle be noted.
- (b) That, once updated, the Panel should receive a copy of the revised Members’ Agreement.

38. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Christian Scade, Principal Scrutiny Officer, provided an update on the proposed work programme for the remainder of the 2017/18 municipal year.

During the discussion a number of issues were considered in relation to High Road West, the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule, and Hornsey Town Hall. It was suggested any scrutiny work in relation to Hornsey Town Hall should be led by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

AGREED:

- (a) That the areas of inquiry outlined in Appendix A of the Work Programme Update be approved and recommended for endorsement by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- (b) That the Chair of the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel and Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meet to consider how to scrutinise issues in relation to Hornsey Town Hall.

39. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

40. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to item 12 as shown on the agenda in respect of future meeting dates, and Members noted the information contained therein’.

CHAIR: Councillor Emine Ibrahim

Signed by Chair

Date

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HOUSING AND
REGENERATION SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY, 19TH
DECEMBER, 2017, 6.30 - 8.20 pm**

PRESENT:

Councillors: Emine Ibrahim (Chair), John Bevan, Zena Brabazon, Gail Engert and
Martin Newton

41. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted the information contained therein'.

42. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

It was noted apologies for absence had been received from Cllr Ann Waters and Cllr Vincent Carroll.

43. URGENT BUSINESS

It was noted Homes for Haringey had recently put safety measures in place on the Broadwater Farm estate following test result findings highlighting several low-rise blocks had not met required building regulations for large panel system blocks with gas supplies. The Chair informed the Panel that an urgent update on these issues would be considered at the meeting.

44. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

45. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

46. MINUTES - 2 OCTOBER 2017

AGREED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 2 October 2017 be approved as a correct record.

47. MINUTES - 7 NOVEMBER 2017

It was noted that the minutes of the meeting held on 7 November 2017 would be reported to the next meeting.

48. AMENDMENT TO THE ORDER OF BUSINESS

AGREED: That a New Item of Urgent Business, concerning Broadwater Farm Gas and Fire Safety, be taken before agenda item 8, Preparation for the Homelessness Reduction Act.

Clerks note – the minutes follow the order of the meeting.

49. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS - BROADWATER FARM GAS AND FIRE SAFETY

Chris Liffen, Interim Managing Director, informed the Panel that Homes for Haringey had recently put safety measures in place on the Broadwater Farm estate. Mr Liffen explained test result findings had shown several of the low-rise blocks had not met required building regulations for large panel system blocks with gas supplies.

The Panel was assured affected residents had been contacted to explain safety measures being taken following the review into the blocks. It was noted around 1,400 people across 725 properties had been affected.

Mr Liffen explained following national advice, given by the Department for Communities and Local Government, Homes for Haringey had started investigations into the construction of the estate which had been built in the 1960s and early 1970s. The Panel was informed that reviews from structural engineers had suggested some blocks did not meet required standards to use gas. It was noted that although the risk was very low, Homes for Haringey had taken a number of precautionary steps to enable residents to stay in their homes.

The Panel was asked to note that the blocks affected, housing both council tenants and some leaseholders, were Croydon, Hawkinge, Hornchurch, Lympe, Manston, Martlesham, Rochford, Debden and Stapleford. In addition, it was noted that the two tower blocks on the estate, Northolt and Kenley, did not have gas supplies while Tangmere was of a completely different construction to the low rise blocks. However, as a precaution, Mr Liffen explained that structural surveyors were reviewing these blocks with results expected soon.

The Panel was informed that Homes for Haringey would visit affected properties to arrange to cap off supplies for gas cookers and to replace them with electric cookers. It was noted that the team would work as quickly as possible and aimed to have the cookers replaced by Christmas, subject to staff gaining access to properties. In response to questions, Mr Liffen advised that as a precaution, the team would also be fitting interrupter valves in order to switch off the gas if a leak was detected and would increase the frequency of gas safety visits. It was noted that a gas safety check would be carried out for free in each leased home and that there were plans to replace the gas system temporarily until a permanent measure could be put in place.

The Panel noted that this was an uncertain time for Broadwater Farm residents but welcomed the steps that had been taken by both the Council and Homes for Haringey, including:

- Holding meetings with the residents' association, knocking on doors on the estate, and distributing letters informing residents of the changes.
- The setting up of a dedicated phone line for effected residents.
- The drop-in centre at the community centre
- The sharing of information with community representatives on the estate.
- The large staff presence that had been on hand and available for discussion.
- The briefings and work that had taken place with colleagues from the police and fire brigade.

During the discussion that followed a range of issues were considered, including:

- The work that was taking place to help identify, and support, vulnerable residents.
- The fact all tenanted properties on the estate had valid gas safety certificates.
- Various issues in relation to the Ronan Point Disaster.
- The importance of good, and continuing, communication with all residents affected.
- Concerns that the cost of an electric cooker would be greater than a gas cooker.
- Compensation packages for affected residents.

The costs associated with putting the safety measures in place were also considered. In response to question, Mr Liffen made clear that Homes for Haringey always put the safety of its residents first and were looking to make residents as safe as possible in the quickest possible timeframe with the minimum of disruption.

In conclusion, the Panel was informed that work would be carried out by Keepmoat. It was noted that Keepmoat had recently been responsible for a kitchen and bathroom renewal project on the estate and had established relationships with residents.

AGREED: That the update on Broadwater Farm Gas and Fire Safety be noted.

50. PREPARATION FOR THE HOMELESSNESS REDUCTION ACT

The Panel received a presentation from Alan Benson, Head of Housing Strategy and Commissioning, Haringey Council, and Denise Gandy, Executive Director of Housing Demand, Homes for Haringey.

Ms Gandy commenced the presentation by explaining the Homelessness Reduction Act received Royal Assent in April 2017 and that it would be implemented in April 2018. The following points were noted:

- It was the first major change to homeless legislation in 15 years and the most significant in 40 years.
- Rather than replacing existing legislation, the Act created additional duties, relating to prevention (prevent more people from becoming homeless in the first place by identifying people at risk and intervening earlier) and relief (intervene rapidly if a homelessness crisis occurs, so it is brief and non-recurrent).

In response to questions, the Panel was informed that if prevention and relief activity failed then the usual tests (priority need and intentional homelessness) would be applied to ascertain if the person was owed the full homelessness duty.

In terms of the duty to provide advisory services, Ms Gandy explained that this required free homelessness advice and information services to be provided to all residents and for advice to be designed with certain vulnerable groups in mind, including care leavers, former armed forces, people leaving custody, victims of domestic abuse, people leaving hospital and people with mental health issues. The Panel noted that the advice must include:

- Prevention on homelessness
- Securing accommodation when homeless
- The rights of applicants and local authority duties
- Help available to people threatened with homelessness
- How to access available help

In response to questions, Ms Gandy explained the legislation would extend the period during which someone might be threatened with homelessness from 28 days to 56 days. In addition, it was noted an applicant would be threatened with homelessness if they had been served a valid section 21 notice to end the Assured Shorthold Tenancy of their only available accommodation, that had expired or would expire within 56 days.

In terms of assessments and personalised housing plans, the Panel was informed that:

- Local authorities needed to carry out an assessment of circumstances and needs of all eligible applicants within 56 days.
- The assessment should include circumstances leading to the threat of homelessness, housing needs and support needs.
- Following the assessment, a Personalised Housing Plan would be drawn up to set out the “reasonable steps” the authority and the applicant would take (and other agencies/people as appropriate).

The Panel was informed that “reasonable steps” should be tailored to the individual and that the plan should be realistic. In response to questions about prevention and relief the Panel was informed that:

- Prevention Duty
 - o Local housing authorities (LHAs) must take reasonable steps to prevent homelessness for any at risk eligible applicant, regardless of priority need. It was noted that this could involve assisting applicants to stay in their current accommodation, or helping them to find a new place to live.
- Relief Duty
 - o LHAs must take reasonable steps to help the applicant secure suitable accommodation. Help could be, for example, providing a bond guarantee, funding a rent deposit or working with a private landlord to make properties available.

Ms Gandy advised LHAs could not refer the prevention duty to another LHA. However, it was noted that the relief duty could be referred if the applicant had no local connection and had a connection to another LHA area. The Panel was informed that a local authority may end the prevention and relief duty, if:

- The applicant had suitable accommodation for at least 6 months
- After 56 days (except where a valid s21). It was also noted that the relief duty must end after 56 days for an applicant who had priority need and was not intentionally homeless.
- The applicant had refused a suitable offer
- The applicant had deliberately and unreasonably refused to cooperate
- The applicant ceased to be eligible
- The application was withdrawn
- The applicant was intentionally homeless from accommodation provided

In response to questions about duties owed to applicants who deliberately refused to cooperate, Ms Gandy advised that local authorities needed to make every effort to engage applicants through a personalised plan. In addition, it was explained that a warning notice must be served if an applicant continued to refuse to cooperate.

Ms Gandy concluded her presentation by providing information on other aspects of the Act and the Code. This included information on the duty to refer and local connection in relation to care leavers. The Panel was informed that in addition to having a local connection to the local authority who looked after them, a care leaver would also have a local connection with an area if they had lived there for 2 years, including time before their 16th birthday. In terms of the Code, it was noted guidance on out of area placements shouldn't limit the search to a specific area if accommodation wasn't affordable. In addition, it was noted households would retain

local connection for 5, rather than 2, if placed into private rented accommodation outside the borough.

The Panel went on to consider the implications and Haringey's response to the legislation. The following points were highlighted by Mr Benson:

- Implications for Haringey:
 - o The number of homeless applications was likely to increase significantly. It was noted that "sector" estimates suggested a 50% - 300% increase in applications across London.
 - o The new approach would be administratively burdensome and there were significant budget implications for: additional staffing resource; the procurement of a new IT solution; additional storage responsibilities; increases in requests for review and legal challenges. However, it was noted that the Act was meant to be "cost neutral" after 2 years.
 - o Further welfare reforms, including the full rollout of Universal Credit in October 2018, likely to exacerbate difficulties associated with homelessness and securing housing options.

- Haringey's Response
 - o It was noted a Task and Finish Group had been set up and that a new staffing structure was in place.
 - o The development of a new Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy
 - o The use of the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant to enhance the local service offer
 - o The work that was taking place on a new Housing Related Support Commissioning Plan
 - o The work that was taking place to review the implications of other policies. For example, it was noted that the Housing Allocations Policy would need to change to reflect new "reasonable preferences".
 - o Modelling work that was taking place on the possible impacts of homelessness demand and TA usage across the Council and wider public sector, including mental health services.
 - o The development of a communication and partner engagement plan in order to raise awareness and manage expectations.

Following the officer presentation a variety of areas were discussed, including:

- Issues in relation to rough sleeping, including on Stroud Green Road especially under the bridge at Finsbury Park.

- Objectives and procedures in relation to the Severe Weather Emergency Protocol.

- Concerns about the level of resource that would be required to deliver services under the Act.

- The importance of support provided by street outreach and homelessness advocacy services.

- The role of customer services

In addition, a number of issues were considered in relation to the processes and procedures that were in place concerning the use of the capital budget to purchase existing properties. It was noted that this included the use of retained Right to Buy receipts, which had previously been returned to Government.

AGREED:

1. That the update on the Homelessness Reduction Act be noted.
2. That the Head of Housing Strategy and Commissioning be asked to provide further information to the Panel, via email, on the Severe Weather Emergency Protocol.
3. That the Head of Housing Strategy and Commissioning be asked to provide further information to the Panel, via email, on the processes and procedures in place concerning the use of the capital budget to purchase existing properties.

51. SCRUTINY OF THE DRAFT 5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (2018/19 - 2022/23)

Rita Bacheta, Senior Business Partner, introduced the report as set out. The Panel considered and noted the information set out in Appendix A (key lines of enquiry for budget setting), Appendix B (Medium Term Financial Strategy), Appendix C (2017 Budget (Savings) Proposals) and Appendix D (Overview and Scrutiny Recommendations from 2017).

The Panel went on to consider the (new) budget proposals for Corporate Plan Priority 4 (P4) and Corporate Plan Priority 5 (P4), as set out in Appendix E of the report.

In addition to the comments below, the Panel raised concerns about the limited financial information provided in the report.

Consultancy Spend (Tottenham Regeneration)

The Panel was informed that following a detailed review of the overall Tottenham Regeneration Programme budget, savings from the General Fund (£50k) had been identified from 2018/19 on consultancy spend. It was noted proposed savings followed a detailed review with budget holders in order to determine what spend could be delayed or reduced to meet savings the Council was required to make. Officers explained that the impact of reduced spend on consultants would mean that progression of regeneration schemes or projects might be delayed.

Reduction in Housing Related Support Budget

The Panel was informed that this was a budget that commissioned services rather than council employees. It was noted that the current budget (2017/18) still included funding that was due to be transferred to Adults Services following the implementation of the Housing Related Support Review. It was explained that the split was as follows: £4,654k to Adults Services with £3,999k to remain in Housing Related Support. In terms of savings offered it was noted that there would be potential savings for 2018/19

of approx. £50k by bringing monitoring roles back into the Housing Related Support team from Homes for Haringey. It was also noted that additional savings, of approx. £120k in 2019/20, would be achieved by recommissioning community based homelessness prevention work.

In addition to the issues above, a number of topics were considered in relation to the budget strategy for P4 and P5, consultancy spend for Wood Green Regeneration, the Council's capital strategy and programme, and the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). During the discussion, the Panel highlighted the possibility of setting an in-principle target of zero for consultancy spend.

The Chair concluded the item by thanking everyone for their contributions.

AGREED:

1. That further information on the Consultancy Spend for Tottenham Regeneration be made available for consideration by OSC on 29 January before final budget scrutiny recommendations are made. This should include information on how the budget was spent in 2017/18 and what the budget will be used for during 2018/19.
2. That a full breakdown of the P4 and P5 budget, for April 2018 – March 2023, be made available for consideration by OSC on 29 January before final budget scrutiny recommendations are made. This should include information on the capital strategy and HRA.
3. That further information on the Consultancy Spend for Wood Green Regeneration be made available for consideration by OSC on 29 January before final budget scrutiny recommendations are made. This should include information on how the budget was spent in 2017/18 and what the budget will be used for during 2018/19.

52. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Christian Scade, Principal Scrutiny Officer, provided an update on the proposed work programme for the remainder of the 2017/18 municipal year.

During the discussion a range of issues were considered in relation to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). In response to questions, Emma Williamson, Assistant Director for Planning, suggested BNP Paribas be asked to attend a future Member Learning and Development session to explain the methodology for assessing viability for CIL setting and the reasons behind not recommending a rise in North Tottenham. The Panel agreed that this would be useful and asked that the delay to the increase in the CIL at Tottenham Hale be included.

AGREED: That subject to the comments above, the areas of inquiry outlined in Appendix A of the Work Programme Update be approved and recommended for endorsement by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

53. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to item 12 as shown on the agenda in respect of future meeting dates, and Members noted the information contained therein'.

CHAIR: Councillor Emine Ibrahim

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: Housing and Regeneration and Scrutiny Panel – 13th March 2018

Item number: 8

Title: Housing-Related Support for Older People – A Progress Update

Report authorised by: Charlotte Pomery – Assistant Director Commissioning

Lead Officer: Gill Taylor – Programme Delivery Manager (Housing Support)
x2847
gill1.taylor@haringey.gov.uk

1. Describe the issue under consideration

This report presents an update on the progress of the Housing Support Transformation programme in relation to older people. It recaps on the findings of the Supported Housing Review and describes some of the initiatives in progress to improve the quality and reach of housing support for older people.

The Housing Support Transformation programme is the name for the suite of recommendations approved by Cabinet in March 2017 at the conclusion of the Supported Housing Review.

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that Members note the progress described by the presentation.

This page is intentionally left blank

Housing Support Transformation Older People

Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Panel
Civic Centre
March 2018

Background

What is Housing-Related Support?

Housing-related support for older people is a preventative and early help provision designed to address homelessness, reduce social isolation and de-escalate and/or manage social care needs.

The council currently commissions the following services for older people:

- **1333** sheltered housing tenancies within Council owned stock, managed by Homes for Haringey (within this are 16 'step-down' properties)
- **609** sheltered housing tenancies commissioned with housing associations and older people's support providers
- **810** units of Community Alarm Service support
- **65** units of floating support

Residential and nursing care are not within the scope of housing-related support, but there is partnership working to enable step-up/downs and care packages to be delivered effectively as people's needs change.

Background

- The Supported Housing Review concluded in March 2017 with Cabinet approval of a suite of data, analysis and recommendations.
- As a joint project between Adults & Housing, the Review was an objective under Priority 5 of the Corporate Plan with clear links to Priorities 2 and 1.
- Its purpose was to consider **supply & demand**, and the efficacy of **support models** & built environments.
- The review was governed by a dedicated Project Board, a Members Working Group and monitored in P5.
- The outcome of the review was the Housing Support Transformation Framework: a 5-yr programme of change governed by four strategic principles.
- There are three specific recommendations for older people's services, with a further four relevant universal recommendations

Recap on Review Findings

Supply & Demand

- Less than 10% demand for this provision type
- Over-supply of low support provision
- High void rates across internal and external provision
- Need for 200 additional Extra Care units
- No provision for older people with LD/MH despite growing need
- A changing demand picture

Gaps

- Those with particular needs e.g. wheelchair users, have extended wait
- Need more adapted and specialist properties
- Need more preventative options and assistive tech development

Support Models

- Residents want more opportunities to remain independent, to share their skills & access health services
- Most residents have low or very low support needs, 10% of cohort have significant care needs.
- The outcomes of the service offer need to be modernised in line with tenant and strategic expectations
- Older people with LD & MH 'fall through the net' too frequently
- Inconsistent quality and availability of support dependent on individual scheme
- Very little bringing people from different backgrounds and experiences together, no intergenerational support

Built Environments

- Wide variance in building quality, location suitability & specification
- Communal spaces are routinely under used but are an excellent resource
- A number of good neighbour schemes are unsuitable e.g. no lifts, geography, mixed with general needs
- 9 properties identified for possible change; modernisation, redevelopment as Extra Care, return to General Needs or innovation projects

Principles for Change

- **Cross-cutting Prevention:** housing support services will prevent homelessness, reduce demand on supported housing and prevent escalation into residential care and unplanned hospitalisation.
- **Community Inclusion:** housing support should reduce social exclusion, isolation, stigma and multiple disadvantage by securing housing, work and wellbeing opportunities that bring diverse people and services together.
- **Integrating Support & Care:** bringing together services, professionals and commissioning functions will create more robust pathways of housing support & care. Our approach will ensure that people don't 'fall through the net', offer opportunities to secure better value for money and efficiency as well as taking greater advantage of available best practice and innovation
- **Commissioning for the Future:** maximising the reach of Council resources to meet the changing demographics and support needs of Haringey residents. Our approach should deliver improved value for money, improved collaboration with specialist providers and a housing support sector that can be responsive to the changing political and economic landscape.

The Recommendations

Recommendations	Progress
<p>To support Homes for Haringey to remodel the current supported housing offer for older people, moving to a hub and cluster approach with 8 open-access hub services spread equally between the east and west of the borough that will make better use of facilities as well as supporting older people in a more personalised way.</p>	<p>In progress – implementation is well underway, 8 hubs are in place, work is ongoing to develop new partnerships and service delivery practices, personnel in place.</p>
<p>To commit to building 200 units of Extra-Care provision in the borough by exploring the potential redevelopment of existing sheltered housing schemes for this purpose. This will start with in-depth appraisals of nine Council sheltered schemes as well as discussions with RSL's about other suitable sites in the borough.</p>	<p>On hold – the demand picture is more developed now than previously and further work is being undertaken before a further building appraisal occurs.</p>
<p>To increase the availability of floating support for older people to enable extended independence in the community and ensure earlier access to assistive technologies, adaptations and social inclusion activities</p>	<p>In progress – new commissioning models are being explored ready for commissioning process in summer 2018.</p>

The Recommendations

Recommendations	Progress
<p>To create the Supported Housing Tenants Charter that sets a foundation for our commitments to supported housing service users affected by changes as part of this programme</p>	<p>Completed - agreed at Cabinet in January 2018, comms strategy in progress.</p>
<p>To note that the Housing Strategy commitment to build new specialist housing should be rigorously explored for all new proposed development work in the borough to increase the available supply of supported housing</p>	<p>Ongoing – conversations are in progress around the Wood Green redevelopment.</p>
<p>That a commissioning practice should mandate improved and streamlined data collection and outcomes monitoring practices in supported housing as well as a commitment to provider collaboration that strengthens relationships between vulnerable people and their communities.</p>	<p>In progress - new outcomes monitoring practices in consultation, due to commence use in 18/19</p>
<p>To build on the proud LGBT history in Haringey by addressing the lack of data, professional training and visibility of the LGBT supported housing community, with particular focus on older and younger people, people from BAME communities and those with disabilities.</p>	<p>In progress - commissioned Opening Doors London & Wise Thoughts to work in our sheltered schemes in 18/19</p>

The Hub and Cluster Model

- This model aims to reinvigorate unused communal spaces by bringing in a range of new health, wellbeing and participation opportunities and partnerships.
- Hubs will become vibrant community spaces for older people living in and around the service; reducing social isolation, proactively addressing health issues and broaden the reach of Council resources.
- There are 8 HfH managed hub services across the borough, each attached to 3-6 cluster services.
- Hubs are staffed Mon-Fri and cluster services receive visiting support. All service users are able to access the Community Alarm Service.
- New partnerships have been formed with Jacksons Lane, Wise Thoughts and Local Area Coordinators with more to follow.
- Implementation; Homes for Haringey colleagues are working with Commissioning to agree a formal Service Level Agreement and performance management framework.

Activities in Progress

- A £1.3m improvement programme is underway at Larkspur Close
- Work has begun on a trailblazer intergenerational supported housing service for older people and young parents
- Consideration is being given to specifying a scheme for older people with learning disabilities in line with the needs and supply gap identified in the Review
- New protocols to use step-down properties for people needing short-term support after leaving hospital are in development
- Work is getting underway on further asset appraisal and development work recommended during the Review

Activities in Progress

- A Co-Production Group of HfH tenants meets monthly
- The Members Working Group has continued to support the Housing Support Transformation programme through it's delivery
- The Community Alarm Service is under review to improve clarity of the support offer available
- Work has commenced to design the future operating model for externally commissioned services

This page is intentionally left blank

Draft London Plan (2017) – Table of Representations: London Borough of Haringey

Introduction

Haringey welcomes the Mayor's draft London Plan, and broadly supports the majority of the provisions within it. The Council particularly supports the draft Plan's ambition to address key issues within the City, including housing affordability. The Council has a number of concerns however about whether the draft London Plan strikes an appropriate balance between various aspects and objectives relating to development and growth. We also have a number of concerns about the deliverability of several aspects of the Plan and the potential negative impacts of some of the policies. In some cases the Plan appears to stray into matters that are not of a strategic scale and reduces the scope for boroughs' Local Plans to provide a local response to these. The recognition that significant investment is required to deliver the plan is noted and the Council supports the Mayor's desire to secure more funding and investment powers from Government but this clearly remains a risk to the delivery of the Plan's objectives.

Haringey Council's detailed comments to the various policies are set out in the table below.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should any of the matters raised require further clarification.

Yours sincerely

Emma Williamson
Assistant Director of Planning.

Chapter 1	Planning London's Future (Good Growth Policies)
London Plan Policy:	Comments
GG1: Building strong and inclusive communities	This policy does address housing and thus the priority of the Plan - to address housing / affordability - which should be referenced in this policy.

Chapter 1	Planning London's Future (Good Growth Policies)
London Plan Policy:	Comments
GG2: Making the best use of land	There are potentially other development or neighbourhood typologies other than high density that represent the best use of land having regard to the local context and character. Reference to 'high density' in the introductory paragraph should be deleted.
GG2 (A)	The focus of development on areas that are well-connected by public transport, walking and cycling is supported. However, orbital public transport connectivity (particularly in outer London) is poor, meaning connectivity to local services can be inadequate and the current radial public transport network emphasises the primacy of central London at the expense of creating balanced communities in outer London. The draft Plan and list of infrastructure projects fail to ensure that outer London has the infrastructure required to support the significant level of growth envisaged.
GG3: Creating a healthy city	The principles of this policy are strongly supported.
GG4 (A)	The Council agrees that a step change is required to increase housing delivery. Councils across London have played their part in granting permissions for thousands of new homes but the rate of delivery remains low. This policy needs to be more robust in its aspiration to address this particular key barrier to raising completion rates to meet need.
GG4(B): Delivering the homes Londoners need	Haringey supports the principle of housing being genuinely affordable. It notes that Government approaches to affordable housing (e.g. "Affordable Rent" and intermediate rent products at up to 80% discounted market rent) do not result in housing that Haringey residents on average incomes within the borough can actually afford. In light of the public distrust of "affordable" housing that these products have engendered, and the likelihood that "genuinely affordable housing" will become an equally mistrusted phrase if it is not seen as genuinely affordable housing, Haringey would argue for a commitment in the Plan to social rented housing, rather than "London Affordable Rent".
GG4 (E)	Haringey supports the desire to seek faster build out rates for developments granted however. It is doubtful that Councils through the planning process will be able to address the issue and entrenched practice of land value capture through the selling of land with planning permission. It would be appropriate for the London Plan to specifically seek to address this strategic planning issue more fully, given that it is one of the more significant barriers to the delivery of housing and housing affordability.

Chapter 1	Planning London's Future (Good Growth Policies)
London Plan Policy:	Comments
GG5: Growing a good economy	Haringey supports this policy.
GG6: Increasing efficiency and resilience	Haringey supports this policy.

Chapter 2	Spatial Development Patterns
London Plan Policy:	Comments
Figure 2.1	In respect of Opportunity Area 14, this should be referred to as 'Wood Green'. Please delete reference to Haringey Heartlands to avoid confusion with the Council's new policy framework for this area.
SD1: Opportunity Areas	Haringey welcomes the Mayor's intention to support and assist growth in Opportunity Areas, and strongly supports Wood Green being identified as an Opportunity Area. However, the Council considers that the delivery of Opportunity Areas should be prioritised in terms of both housing distribution and in policy objectives. In respect of the latter, greater flexibility needs to be introduced to overcome policy constraints inherent in other parts of the Plan such as MOL and biodiversity & heritage conservation, recognising that, where compromise is justified, it results in more sustainable outcomes both within and without of the Opportunity Area.
Paragraph 2.1.1	Paragraph 2.1.1 indicates that Opportunity Areas are the capital's most significant locations with development capacity. In London boroughs such as Haringey, with the Mayor's proposed approach to suburban intensification, this is not the case as about one third of Haringey' housing target is anticipated to come from small sites outside the Opportunity Areas and not necessarily in areas as accessible to town centres and public transport nodes. This is similar to the ratio proposed in Table 4.2 for the city as a whole.

Chapter 2	Spatial Development Patterns
London Plan Policy:	Comments
	It is therefore apparent that ‘small sites’ and suburban locations are intended to make relatively the same strategic contribution as Opportunity Areas to providing the capacity to meet London’s housing needs.
Supporting London’s Growth	With respect to the housing and employment figures stated for each of the OAs, the Plan should clarify 1) the amount already delivered – noting that many of these areas and their capacities have been carried forward through a number of earlier iterations of the London Plan and; 2) the amount to be delivered within the current London Plan period. In not providing this detail, the Council considers that this runs the risk of giving a false impression of the actual capacity and contribution OA’s are to make to London’s growth needs.
Figure 2.6	The Council has been progressing a Wood Green Area Action plan to provide the positive policy framework required for the rejuvenation of the town centre and regeneration of the area west of the High Street. The AAP establishes a new housing target of 6,400 new homes and 4,000 jobs. These targets should be reflected in the Figure 2.6
Wood Green/Haringey Heartlands OA	<p>The Council would request that Paragraph 2.1.33 be amended to read:</p> <p>The Planning Framework should promote the opportunity to build on the area’s industrial heritage through new and refurbished workspace in the west of the area, and expand retail provision to reduce dependence on the High Road. It should also set out how site assembly and provision of better links between the town centre, and surrounding areas including Alexandra Palace Park hold the key to comprehensive development.</p>
SD2: Collaboration in the Wider South East	The Council welcomes the recognition in the Plan of this wider collaboration which is currently missing from the Mayor’s draft Housing Strategy. It is understood that the Mayor wants London to meet its own housing needs, but this does not take into account how the wider South East has historically supported London’s growth. The targets set for individual boroughs, particularly those in outer London are likely to be unachievable for a variety of reasons, including unrealistic small sites capacity, lack of affordable housing funding, and lack of funding for associated infrastructure. In addition the draft London Plan places additional constraints where they are not needed and where local areas should have more discretion taking account of local evidence base work and national policies. These will further limit potential which might otherwise have existed, e.g. review of green belt boundaries.

Chapter 2	Spatial Development Patterns
London Plan Policy:	Comments
	As such the Mayor should consider London's housing needs being addressed in the wider South East. Currently the Mayor's commitment is weak in terms of providing clarity on how needs will be met. Greater emphasis should also be placed on ensuring edge of London councils are explicitly considered as part of London's housing market for the purposes of Housing Market Area assessments to identify local housing targets and actively take account of meeting the needs generated within this area as a requirement of the duty to co-operate.
SD4: The Central Activities Zone (CAZ)	No Comment
SD5: Offices, other strategic functions and residential development in the CAZ	No Comment
SD6 (A) Town Centres	The Council supports the enhancement of the vitality and viability of town centres. The Policy should be strengthened further by ensuring the Mayor uses his planning powers to direct strategic retail development proposals to locate in the existing higher order centres. In the past we have seen new metropolitan centres emerge from district centres, to the detriment of existing metropolitan centres that are struggling to maintain their strategic role and function, and require such investment to rejuvenate and thrive.
SD6 (B)	Guidance on how this should be achieved at a London wide level should be detailed by the Mayor, to ensure a comprehensive approach in ensuring town centres do not decline.
SD6 (C)	The Council supports the principle of housing in town centres and has local policies to support this. Residential only schemes within the town centre are of concern however given Local Evidence and Plans to encourage mixed use developments to re-vitalise the Borough's centres.

Chapter 2	Spatial Development Patterns
London Plan Policy:	Comments
SD6 (E)	The Council supports the increase in housing and the managed re-development of existing office space. However, this should not be at the risk to the viability and vitality of the Town Centre. In order for LPA's to make a planning decision on the cumulative impact of Prior Approval, a threshold or guidance should be provided by the Mayor to justify planning decisions i.e. at what point (% losses, vacancy rates etc) would the impact of prior approval tip the balance towards retaining office space?
SD6 (J)	Ground floor residential is a sign that a parade or centre is in decline, and cannot support retail / employment floorspace. Residential use in these locations would not be reversible and would result in inactive frontages, the loss of vibrancy and vitality within centres and poor quality residential. Policy should allow for developments to be considered more in line with local evidence.
SD7: Town centre network (B)	The retention of Wood Green as a metropolitan centre is welcomed.
SD8: Town centres: development principles and Development Plan Documents	The Council supports this policy.
SD9: Two centres: Local partnerships and implementation	Haringey welcomes the encouraging policy to implement Article 4 directives to assist in the loss of office space within town centres.

Chapter 3	Design
London Plan Policy:	Comments
D1: London's form and characteristics	This policy is generally supported.

Chapter 3	Design
London Plan Policy:	Comments
D1(B)	The Council supports this policy. However, there is concern that this policy requires development to respond to the surrounding context, yet Policy H2 Small Sites is encouraging developments that may be substantially out of character with the existing area. This would be especially evident in outer London boroughs.
D2: Delivering good design	Whilst this policy is supported in principle as a means to identifying an areas capacity for growth, this level of assessment will be challenging in the context of resourcing and capacity constraints within Local Planning Authorities. Apart from conservation areas, many local authorities will not have detailed assessments of their areas.
D2: (E-G)	The use of Design Review Panels is supported by the Council and Haringey has established such a panel.
D3: Inclusive design	The Council supports this policy.
D4: Housing quality and standards	The Council supports the Housing Quality and Standards Policy. Greater clarity should be provided with regard to one bedroom, one person flats (not being set out as a studio) and greater detail on large-scale HMO/ 'Collective Living' arrangements - whilst these may assist in providing housing choice, they do not always provide a high quality standard of living.
D5: Accessible housing	This policy is supported. The supporting text could provide greater clarity on the extent to which it applies to new dwellings (i.e. new build and / or change of use / conversions).
D6: Optimising housing density	The Council supports the policy to ensure development make the most efficient use of available sites.
D7: Public realm	The policy is supported. There does however need to be recognition of the pressures on public finances to maintain the quality of spaces in the longer term, which is sometimes harder to achieve than the initial cost of installation.
D8: Tall buildings	The principle of the policy is supported.

Chapter 3	Design
London Plan Policy:	Comments
D9: Basement development	The Council support this policy.
D10: Safety, security and resilience to emergency	This policy is supported.
D11: Fire Safety	The Council supports this policy.
D12: Agent of Change	<p>The Council strongly supports the inclusion of the Agent of Change policy.</p> <p>The Council is however concerned about the ability for developments to satisfactorily mitigate noise in relation to policy E7 which seeks to intensify existing industrial estates/mixed uses etc. Even in the event that the proposed new development (being a sensitive receiving environment) may have measures in place, there is concern that this maybe insufficient to provide future users of an industrial park/site confidence to take up a lease/purchase the property. It is considered that agent of change should assume worst case scenario / impact i.e. B2 rather than for example, current B8.</p> <p>Whilst many buildings are able to incorporate further materials into the built fabric, this can end up having an impact on viability, which leads to potentially fewer contributions such as affordable housing.</p>
D13: Noise	The Council supports this policy.

Chapter 4	Housing
London Plan Policy:	Comments
H1: Increasing Housing Supply	The Council supports the intent of this policy, recognising the need to facilitate a substantial increase in housing delivery to address housing affordability within London.

Chapter 4	Housing
London Plan Policy:	Comments
	<p>The draft Plan proposes a significantly different approach to housing, with a much stronger reliance on windfall / small sites, particularly in Outer London; such a reliance on uncertain, unidentified windfall / small sites is considered contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework as the evidence that these sites will come forward is not compelling. The proposed housing target for Haringey is 19,580 homes (1,958 homes per annum), which is a significant increase over our current target of 1,502 homes per year. The Council is concerned about the scale and deliverability of this increase especially in relation to anticipated delivery on small sites and the current delivery of completions as opposed to consents.</p> <p>The Council notes that this is the largest single increase in the housing target in any iteration of the London Plan. But also that, while housing delivery overall has increased since the first London Plan, no previous increase in the target has resulted in a concomitant increase in housing delivery, As such, given that this is likely to result in the biggest gap yet between target and delivery, it is important that the Plan, and related documents such as the Housing Strategy, are much clearer on what can be done to improve the housing experience of Londoners until delivery rises to meet that target.</p> <p>Given the likelihood of an increasing gap between target and delivery, it is crucial that the London Plan address a London-wide approach to the Government’s housing test and Five Year Housing Land Supply. At the moment, borough’s such as Haringey have a significantly lower objectively assessed housing need applying the Government’s new standard method (1,148 dwellings per annum vs current strategic requirement of 1,502 and proposed draft strategic requirement of 1,958), and should therefore not be penalised if delivery falls short of the target, especially in the first years of the uplifted strategic target. This will certainly give rise to further local opposition to growth if unplanned development is imposed by way of grant on the grounds of not being able to demonstrate a 5YHLS.</p>
H2: Small Sites	<p>The Council acknowledges that small sites can potentially make a contribution to housing stock within the Borough. However, the significant increase in Haringey’s overall housing target is essentially attributed to the small sites target for the borough in the draft Plan. The Council has significant concerns about the small sites target for the borough. Our concerns are three-fold and relate to the proposed reliance on windfall / small sites, which the draft Plan indicates will contribute 626 dwellings per year out of the overall target for</p>

Chapter 4	Housing
London Plan Policy:	Comments
	<p>the borough of 1,958 homes per year (i.e. 32% of our overall target).</p> <p>Firstly, the Council has significant concerns about the methodology used to identify the housing capacity of small sites, noting that this methodology and approach to small sites were not discussed with boroughs prior to the draft targets being set. The Council considers the methodology is not robust, in that it uses a ‘proxy’ for potential housing yield from small sites rather than a detailed assessment of the potential capacity from the three potential types of small sites capacity identified in Policy H2 Small Sites of the draft Plan. The small sites targets set in the draft Plan are therefore not considered to be based on robust evidence and are most likely to be an overestimation of capacity. Such a reliance on uncertain, unidentified windfall / small sites is itself is considered contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires (paragraph 48) that there must be ‘compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens where Borough’s have a presumption against development on these.</p> <p>Secondly, the Council considers the small sites targets are undeliverable (although noted they are indicative, the table puts a presumption on Boroughs that developers will assume is an actual target). Haringey currently averages around 175 dwellings per year from small sites in a relatively supportive policy environment. The proposed small sites target of 626 homes per year therefore represents a significant increase from such sites. The proposed small sites policy and its presumption in favour of housing development on sites are unlikely to achieve such a significant increase in delivery of housing on small sites. The proposed Policy presumption in favour of small sites is un-tested and therefore not a reliable basis for setting targets. There is no evidence that the small to medium house builder market within London can grow to sufficiently to meet this target. Such small sites are often not implemented for some time following grant of planning permission, if at all. Further, it would seem to encourage speculation, to maximise land value uplift, where currently this is suppressed as a result of the uncertainty of windfall sites. There is no evidence that this will result in the additional numbers of housing from small sites being delivered above that already being achieved, and will not result in a new industry of selling small sites with permission at well above current market value.</p>

Chapter 4	Housing
London Plan Policy:	Comments
	<p>The Viability Assessment that forms part of the evidence base for the draft Plan arguably does not properly consider the types of developments that are envisaged by the small sites policy and the SHLAA methodology i.e. are these sites genuinely viable.</p> <p>As small sites generally deliver fewer affordable housing units, Haringey would argue for stronger affordable housing policies related to small sites to ensure they benefit the local community. This policy should require that contributions should usually be on-site, rather than off-site contributions. It should also be recognised that getting affordable housing on any small sites will require higher grant levels, as these sites are generally more expensive to deliver in our experience, mainly because there are no economies of scale and the abnormalities (which can be proportionately higher) are spread over fewer units.</p> <p>Additionally, Haringey has concerns about the usefulness of the design codes the draft Plan requires boroughs to prepare, given that there will be a wide variety of small sites and each one will have its own constraints and context; the codes are unlikely to give developers the certainty they seek in order to bring the small sites forward any more than the current local policy context.</p> <p>Thirdly, the Council has concerns about the ad-hoc and dispersed nature of sites coming forward through the small sites policy and the implications of this for infrastructure planning (for example, see transport below) and the Mayor's desire for 'good growth'. Such sites are also constrained with respect to how they can deal with other policy requirements such as flood risk / urban greening and Local Polices to protect the supply of family homes.</p> <p>Haringey also believes that the policy understates the infrastructure challenge. That is, it states that minor developments will only have incremental impacts on local infrastructure, that these impacts should be addressed by borough infrastructure delivery plans and that boroughs should not normally refuse permission for smaller development 'on the grounds of infrastructure capacity'. While this may have been defensible when small sites targets were smaller, the cumulative impact of a great many more small developments will produce a substantial need for more infrastructure.</p>

Chapter 4	Housing
London Plan Policy:	Comments
	<p>A further concern is that the NPPF (para 48 and 53) seeks to resist inappropriate development of residential garden land, where it would be harmful to the surrounding area. This national planning policy requirement has filtered through to the Haringey Local Plan where new development is directed towards town centres and key brownfield sites in the Opportunity Area. The Small Site Policy may result in the opening up of residential gardens. The Council query the soundness of this policy in relation to the NPPF. In addition much of Haringey is a Conservation Area and the development of garden land in these areas would have a detrimental impact on these conservation areas.</p> <p>Additionally, the removal of these (often) green spaces, would conflict with the Mayors strategy for London to be 50% green by 2041. Smaller schemes having to achieve a 'pass' in terms of table 8.2 (Urban Greening Factors), may be unreasonably burdened on providing greenspace etc above the 'net' loss of the existing space.</p> <p>Given this, and the relatively permissive policies that Haringey has in relation to encouraging housing schemes, it is unlikely that the unrealistic targets would be able to be achieved.</p> <p>Based on the above, the Council does not feel that it is in a position to offer a re-wording of the proposed policy, as the fundamentals of it (i.e. methodology, evidence base and deliverability) appear to be flawed.</p>
H3: Monitoring Housing Targets	The policy is supported, subject to reconsideration of the small sites target.
H4: Meanwhile Use	The Council supports the principle of this policy.
H5: Delivering Affordable Housing	The Council supports the underlying principle of this policy. Haringey is committed to the delivery of affordable housing as the first priority in residential led schemes. But some variation around this general principle should be able to be applied, where appropriate, to ensure that Councils can make the most appropriate use of their land having regard to a range of other planning objectives such as cross-funding the

Chapter 4	Housing
London Plan Policy:	Comments
	provision of new / improved infrastructure or as a catalyst for town centre renewal or employment-led regeneration.
H6: Threshold approach to applications	<p>The Council supports the threshold approach policy.</p> <p>However, the Council believes that introducing the higher Affordable Housing threshold just for public land should explicitly be identified as a transition phase to adopting this higher threshold on all land, as soon as it is demonstrated it is deliverable. But as noted in policy H5, it also needs to be recognised that Councils need to make the most appropriate use of their land having regard to a range of other planning objectives such as cross-funding the provision of new / improved infrastructure and this policy should not preclude such considerations.</p> <p>The Council also supports the use of review mechanisms where this assists in maximising affordable housing, especially in areas with rising residential values.</p>
H7: Affordable Housing Tenure	The Council supports this policy
H8: Monitoring of Affordable Housing	The Council supports this policy
H9: Vacant Building Credit	<p>The Council supports this policy but considers that an additional criteria should be added to Part B:</p> <p>The building has not been demolished prior to the grant of planning permission.</p> <p>The Council considers the above addition will prevent applicant seeking to circumvent Part C through demolition.</p>

Chapter 4	Housing
London Plan Policy:	Comments
H10: Redevelopment of existing housing and estate regeneration	The Council supports the overall intent of this policy. The Council supports the need to protect existing tenants' ability to remain on site in relation to their affordable housing needs and to ensure that affordable housing should be replaced on an equivalent basis..
H11: Ensuring the best use of stock	The Council supports this policy
H12: Housing size mix	The Council supports the overall intent of this policy.
H13: Build to Rent	The Council supports this policy
H14: Supported and specialised accommodation	The Council supports this policy
H15: Specialist older person housing	The general intent of this policy is supported although it should be strengthened with more definitive wording as to the applicable Use Class (e.g. Part C amend to read 'is considered as being in Use Class C3' and para 4,15.3 ' ...accommodation should be considered as is C3 housing:'). This removes any ambiguity.
H16: 16 Gypsy and Traveller accommodation	The Council is concerned that the draft Plan's definition of Gypsies and Travellers goes beyond Government policy and the reasons for doing so (paragraph 4.16.2) do not appear to be supported or justified by evidence. The onus is on the Mayor to demonstrate why the definition should depart from that of Government policy.
H17: Purpose-built student accommodation	The Council supports this policy and its emphasis on ensuring mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods.

Chapter 4	Housing
London Plan Policy:	Comments
H18: Large-scale purpose-built shared living	<p>The Council supports this policy although considers the Policy should include locational criteria setting out where such development would be more appropriate. It should also seek to avoid clusters of this particular typology dominating the provision of new housing within an area. Lastly, it should also expressly set out that such development should be car-free. The above will assist in avoiding proposals coming forward in quiet residential suburban streets resulting in unacceptable impacts on the existing residential amenity.</p> <p>The Council would encourage the Mayor to produce guidance for this form of residential accommodation. This should provide guidance on minimum standards, a ratio to determine a satisfactory level of communal space, and design.</p>

Chapter 5	Social Infrastructure
London Plan Policy:	Comments
S1: Developing London's social infrastructure	The Policy is supported
S2: Health and social care facilities	The Policy is supported
S3: Education and childcare facilities	The Policy is supported.
S4: Play and informal recreation	The Policy is supported
S5: Sports and recreation facilities	The Policy is supported.

Chapter 5	Social Infrastructure
London Plan Policy:	Comments
S6: Public toilets	The Policy is supported
S7: Burial space	The Policy is supported

Chapter 6	Economy
London Plan Policy:	Comments
E1: Offices	Haringey supports the overall proposed policies for Offices.
E1 (E)	Support for boroughs making Article 4 Directions to protect existing offices is welcomed.
E1 (G)	Support for lower cost and affordable workspace is welcomed in principle but this will need to be balanced with the impact of this on overall scheme viability, particularly in Outer London where new office space is likely to be part of mixed use development that is predominately residential (with associated affordable housing requirements).
E2: Low-cost business space	Haringey welcomes the principle of supporting the retention and provision of low-cost B1 business space but consider that further information is required with respect to what constitutes low-cost space (beyond that indicated in paragraph 6.2.2). Some space in Haringey is low cost due to it being poor quality, unsuitable size / configuration or offered on a short-tenure basis. Low-cost space that would support SME or start-up businesses needs to be low cost relative to the quality of space offered. The policy should give particular consideration to the provision of low cost workspace near to local and district centres. This will contribute to a mixed economy and support the day time economy.
E2 (B)	This policy should be expanded upon to reflect the considerations outlined in paragraph 6.2.4 as it currently makes no reference to 'viable existing business uses on site'.

Chapter 6	Economy
London Plan Policy:	Comments
E3: Affordable workplace	Haringey welcomes the support for affordable work space, the criteria outlined in Policy E3 and the recognition that boroughs may wish to include more locally specific policies in their Local Plan. As noted previously, the impact of affordable work space provision on broader scheme viability and the provision of affordable housing should be recognised in the policy. It is recognised that in some instances however that affordable work space will be required (and therefore prioritised) in order to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms (i.e. to offset the loss of existing space / businesses).
E4: Land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function	Haringey welcomes Policy E4's requirement of no net loss of industrial floorspace capacity (and operational yard capacity) as the Council's own evidence base supports the need to retain key floorspace within the borough.
E4(G)	Haringey supports the Mayor's view that Article 4 Directions should be used to assist in the retention of industrial floorspace; this is supported by the Council's own Article 4 Direction evidence for Warehouse to residential.
E6: Locally Significant Industrial Sites	The Council supports the principle of this policy.
E7: Intensification, co-location and substitution of land for industrial, logistics and services to support London's economic function	The Council supports the draft Plan proposals to retain industrial floor space within London / Haringey; this is supported by the Council's own evidence. Concern is expressed however about the ability for developments to satisfactorily mitigate noise – see response to Agent of Change D12.

Chapter 6	Economy
London Plan Policy:	Comments
E8: Sector growth opportunities and clusters	<p>Haringey supports this policy and notes the recognition of the need to promote economic development clusters in Outer London.</p> <p>The Council support the need for incubation and accelerator space.</p>
E9: Retail, markets and hot food takeaways	<p>Retail and hospitality benefit from services that increase footfall. Other services that should be encouraged would be libraries, health centres, recreation, and arts activities.</p> <p>Haringey recognises the concern regarding A5 hot food takeaway uses and obesity. The Council supports this Policy approach and has local evidence to justify it.</p>
E10: Visitor infrastructure	<p>The Council supports this policy. The bulk of the visitor economy will centre on the CAZ, however it will also at points overlap with the Outer London boroughs, particularly where those boroughs host specialist or niche assets. The London Plan should ensure Outer London Boroughs also benefit from “A sufficient supply of serviced accommodation for business visitors should be maintained”.</p>
E11: Skills and opportunities for all	<p>Haringey fully supports the Skills and Opportunities for All policy.</p>

Chapter 7	Heritage and Culture
London Plan Policy:	Comments
HC1: Heritage Conservation & Growth	<p>Haringey supports this policy, recognising that there needs to be a balance between providing growth within the Borough, whilst preserving and enhancing heritage assets within the Borough.</p>
HC3: Strategic & Local Views	<p>Haringey agrees that important local views require protection, and development within them must be dealt with sensitively (as outlined in Policy HC4 London View Management Framework).</p>

Chapter 7	Heritage and Culture
London Plan Policy:	Comments
HC4: London View Management Framework	The Policy is supported.
HC5: Supporting London's culture and creative industries	The Policy is supported.
HC6: Supporting the night time economy	The Policy is supported.
HC7: Protecting public houses	The Policy is supported and provides further weight to existing local policy.

Chapter 8	Green Infrastructure and Natural Environment
London Plan Policy:	Comments
G1: Green infrastructure (B)	The Council supports this policy, however the Mayor should assist with identifying what and where green infrastructures strategies should be undertaken. G1(B) needs to be strengthened to specify that the strategies should be reflected in local policy and decision making on planning applications / biodiversity offsetting measures.
G2: London's Green Belt	The Council supports the protection of Green Belt Land where robust, up-to-date Green Belt studies identify land as continuing to serve Green Belt purposes (consistent with the NPPF). Policy G2(B) is however considered to be inconsistent with the NPPF, as the statement that 'de-designation of Green Belt is not supported' makes no reference to the NPPF requirement that Local Plans need to be justified by evidence and Green Belt boundaries should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.
G3: Metropolitan Open Land	The policy is supported

Chapter 8	Green Infrastructure and Natural Environment
London Plan Policy:	Comments
G4: Local green and open space	The policy is supported. Types of Green Spaces should be identified, to increase the ability of providing an increase in biodiversity.
G5: Urban Greening	The Council generally supports this policy, and encourages the Greening of London, in an attempt to achieve the Mayors target of 50% green cover across the City.
G7: Trees and woodlands	The Council supports the retention of trees and woodlands.
G8: Food growing	The Council supports the policy to provide Food Growing within developments. However, the success of these is reliant on the future occupiers of the development. As such, any proposal for this, whilst supported, must be supported with a Management and Maintenance Plan to ensure its on-going success.

Chapter 9	Sustainable Infrastructure
London Plan Policy:	Comments
SI1: Improving air quality	The Council supports this policy. Further guidance is required with respect to what constitutes Air Quality Neutral and Air Quality Positive.
SI2: Minimising greenhouse gas emissions	The Council supports this policy and welcomes the energy efficiency targets within the policy.
9.2.1	It is unclear how Policy SI2 will apply to refurbishments in practice, as it is unclear what constitutes 'major refurbishment'

Chapter 9	Sustainable Infrastructure
London Plan Policy:	Comments
SI3: Energy infrastructure	The Council supports this policy.
SI4: Managing heat risk	The Council supports this policy.
SI5: Water infrastructure	The Council supports this policy.
SI6: Digital connectively infrastructure	The Council supports this policy.
SI7: Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy	The Council supports this policy.
SI8: Waste capacity and net waste self-efficiency	The Council supports this policy.
SI9: Safeguarded waste sites	The Council supports this policy.
SI10: Aggregates	The Council supports this policy.
SI1: Hydraulic fracturing (Fracking)	The Council supports this policy.
SI12: Flood risk management	The Council supports this policy.
SI13: Sustainable drainage	The Council supports this policy.

Chapter 9	Sustainable Infrastructure
London Plan Policy:	Comments
SI14: Waterways – strategic role	The Council supports this policy.
SI15: Water transport	The Council supports this policy.
SI16: Waterways – use and enjoyment	The Council supports this policy.
SI17: Protecting London’s waterways	The Council supports this policy.

Chapter 10	Transport
London Plan Policy	Comments
T1: Strategic approach to transport	<p>The Council agrees with a modal shift to more sustainable transport modes. Improvements however are needed to orbital public transport within outer London.</p> <p>The approach to small sites will focus a significant proportion of new housing within Outer London into areas with poor access to sustainable transport nodes and for which the Mayor has few identified and deliverable/funded infrastructure projects to address these.</p>
T2: Healthy Streets	The Council agrees with the Ten Healthy Streets Indicators/Principles.
T3: Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding	The Council supports the policy.

Chapter 10	Transport
London Plan Policy	Comments
	Amend paragraph 10.3.2 to mention the need to provide better orbital routes that would negate the need to travel into central London only to travel back out again. This would assist in reducing capacity pressure on the central stations (both rail and underground).
T4: Assessing and mitigating transport impacts	The Council supports the policy.
T5: Cycling	The Council agrees with ensuring adequate facilities for cycle storage for future developments.
T6: Car parking	The Council supports this policy.
T6.1: Residential parking	The Council supports this policy.
76.1(C)	
T6.2: Office Parking	The Council supports this policy.
T6.3 Retail Parking	The Council supports this policy.
T6.4: Hotel and leisure uses parking	The Council supports this policy.
T6.5: Non-residential disabled persons parking	The Council supports this policy.

Chapter 10	Transport
London Plan Policy	Comments
T7: Freight and Servicing	The Council supports this policy.
T8: Aviation	The Council supports this policy.
T9: Funding transport infrastructure through planning	The Council supports this policy. Haringey would note that Outer London Borough's do not currently directly benefit from Mayoral CIL, in terms of the improvements to public transport or other forms of sustainable transport infrastructure (improved cycle ways etc). The Council would support Mayoral efforts to bring Crossrail 2 to Haringey.

Chapter 11	Funding the London Plan
London Plan Policy	Comments
DF1: Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations	The Council supports this policy.

Chapter 12	Monitoring
London Plan Policy	Comments
M1: Monitoring	The Council supports this policy.

Report for: Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel – 13 December 2018

Title: Work Programme Update

Report authorised by : Mike Kay, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager

Lead Officer: Philip Slawther, Principal Committee Coordinator, 0208 489 2957, philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

**Report for Key/
Non Key Decision:** N/A

1. Describe the issue under consideration

1.1 This report gives details of the proposed scrutiny work programme for the remainder of the municipal year.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

N/A

3. Recommendations

3.1 (a) That the Panel considers its work programme, attached at **Appendix A**, and considers any areas of the work programme to be rolled over to 2018/19.

(b) That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be asked to endorse the carry forward of any areas of work, at (a) above, at its next meeting.

4. Reasons for decision

4.1 The work programme for Overview and Scrutiny was agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 17 July 2017. Arrangements for implementing the work programme have progressed and the latest plans for the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel are outlined in **Appendix A**.

5. Alternative options considered

5.1 The Panel could choose not to review its work programme however this could diminish knowledge of the work of Overview and Scrutiny and would fail to keep the full membership updated on the work programme.

6. Background information

6.1 The careful selection and prioritisation of work is essential if the scrutiny function is to be successful, add value and retain credibility. At its first meeting

of the municipal year, on 13 June 2017, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed a process for developing the 2017/18 scrutiny work programme.

- 6.2 Following this meeting, a number of activities took place, including various agenda planning meetings, where suggestions, including a number from members of the public, were discussed. From these discussions issues were prioritised and an indicative work programme agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in late July.
- 6.3 Whilst Scrutiny Panels are non-decision making bodies, i.e. work programmes must be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, this item gives the Panel an opportunity to oversee and monitor its work programme and to suggest amendments.

Forward Plan

- 6.4 Since the implementation of the Local Government Act and the introduction of the Council's Forward Plan, scrutiny members have found the Plan to be a useful tool in planning the overview and scrutiny work programme. The Forward Plan is updated each month but sets out key decisions for a 3 month period.
- 6.5 To ensure the information provided to the Panel is up to date, a copy of the most recent Forward Plan can be viewed via the link below:

<http://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RP=110&RD=0&J=1>

- 6.6 The Panel may want to consider the Forward Plan and discuss whether any of these items require further investigation or monitoring via scrutiny.

Recommendations, Actions and Responses

- 6.7 The issue of making, and monitoring, recommendations/actions is an important part of the scrutiny process. A verbal update on actions completed since the last meeting will be provided by the Chair and the Clerk.

Contribution to strategic outcomes

- 6.9 The individual issues included within the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel work programme were identified following consideration, by relevant Members and officers, of the priorities within the Corporate Plan. Their selection was based on their potential to contribute to strategic outcomes, specifically in relation to Priority 4 – “Drive growth and employment from which everyone can benefit” – and to Priority 5 – “*Create homes and communities where people choose to live and are able to thrive*”

7. Statutory Officers comments (Chief Finance Officer (including procurement), Assistant Director of Corporate Governance, Equalities)

Finance and Procurement

- 7.1 There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations set out in this report. Should any of the work undertaken by Overview and Scrutiny generate recommendations with financial implications then these will be highlighted at that time.

Legal

- 7.2 There are no immediate legal implications arising from this report.
- 7.3 Under Section 21 (6) of the Local Government Act 2000, an Overview and Scrutiny Committee has the power to appoint one or more sub-committees to discharge any of its functions.
- 7.4 In accordance with the Council’s Constitution, the approval of the future scrutiny work programme and the appointment of Scrutiny Panels (to assist the scrutiny function) falls within the remit of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 7.5 Scrutiny Panels are non-decision making bodies and the work programme and any subsequent reports and recommendations that each scrutiny panel produces must be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such reports can then be referred to Cabinet or Council under agreed protocols.

Equality

- 7.6 The Council has a Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not;
 - Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

- 7.7 The three parts of the duty applies to the following protected characteristics: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy/maternity; race; religion/faith; sex and sexual orientation. In addition, marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty.
- 7.8 The Panel should ensure that it addresses these duties by considering them during scoping, evidence gathering and final reporting. This should include considering and clearly stating: How policy issues impact on different groups within the community, particularly those that share the nine protected characteristics; Whether the impact on particular groups is fair and proportionate; Whether there is equality of access to service and fair representation of all groups within Haringey; Whether any positive opportunities to advance equality of opportunity and/or good relations between people, are being realised.
- 7.9 The Panel should ensure that equalities comments are based on evidence, when possible. Wherever possible this should include demographic and service level data and evidence of residents/service-users views gathered through consultation

8. Use of Appendices

Appendix A – Work Programme

9. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

- 9.1 External web links have been provided in this report. Haringey Council is not responsible for the contents or reliability of linked websites and does not necessarily endorse any views expressed within them. Listings should not be taken as an endorsement of any kind. It is your responsibility to check the terms and conditions of any other web sites you may visit. We cannot guarantee that these links will work all of the time and we have no control over the availability of the linked pages.

Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel – Work Programme 2017/18

Date	Agenda Item	Details / Desired Outcome	Lead Officer / Witnesses
22 June 2017	Terms of Reference and Membership	To note the terms of reference and membership for the Panel.	Christian Scade, Principal Scrutiny Officer
	Homelessness Supply and Demand	Presentation Homelessness Supply and Demand.	Denise Gandy, HFH Alan Benson, Housing Strategy and Commissioning Manager
	Cabinet Member Q&A	An opportunity to question Councillor Alan Strickland, Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning, on his portfolio.	Cllr Strickland, Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning
	Scrutiny Work Programme Development 2017/18	This report sets out how the foundations will be laid for targeted, inclusive and timely work on issues of local importance where scrutiny can add value.	Christian Scade, Principal Scrutiny Officer
	Urgent Item on Fire Safety	In response to the Glenfell Tower tragedy the Chair informed the Panel that an urgent item on fire safety would be considered.	Cllr Strickland, Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning
2 October 2017	HDV Update	Verbal update – this will be the first item on the agenda	Cllr Weston, Lyn Garner and Richard Grice.
	Property Licensing Update	This request was made following a verbal update to the Panel in February 2017 .	Alison Crowe, Programme Manager Cllr Ahmet, Cabinet Member for Environment

Appendix A

Date	Agenda Item	Details / Desired Outcome	Lead Officer / Witnesses
	What does “Good Growth” mean for Haringey?	What does “Good Growth”, as a concept, mean for Haringey, especially in terms of people, place and prosperity.	Peter O’Brien, Area Regeneration Manger
	Viability Assessments – Scrutiny Project Update	Monitoring of previous scrutiny recommendations following the Cabinet Response in January 2017 with a covering report to set the scene	Emma Williamson, AD Planning Dean Hermitage, Head of Dev. Manage. and Enf. Planning
	Scrutiny Project Work – Scoping Documents	To discuss and (formally) agree the scope/ terms of reference for project work below – see “project work”.	Christian Scade, Principal Scrutiny Officer
	Scrutiny Work Programme	Update – standing item.	Christian Scade, Principal Scrutiny Officer
7 November 2017	Budget Monitoring	An update on the financial performance / budget monitoring of services related to Priorities 4 and 5 of Haringey’s Corporate Plan.	Lyn Garner, Director of Regeneration, Planning & Dev Rita Bacheta, Senior Business Partner
	Plans to Reduce TA	As discussed with the Chair as part of the P5 dashboard briefing.	Denise Gandy, HFH Alan Benson, Housing Strategy and Commissioning Manager
	HDV Update	Standing item for 2017/18.	Dan Hawthorn, Director of Housing and Growth
	Scrutiny Work Programme	To consider and, where appropriate, update the Panel’s work programme for 2017/18	Christian Scade, Principal Scrutiny Officer

Appendix A

Date	Agenda Item	Details / Desired Outcome	Lead Officer / Witnesses
19 December 2017	Budget Scrutiny	To include scrutiny of the MTFs and HRA	Cllr Strickland, Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning.
	Preparation for the Homelessness Reduction Act	This item was requested following the Homelessness Supply and Demand Updates considered by the Panel in June 2017.	Denise Gandy, HFH Alan Benson, Housing Strategy and Commissioning Manager
	Scrutiny Work Programme	To consider and, where appropriate, update the Panel's work programme for 2017/18	Christian Scade, Principal Scrutiny Officer
13 March 2018	TA Joint Venture	To provide an update on Temporary Accommodation Joint Venture.	Alan Benson, Housing Strategy and Commissioning Manager
	Housing for Older People	To include an update on the Supported Housing Review although this item will also include other areas.	Gill Taylor, Programme Delivery Manager.
	Draft London Plan	To provide an update on Haringey's response to the Mayor's London Plan.	Emma Williamson, AD Planning.
	Social Housing Scrutiny Project – Draft Report	To consider the Panel's draft report and recommendations.	Philip Slawther, Principal Committee Coordinator
	Scrutiny Work Programme	To review work carried out during 2017/18 and to highlight issues to be rolled over to 2018/19.	Philip Slawther, Principal Committee Coordinator

FUTURE ITEMS – details and/or timings to be confirmed

- Rolled over from 2016/17

- Consideration of performance against housing supply commitments within the Council's policy framework. This was suggested by OSC as part of the Sale of Land at Kerswell Close Call-In – [minutes available here](#)
- The work of the Decision Panel (scope TBC)
- CIL issues – for further discussion with the AD for Planning

New Items put forward for consideration during 2017/18

- Estate Renewal Schemes
- Homelessness and Rough Sleeping – focusing in on the cost of emergency accommodation
- Intermediate Housing Policy
- Private Rented Strategy

PROJECT WORK

In-depth Scrutiny Work

- A project has been scoped focusing on the conditions and attitudes towards social housing in Haringey
- The scoping document, and terms of reference, for this review was agreed by OSC in October 2017.

Scrutiny in a Day

- To consider the impact of tall buildings and high density development on residents' way of life, including public health.
- This Scrutiny in a Day will take place towards the end of 2017 / early 2018
- The membership for this review may include representatives from the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel
- Work in this area still needs to be scoped

This page is intentionally left blank