

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HOUSING AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON THURSDAY 14TH MARCH 2019, 6.30 - 9.15 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Ruth Gordon (Chair), Dawn Barnes, Isidoros Diakides, Bob Hare, Yvonne Say, Daniel Stone and Sarah Williams

55. 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'.

56. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

57. URGENT BUSINESS

None.

58. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

59. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

A deputation request had been received from Faruk Tepeyurt on behalf of the Peacock Industrial Estate regarding the High Road West regeneration scheme. This request was not valid as it had been received on the day of the meeting and not at least five working days previously as required. Under the discretion of the Chair it was determined that the request be allowed to proceed nevertheless.

Mr Tepeyurt said that he is the elected spokesperson for the Peacock Industrial Estate where he runs a business, and was also speaking on behalf of the Tottenham business group. He said that the majority of the business community on the Estate are on record from a 2013 consultation that they do not object to regeneration but they do want to be a part of it and remain where they are. In November 2013 a petition with 4,000 signatures was submitted to Haringey Council against the Compulsory

Purchase Order (CPO) and what they regarded as a flawed consultation process but Mr Tepeyurt said that this was ignored.

Under the proposals Lendlease would be given a 250-year long term lease impacting on the 50 business entities on the Estate which currently employ around 250 people. Mr Tepeyurt said that the Council doesn't want to protect the existing employment opportunities. The Peacock Industrial Estate businesses want to have their own planning initiative and regenerate the area jointly. A pre-planning application has been submitted to the Council. However, Mr Tepeyurt said that Lendlease just wants the taxpayer to buy up the Estate's units at cheap rates and then transfer the assets to them. Existing businesses owners would become leaseholders instead of freeholders. Mr Tepeyurt said that a special scrutiny meeting should be held to discuss the problems of the Peacock Industrial Estate businesses regarding this regeneration scheme.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Tepeyurt said:

- That business owners were being asked to downgrade their ownership status from freeholder to leaseholder. As leaseholders they would have to pay ground rent and service charges which they don't have to do currently. This would be justified on the basis of the quality of the new units but the current units are good quality.
- The Peacock Industrial Estate's preferred option would be to remain in place but with better landscaping of the Estate to make it more welcoming. A second-choice option would be a mixed use development with industrial units, residential homes and green spaces from their own land. But Lendlease and the Council would also need to allocate space from their own land.
- Asked about problems with noisy industrial units operating near residential buildings, Mr Tepeyurt said that the proposals include plans for coffee shops, retail units and workshops but some businesses wouldn't be able to operate from the new workshops. If these businesses are going to be removed they should be relocated within a one-mile radius but there are no suitable locations. There is no plan for where these businesses and jobs will be going.

Cllr Gordon thanked Mr Tepeyurt for his presentation and acknowledged that this is an issue on which the Panel has a lot of questions. The High Road West regeneration is included in the Panel's 2019/20 work programme and would be scheduled after the Panel's current scrutiny review had been concluded.

60. MINUTES

The scrutiny officer to the Panel advised that some minor amends had been made to item 49 in the minutes of the previous meeting held on 21st Feb 2019 which related to a deputation on the issue of Wards Corner. The amendments were to add details of the occupations/roles of the people who spoke to the Panel and to add emphasis to make it clearer that comments made were from the deputation and not from the Panel

Members. With these minor amends added the minutes were agreed as an accurate record.

The action points from the previous meeting were then discussed. Following a deputation on child yield figures used for new housing developments at the Panel's meeting on 15th January 2019, the Chair of the Panel had written to the Leader of the Council recommending that the new figures be adopted by Haringey Council. In his response letter to the Chair of the Panel, the Leader of the Council had stated that the Council will be commencing a Local Plan review in October and that as part of this Haringey will be carrying out research along similar lines to Merton Council to establish a 'Haringey Child Yield'. A timetable for this work would be confirmed in due course.

In response to a question from the Panel, Dan Hawthorn, Director of Housing, Regeneration & Planning said that Merton Council has carried out their own local research in order to set an evidence-based local policy, otherwise the default position would be to use the GLA calculator. Haringey is proposing to replicate this method of research to establish the local conditions on which future calculations should be based.

Asked how long it would take to establish this policy using new calculations and hearing concerns from Panel Members that the process could take as long as three or four years, Dan Hawthorn acknowledged that changes to planning policy can take a long time due to the need to establish that there is a sound evidence base but that four years is over pessimistic and that two years may be more realistic. It isn't always necessary to wait until the end of that process before the new calculations can be used because the policy gains more weight the further it gets through the process. A more detailed response could be obtained from Emma Williamson, Assistant Director for Planning, who was not present at the meeting. (ACTION) Cllr Williams suggested that a political steer would also be needed from the Cabinet Member for Planning.

There had also been a number of other action points from the previous meeting on 21st February 2019:

- The Panel asked to receive the minutes that the meeting between Grainger and the Wards Corner market traders on 12th February 2019. The minutes had now been obtained and circulated along with a letter from Grainger to the market traders dated 29th January 2019. These documents would be considered as part of the Panel's scrutiny review on Wards Corner.
- The Panel had asked to receive written responses to questions from the Cabinet Member Questions agenda item that there had not been time to ask. A full list of answers had now been received and would be circulated to Panel Members.
- The terms of reference for the Tottenham landowners group and the Wood Green landowners group had been circulated to Panel Members as requested. Cllr Gordon expressed concern that paragraph 3.2 of the Wood Green group's terms of reference stated that the minutes of each meeting should be ratified at the following meeting and then published online, commenting that this would lead to a delay and that draft minutes ought to be published prior to the next

meeting in order to improve transparency. Peter O'Brien, Assistant Director for Regeneration, said that he would take this away as a suggestion for the group when the group reconvenes. The group as it is not currently holding meetings as the Wood Green Area Action Plan (AAP) is currently on hold and no date has been set for the next meeting. Asked why Ward Councillors were not being involved in the Wood Green landowners forum, Peter O'Brien said that this was the position taken by Members at the Housing & Regeneration sub-group of Cab. Cllr Gordon proposed that the suggestion that Ward Councillors should be involved should be raised with the Housing & Regeneration sub-group of Cab. (ACTION)

- A report including details of the timetable for the 16-month process required to change the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) rate, initially published in the Panel's agenda pack in January, had been recirculated.
- Further information had been requested on the review of the management process of CIL and the single integrated plan for the future of the Broadwater Farm estate but neither of these were available yet.

AGREED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21st February 2019 be approved as an accurate record.

AGREED: That a further response on the timetable for implementation of a new policy on child yield calculations be obtained for discussion at the Panel's next meeting in June 2019.

61. HIGH ROAD WEST UPDATE

Peter O'Brien, Assistant Director for Regeneration, introduced the report on this item. In September 2017 the Cabinet approved Lendlease as the preferred bidder for the High Road West regeneration scheme. As part of the agreement the Council agreed to acquire 145 social rented homes and 46 shared equity homes. Benefits of the scheme are set out in paragraph 1.3 of the report including a library and learning centre, improved public realm and a significant amount of business space.

A significant recent change has been the new condition for a ballot of residents recently introduced by the Mayor which will shape how the High Road West scheme proceeds. The new administration has set a major priority on the delivery of Council rented homes and has set officers the ambition to achieve a step change in the amount of Council rented homes in this scheme. This is critically important as shifting the mix of housing in the scheme impacts fundamentally on its financial viability so the Council is working with Lendlease and the GLA to bring additional resources into the scheme so that these ambitions can be delivered.

The ballot of residents will be accompanied by a 'Landlord Offer' which is the package of documents that the Council will put forward as part of the ballot including a local lettings policy which will set out how the new Council homes will be allocated. The quantum of additional Council homes in the scheme will enable more people to be taken off the housing register in the Borough and also addresses other forms of need

such as Temporary Housing residents. The Landlord Offer will also include a leaseholder offer and a document which sets out the broad vision of the High Road West scheme.

The Council made a number of commitments to local businesses in 2014 through the Business Charter and these are set out in paragraph 3.1 of the report. There are around 60 businesses in the High Road West area which are very varied and total around 200,000 sq/ft of floorspace. The proposals for the High Road West scheme include at least 200,000 sq/ft of non-residential space, including retail, business and leisure. Every effort will be made to re-accommodate as many of the existing businesses as possible but, given the fundamental change in the character of area, it is very challenging to envisage all businesses being re-accommodated. There are detailed discussions to be had with each business about their business requirements and aspirations which will take some time.

In terms of community engagement, a Resident Charter was created in 2014 which set out the residents' priority for development in the area and further input from residents was gathered through a residents' design panel set up in 2016. Further continuing resident engagement measures are set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report.

A dedicated rehousing team to facilitate the rehousing of Love Lane Estate residents has been established at The Grange which is the community centre opposite the Estate. The numbers of the various types of tenants has changed significantly since 2014 and the detail of this is set out in paragraph 5.3 of the report. A socio-economic programme is in the process of being established as part of the scheme, the major improvement works to White Hart Lane station are expected to be completed in autumn 2019 and the road surfacing work is expected to be completed in April 2019.

Cllr Say commented that the report had only reported only positive aspects but as had been heard through the deputation earlier in the meeting not everything was positive.

In response to questions from the Panel, Peter O'Brien and Dan Hawthorn said:

- On a planning application by Tottenham Hotspur Football Club for the Goods Yard site, which the Council was itself trying to acquire according to paragraph 3.5 of the report, he said that he was limited in what he could say about this but that parties often take a set of positions in relation to land in complex development sites. The Council has to focus on establishing the viability of the scheme and the right offer for residents after which they would be in a strong position to negotiate with third parties on any subsequent land deals.
- Asked whether the commitments to local businesses set out in the Business Charter, most notably Commitment 1 (opportunities to participate in regeneration) and Commitment 3 (valuation and compensation), actually match the offer to the Peacock Industrial Estate businesses, particularly given the shift from freehold to leasehold, the conversations with businesses are still at a very early stage and the question of the viability of the scheme is still to be resolved so this stage has not yet been reached.
- Asked about the thinking regarding the described change of character to the floor space and the potential for losing high quality jobs to be replaced with

semi-skilled or unskilled jobs, he said that the wider context had to be considered. Pressures that the Borough is trying to address include housing as a major priority and most remaining sites in London are complex and difficult. Employment generating space is another factor and many of the jobs on the Peacock Industrial Estate are relatively low density jobs and in a mixed use scheme there would be higher job density. Not all of the new jobs will be in the retail/leisure sector, there will also be a significant number of jobs in other areas.

- On the shift in the quantum of social housing in the scheme the Council is looking to at least double the numbers but, because of the scale of this, conversations will need to continue on achieving viability. It is currently difficult to answer questions about the amount or proportion of social housing while the conversations with Lendlease and the GLA are ongoing.
- On the socio-economic programme referred to in the report, the £10m commitment is a contribution from Lendlease as part of the agreement and this sum of money will come in over a 10-year period. A more detailed update about the nature of this programme could be circulated to the Panel. (ACTION)
- On why, according to the report, the number of resident leaseholders on the Love Lane Estate have decreased from 49 to 35 since 2014, this is because some properties have been acquired by the Council.
- On the demolition of the existing Council housing, it is clear from the consultation that the majority of the residents supported demolition of the blocks for reasons such as the quality of the housing. The judgment made at the time was that the uplift in the number of affordable homes would be worthwhile and that the existing residents would have the right to an equivalent home on equivalent terms. The new direction of this administration that wants 'direct replacement and more' leads us to the current position.
- Residents eligible to vote in the ballot will be all secure tenants, all temporary accommodation tenants who have been on the Council's housing waiting list for a year or more and all resident leaseholders. If the result of the ballot was 'no' then the GLA funding, on which the scheme depends, would not be provided. The options at this point would then be either not to proceed with the scheme or to make a revised offer to residents and then hold another ballot. If the result of the ballot was 'yes' then it could be another year to get through the planning process as this is a particularly large scheme and there is a wide range of stakeholders to engage with. The building itself would be a phased development over a period of approximately 10 years.
- On maintaining high quality jobs in the borough, the Borough Plan had been adopted the previous month which includes a commitment to quality jobs that give opportunities to local people as part of the wider local economy. Arrangements are also being put in place for the Council's economic development strategy. Some kinds of jobs, including light industrial, office and retail use, can co-exist with housing but some heavy industrial uses require segregation. Where those can't be accommodated in the High Road West scheme the Council will seek to find suitable alternative premises as close as possible.

- The new administration's commitment to build 1,000 new council homes is a net figure so those replacing demolished council housing will not count towards this target. Building homes ourselves is preferable but hitting this target, which involves a very large increase in the number of council houses being built, requires a mix of options and working with partners.

Cllr Diakides requested a briefing note on what public sector subsidies had been provided towards the scheme and also asked whether the Development Agreement could be made available to the Panel. (ACTION)

Cllr Gordon highlighted the Overview & Scrutiny Committee's ongoing scrutiny review into small businesses which fits in with the conversations on this scheme about the possible loss of high quality jobs so she would raise this with the Overview & Scrutiny Committee. The Panel is also concerned about the possible overall loss of Council rented homes.

The Panel moved on to questions about issues at the Love Lane Estate including the tenancies of the residents and as well as anti-social behaviour and repairs. Denise Gandy, Executive Director of Housing Demand at Homes for Haringey (HFH), reported that the Estates Watch scheme, which involves using CCTV and an intercom system in partnership with the Police, is being piloted including at Love Lane. This has enabled the gathering of evidence to support police action and the prevention of some people from gaining unauthorised access to the blocks. A detailed update from Astrid Kjellberg-Obst, Executive Director of Operations at HfH, could be provided in writing. (ACTION) A further update on the repairs issue could be provided by Chris Liffen, Executive Director for Property Services at HfH. (ACTION)

On the issue of the tenancies at Love Lane, Dan Hawthorn, Director of Housing, Regeneration & Planning, said that there is an important question when allocating housing about the fairest way of balancing the aspirations of the current Love Lane residents with others on the housing waiting list who may have been waiting longer. The proposed approach to striking that balance would need to be included in the Landlord Offer ahead of the residents' ballot.

62. SOCIAL HOUSING - SCRUTINY REVIEW UPDATE

The Panel asked questions about the updates provided in the report to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review on Social Housing that was originally published in March 2018.

Recommendation 3c – Cllr Diakides asked why there was still no change to the position as reported in July 2018 of a 40% borough-wide affordability target rather than a 50% target as recommended. Cllr Emine Ibrahim, Cabinet Member for Housing & Estate Renewal, said that this was predominantly a planning issue and so a response would be required from the Leader of the Council who leads on planning.

Alan Benson, Head of Housing Strategy & Commissioning, said that there were two issues in recommendation 3c, firstly the proportion of affordable housing required and

secondly the definition of affordability within this. On the definition, the Affordable Rent product referred to in the report is no longer being funded by the Mayor of London so there will be no more of that coming forward. In the revised appendix to the Housing Strategy which is going to Cabinet shortly that the Council's preferred option is social rented housing although some housing associations may still bring forward London Affordable Rent. There is a plan to bring forward a new Local Plan and a 50% target but that does take some time. Cllr Gordon suggested that a fuller discussion about the Local Plan should be scheduled at a future meeting. (ACTION)

Recommendation 4 – Cllr Barnes asked about the St Anns development site. Dan Hawthorn and Cllr Ibrahim said that the GLA is the landowner now and will be responsible for the procurement process. Haringey Council is involved in discussions as the planning authority and as a potential buyer of Council homes on the site.

Recommendation 9 – Cllr Say asked what could be done to ensure resident involvement of new social housing when it is not known who the future residents will be. Cllr Ibrahim and Alan Benson said that Homes for Haringey has a Resident Scrutiny Panel which could potentially be widened. Also there is a commitment that a design guide will be produced and put out for public consultation which will set out in detail what sort of buildings and the quality of homes that will be built in the future.

Recommendation 13 – Cllr Say asked for a timeframe on the fitting of sprinklers to high-rise blocks. Alan Benson said that the Government's recommendations on fire safety were still being awaited and this is important as it is not clear that sprinklers are the best solution in all situations so clarity is required from the Government as to what it expects the Council to deliver. However, funding has been set aside in the Housing Revenue Account budget to deliver fire safety works when required. Cllr Gordon reminded the Panel about the Overview & Scrutiny Committee's current ongoing fire safety scrutiny review and Cllr Ibrahim said that a lot of other work has been done on fire safety including with fire doors on Broadwater Farm.

Recommendation 16 – Cllr Say asked how long the "root and branch review" of estate service standards, that the report says is being carried out, will take. Denise Gandy said that she would obtain an update on this from Sean McLaughlin and share this with the Panel. (ACTION) Cllr Williams asked why Council tenants are having to pay service charges for street sweeping in addition to council tax. Cllr Ibrahim said that she had previously made enquiries about this issue as well and had been told that this is for communal areas only. A full response would be obtained from Sean McLaughlin. (ACTION)

63. Q&A - CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING & ESTATE RENEWAL

This item was curtailed due to time. Cllr Gordon said that this would have included questions on the review of housing management and housing demand services and on extending the Council's existing contact for the provision of information, advice and guidance services. Cllr Ibrahim said that housing review will be on whether using an Arms Length Management Organisation (ALMO) is the right way to continue delivering

housing services as some boroughs have brought these back in-house. This would be brought to Cabinet in April. The question on information services was about community organisations that the Council funds with which the contracts have come up for renewal.

Cllr Barnes asked for an update on the decant of Broadwater Farm and Cllr Ibrahim agreed to circulate an update in writing. (ACTION)

64. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

Signed by Chair

Date