

## NOTICE OF MEETING

# REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 14th January, 2021, 7.00 pm - MS Teams (view it [here](#))

**Members:** Councillors Sarah Williams (Chair), Gina Adamou (Vice-Chair), Dhiren Basu, John Bevan, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Justin Hinchcliffe, Peter Mitchell, Sheila Peacock, Reg Rice, Viv Ross, Yvonne Say, Daniel Stone and Preston Tabois

Quorum: 3

### 1. **FILMING AT MEETINGS**

Please note 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. 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', 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 dealt with under the agenda item where they appear. New items will be dealt with at item 8 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. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 14)**

To approve the minutes of the meetings held on 2, 5 and 29 October 2020.

**6. PLANNING SERVICES 2020/21 QUARTER 3 UPDATE (PAGES 15 - 28)**

A report on the work of the Planning Service during October to December 2020.

**7. INFORMATION REPORT RESPONDING TO MEMBER COMMENTS IN THE REVIEW OF MEMBER ALLOWANCES THAT REGULATORY COMMITTEE SHOULD BE FORMALLY RECONSTITUTED AS TWO SEPARATE COMMITTEES - A PLANNING COMMITTEE AND A LICENSING COMMITTEE**

Report to Follow

**8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

To consider any new items of urgent business admitted under agenda item 2 above.

**9. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

The date of the next meeting has been moved to 25 February 2021.

Emma Perry, Principal Committee Co-ordinator  
Tel – 020 8489 3427  
Fax – 020 8881 5218  
Email: emma.perry@haringey.gov.uk

John Jones  
Monitoring Officer (Interim)  
River Park House, 225 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8HQ

Wednesday, 06 January 2021

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SPECIAL REGULATORY COMMITTEE HELD ON FRIDAY, 2ND OCTOBER, 2020 – 10.00am – 10.05am**

**PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Sarah Williams (Chair), Peter Mitchell, Reg Rice, Viv Ross, Yvonne Say and Daniel Stone**

**1. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair informed all present that the meeting was being streamed live on the Council's website.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Basu and Hinchcliffe.

**3. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**5. ESTABLISHMENT OF PLANNING AND LICENSING SUB COMMITTEES 2020/21**

**RESOLVED that:**

1. The terms of reference of the Regulatory Committee as set out within the Council's Constitution, attached as Appendix 1, be noted and the terms of reference of the Planning and Licensing Sub-Committees, attached as Appendix 3 to the report, be confirmed.
2. The establishment of a Planning Sub-Committee and two Licensing Sub-Committees, with the memberships set out in Appendix 2 to the report, be approved, as follows:-

Planning Sub Committee:

Councillor Williams (Chair)  
Councillor Adamou (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Basu  
Councillor Bevan  
Councillor Cawley-Harrison  
Councillor Hinchcliffe

Councillor Mitchell  
Councillor Rice  
Councillor Ross  
Councillor Say  
Councillor Stone

Licensing Sub A:

Councillor Williams (Chair)  
Councillor Rice  
Councillor Cawley-Harrison

Licensing Sub B:

Councillor Adamou (Chair)  
Councillor Say  
Councillor Ross

- 3.3 The provisions in the Committee Procedure Rules, Part 4, Section B of the Constitution covering substitution arrangements for Committees and Sub-Committees, be noted. Additional delegations are made to the Democratic Services Manager (Part 3, Section E paragraph 1.5 of the Constitution), attached at Appendix 4ii to this report, for the appointment of a substitute Member for a Licensing Sub-Committee from among the Members of the Regulatory Committee when the permanent Sub-Committee Member is unable to attend for any reason.
- 3.4 That it be noted that the Council Procedure Rules in Part 4 Section B of the Constitution do not apply to licensing hearings only in those areas where they conflict with the Local Licensing Procedure Rules and the relevant Acts and Regulations which take precedence.

**6. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

The next meeting was taking place on 14 January 2021.

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

## **MINUTES OF MEETING REGULATORY COMMITTEE HELD ON Monday, 5th October, 2020, 7.00 – 8.50PM**

### **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Sarah Williams (Chair), Gina Adamou (Vice-Chair),  
John Bevan, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Peter Mitchell, Reg Rice, Viv Ross  
and Yvonne Say**

#### **1. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair informed the Committee that the meeting would be live streamed on the Council's website.

#### **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Basu, Hinchcliffe and Peacock

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Bevan and Stone.

#### **3. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

#### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **5. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings held on 6 June, 14 June and 13 July 2020 be approved as a correct record.**

#### **6. PLANNING SERVICES 2020/21 QUARTER 2 UPDATE**

Rob Krzyszowski, Interim Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability, introduced the report, as set out in the agenda. Each service head would introduce their section of the report.

Dean Hermitage, Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Planning, introduced the section of the report entitled Development Management, as set out in the agenda. Mr Hermitage amended the figure for the number of cases on-hand at the end of August 2020, which should have been 447 and not 513. He explained that there had been a peak in the number of enforcement complaints received during the lockdown period, as well as a backlog of sites.

Members of the Committee raised the following questions and observations on the report and appendices:-

- In response to a question regarding the threshold for the overturns for refusals, it was explained that the threshold should remain at 10% or below. It was noted that it would currently take two or more losses to take the figure above the threshold.
- The planning statistics for major applications were reported every quarter to MHCLG (The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) and every Council was also required to publish these on their website.
- In response to a question regarding enforcement figures, it was explained that the service currently served on average around 90-110 notices per year. This meant that the Council had the 10<sup>th</sup> highest number of notices served of any other local authority last year, and the 5<sup>th</sup> highest the year before that.
- It was confirmed that member training on conservation areas would be added to the list of future training topics.
- Mr Hermitage would speak to the enforcement team to ensure that members were being sent out the results of enforcement cases, where requested, and would also follow up any of those requested personally by Councillor Bevan. It was confirmed that the two appeal sites pending related to the hardware store application on West Green Road and the demolition of a large 1920s house in Highgate.
- With regard to the correct site address being given for the Bridge Castle Museum site, it was stated that some sites were subject to registered addresses, however Mr Hermitage agreed to take this away and look into the matter.
- It was confirmed that the timescale for the determination of planning applications was dependent on the type of planning application. Minor and other applications was 8 weeks, Majors were 12 weeks and those with an environmental impact assessment took 16 weeks. The majority of applications were determined within the target of 56 days. It was noted that major applications that took a long time to determine, such as the new Tottenham Hotspur Football Ground, would have an impact on these figures. It was also confirmed that there had been no leeway given for any delays caused by Covid-19.
- Reference was made to paragraph 5.12 of the report and it was confirmed that 10 council homes out of the 111 homes in total related to applications where the Council was the applicant.

Brice Tudball, Planning Policy Manager, introduced the section of the report entitled Planning Policy & Infrastructure plan policy update – pages 9-11 in the agenda.

Members of the Committee raised the following questions and observations on the report and appendices:-

- In response to a concern raised that there was no recognition of industrial space in the borough and the provision of land for employment, it was explained that key issues of the supply and demand for employment land in the borough would be addressed in the Local Plan.
- In response to a question regarding the sewage works at Pinkham Way, it was stated that there had been a lack of detail in the sub version of the NLWP (North

London Waste Plan) regarding the list of appropriate uses for the site, potential flood risks across the site and suitable future development for the site.

- Reference was made to CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) and whether the level could be increased again post Covid. In response, it was stated that an increase in CIL had been proposed for residential uses and some developments in the East of the borough, accompanied by a robust viability assessment. It was noted that Covid would be taken into consideration by the Inspector, however they would not be able to recommend that the Council reduce their rates post Covid.
- In response to a question regarding the cycling and walking action plan and the school streets action plan, it was stated that they had not been referenced in the report as they were not within the pure planning remit. The cycling and walking action plan was due to go to Cabinet before the consultation took place and was expected to be adopted in 2021. The cycling and walking plan had actually been sped up as a result of Covid, due to the provision of temporary cycle routes. The school streets action plan had also been delayed and was expected to be published in Spring/Summer 2021. This was as a result of urgent interventions surrounding social distancing requirements outside schools. It was noted that there was capital in the capital programme, so the project was not reliant on TfL funding.
- It was explained that Highgate school had SPD (Supplementary Planning Documents), as there was a clear commitment in the local plan and imminent planning applications for the school. It was important to ensure that residents could engage in the SPD, following the initial approval by Cabinet in March 2020. The team were looking to restart the process soon.

Bob McIver, Head of Building Control, introduced the section of the report entitled Building – pages 11-13 in the agenda. Mr Iver stated that the income and applications received by the building control service had reduced as a result of Covid. However, they had started to see a rise in the number of applications received over the past 4 weeks. The service had also made an application to the Government's compensation scheme due to the loss of income.

Members of the Committee raised the following questions and observations on the report and appendices:-

- It was recognised that some developers had chosen not to use the Council's building control service and had decided to go to a private company. In response, Mr McIver was unsure of the reason for this but stated that there was around a 50/50 split of people using the Council and going to a private company, of which there were quite a few. It was believed that there was a number of reasons for this, with costs being a big consideration. The Council also carried out a number of inspections and some developers may choose to go elsewhere where there were not so many checks. He was currently working with colleagues in Development Management to try to resolve this problem.
- In response to a question regarding the Grenfell inspection and the service's expertise, Mr McIver confirmed that all of the surveyors within the service had undertaken their level 6 fire safety qualification. The Government had asked for a review, which had issued 53 recommendations, with one of the issues being the choice of provider. A Building Safety Bill was coming in for in-scope buildings,

with a building safety review, to be undertaken by the Health & Safety Executive. Concern was raised regarding in-scope buildings and those without residential accommodation which were over 18m, which were not covered by the Local Authority building control team.

- In response to a question regarding the workforce and the possibility of offering apprenticeships, it was stated that this had been discussed with HR. The suggestion had been to downgrade vacant building surveyor posts to allow an apprentice to come in. The issue being raised was that once the apprentice was trained and fully qualified, there was currently no post for them to go into and they often then left the Council to take up another opportunity elsewhere. This was an ongoing issue which the Chair also agreed to look into, in liaison with officers.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

### **7. NEW HARINGEY LOCAL PLAN - FIRST STEPS ENGAGEMENT**

Rob Krzyszowski, Interim Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability, introduced the report, as set out in the agenda.

Bryce Tudball, Planning Policy Team Manager, outlined the report and the appendices, as set out in the agenda.

Members of the Committee raised the following questions and observations on the report and appendices:-

- It was felt that the images used on pages 58 and 128 of the gun shop were inappropriate.
- A number of minor mistakes in the word processing of the document were identified, which needed to be amended.
- Pages 69 – the opportunity for new leisure and cultural provision listed on page 70 should also be listed on page 69.
- It was believed that the green space referred to on the map on page 117 was Muswell Hill golf course.
- The number of wards identified on page 203 should be 9 and not 8 as listed.
- It was important to be consistent with the use of either old or new Wards.
- It was felt that the image used for the cycle superhighway should be more inclusive.
- Could an update be given on Cross Rail 2 as it was felt that a lot of the information was based on this.
- Pages 49 and 55 – it was felt that the colours used made it difficult to read the information in the various panels.
- Page 97 – the use of the image used on this page could be contentious.
- Some of the language used was not accessible for every reader. It was felt that the document was too large and should be structured in a way on the website that it could be split up into sections, to be make it more accessible.
- Members questioned who would carry out the consultation work.
- Page 50 – did all of the borough's parks have a green flag now?



- Page 51 – it was suggested that the jobs statistics from June 20 are dated and may not reflect the latest position. It was requested that the document provide more up to date information if available.
- Page 86 – The map only identified one tube station but did not reflect the nearby tube stations in neighbouring boroughs.
- Page 87 – The Odeon cinema had changed to an Everyman cinema around 3 years ago.
- Page 100 – it was unclear how the Council's proposal to secure affordable housing from developments of all size fits with the Government's consultation proposal to increase the affordable housing threshold.
- Page 101 – it was important that developers build affordable housing rather than accept payments in lieu; this also applies to securing carbon neutral developments rather than accepting offsets.
- Page 203 – it was questioned where the information was sources regarding the level of deprivation in the borough.
- It suggested that the RNLB could be used to ensure that the document was accessible.
- Page 301 – was the BMG survey up to date?
- Look at the issue of car free developments and workmen and women not being able to park their vans.
- Page 42 – the Air Quality Action Plan was not listed as part of the strategies.
- Like to see some engagement with some of the new community groups that had started in the area linked to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- The use of social media and digital advertising was questioned.
- It was questioned whether there was the opportunity to engage with schools directly, rather than purely through a bulletin.
- The opportunity of using any vacant premises within high streets for pop up engagement and consultation units was raised.
- Page 301 – It was suggested that Gender Identity should be considered within the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) as well as socio-economic equalities
- Page 209 – It was suggested that the average life expectancy was decreasing in Haringey and that the IIA may be incorrect
- Page 210 – was there any information on the new health care provision in Muswell Hill being referred to.
- Page 248 – it was questioned whether the street names review was still taking place.

The following was provided in response to the questions and observations from the Committee:

- In response to the issue raised regarding Cross Rail 2, Mr Kyzyszowski explained that Local Plan right to have some mention of CR2 but should not be dependent on CR2 as happening slowly/significantly delayed from original timetable.
- Mr Tudball acknowledged the typing errors and requests for image changes and confirmed that they would be amended.
- In response to concerns raised regarding the size of the document, it was confirmed that a summary document of around 20-30 pages would be produced,

as well as a dedicated web page with the First Steps document being split into different sections.

- Mr Tudball confirmed that the planning policy team would carry out the consultation and that they had been engaging with the council's corporate communications team in relation to the consultation strategy and implementation.
- Clarification would be sought if all of the borough's parks were green flag parks.
- The economy sections of the document would be updated to reflect latest furlough data and number of people receiving universal credit, if available.
- In response to a question regarding affordable housing, it was explained that the Council had set out strong opposition to the Government's proposal to increase the affordable housing threshold. If policy and evidence was supportive the New Local Plan would seek to secure affordable housing contributions from schemes of all sizes.
- In response to a question regarding sites being carbon neutral, Mr Krzyszowski advised that the proposed approach was for this to be done on site as a default, and the evidence base in support of this was currently being strengthened.
- In response to a question regarding the level of deprivation within the borough, it was explained that this had been derived from the index of multiple deprivation. However, this information would be double checked.
- It was explained that a 2018 survey had been listed as background to the Communications and Engagement Plan, as officers were keen to understand consultation data we already hold and not to ask for duplicate surveys to be carried out.
- The transport section of the First Steps document included consideration of car free development and circumstances where this may not always be an appropriate option.
- It was confirmed that the Lead Cabinet Member had been updated in the Foreword of the documents published for Cabinet.
- The Air Quality Action Plan would be added to the list of strategies referenced in the First Steps Engagement document.
- The Planning Policy Team was working up a detailed implementation plan in relation to the upcoming consultation, detailing digital advertising, pop ups etc.
- The team were keen to engage with younger people and were looking at the best ways to do this.
- Further clarification would be provided in relation to the Muswell Hill new health care facility.

### **RESOLVED that:**

- 1) The New Haringey Local Plan: First Steps Engagement consultation document (Appendix A) be commented on and noted;
- 2) Cabinet be recommended to approve for public consultation, in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the New Haringey Local Plan: First Steps Engagement consultation document (Appendix A);

- 3) Cabinet be recommended to delegate authority to the Interim Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability to agree the final version of the New Haringey Local Plan: First Steps Engagement consultation document, and other supporting material to be produced for consultation purposes including the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) Scoping Report, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability to the extent that any changes to the versions approved by Cabinet are non-material (examples of changes permitted shall include minor text, layout and design changes as well as changes needed for clarification and for consultation purposes).

## **8. RECENT GOVERNMENT ANNOUNCEMENTS ON PLANNING**

Rob Krzyszowski, Interim Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability, introduced the report, as set out in the agenda.

Members of the Committee raised the following questions and observations on the report and appendices:-

- In response to a question regarding the proposed changes to the current planning system and whether the Government had given a timescale for this, it was explained that the proposal was to bring some secondary legislation later this year. It was however felt that this was optimistic and that full implementation could not be achieved by the end of this year.
- Reference was made to some information in appendix A also being included in appendix B, especially around the determination of affordable housing. In response it was confirmed that this would be made clear in both appendices in the final version.
- Concern was raised regarding the levy and whether it would disadvantage Haringey. In response, it was explained that further detail was required from the Government to understand the impact of the proposals. Mr Tudball added that the service would not agree with a standardised national levy, which would disadvantage Haringey due to the differing values across the country and London. This point had been made clear in their response.

### **RESOLVED that:**

- A) The response to the changes to the current planning system consultation, which was submitted on 1 October 2020, be noted.
- B) The Regulatory Committee provide comments on the draft response to the Planning for the Future White Paper ahead of its submission by 29 October 2020.

## **9. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

## **10. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

14 January 2021

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SPECIAL REGULATORY COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, 29TH OCTOBER, 2020**

### **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Sarah Williams (Chair), Gina Adamou (Vice-Chair), Dhiren Basu, John Bevan, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Peter Mitchell, Sheila Peacock, Reg Rice, Viv Ross, Yvonne Say and Daniel Stone**

#### **1. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair informed the Committee that the meeting would be live streamed on the Council's website.

#### **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Hinchcliffe.

#### **3. URGENT BUSINESS**

It being a special meeting of the Regulatory Committee, under Part 4(B), paragraph 17 of the Council's Constitution, there was no other business to be considered.

#### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **5. LICENSING ACT 2003 REVIEW OF LICENSING POLICY 2021-2026**

Daliah Barrett, Licensing Officer, introduced the report, as set out in the agenda. Ms Barrett explained that the Regulatory Committee at its meeting on 6 July 2020 had agreed that amendments to the Statement of Licensing Policy (SOLP) should be consulted on. The consultation took place for an eight-week period, which ended on 21 August 2020. Responses had been received from a local resident, a Responsible Authority and the O&S Committee. The report considered the responses to the consultation and their effects on the draft SOLP.

Details of the responses for public consultation on this revision were set out at Appendix B to the report.

Reference was made to the addendum paper previously circulated to members which referred to Table 1 at paragraph 5.5 of the report and clarified the page reference numbers within the agenda pack.

The following was provided in response to questions and comments from the Committee:

- In response to a request for the Police to provide a short report to Licensing Sub-Committee meetings, responding to representations made, the Licensing Officer confirmed that regular meetings took place with Police colleagues and this matter would be raised with them.
- Page 3 – In response to a question regarding alcohol related data, it was explained that the way in which data was gathered had changed and the Council's analyst now gathered this data.
- Page 14 – the introduction from the Cabinet Member should be amended to reflect a more general Covid-19 update, given the changing circumstances surrounding the pandemic.
- Page 18 – the wording for schools ratings should be consistent.
- Page 19 – it was questioned whether the figures surrounding domestic abuse were correct. It was noted that these figures would be checked with Public Health.
- Page 21 – New pavement licence, it was questioned whether there was a statutory appeal process. In response, it was stated that Government guidance suggested that an appeal could be carried out.
- Page 22, paragraph 3.32, it was suggested that the first sentence be deleted.
- Page 25, paragraph 5.11, in response to a question regarding the 'Ask for Angela' campaign, it was explained that this was a campaign added to all licences. The wording would be looked at in the policy.
- Page 25, paragraph 3.13, Ms Barrett would check with Public Health what the second leading substance being referred to was.
- Page 30, paragraph 10.4 – in response to a question regarding a 'relevant' offence, it was confirmed that this was included in the information provided to personal licence holders.
- Page 38, paragraph 16.8 – in response to a question regarding what happens when an annual fee was not paid, it was confirmed that the licence would be suspended.
- Page 39, paragraph 16.9, the sentence was incomplete.
- Page 39, paragraph 16.10 – It was questioned whether reference could be added for adherence to the Challenge 25 scheme. In response, it was confirmed that a challenge 25 condition was added to every licence where alcohol was being supplied.
- Page 40, paragraph 16.13, it was felt that the wording of this paragraph was inconsistent with the message surrounding licensing conditions.
- Page 41, paragraph 17.7, it was suggested that this should be amended to refer to premises within a defined area during match days. Ms Barrett confirmed that she would look at this to ensure that it was clear.
- Page 41, paragraph 17.2, clarification was sought whether the idea of a cumulative impact policy would be considered.
- In response to a question regarding proxy buying of alcohol, it was explained that the Police used cadets for this operation, however this was currently

stopped during the Covid-19 pandemic. Trading standards officers were aware of this issue.

- In response to concerns raised regarding alcohol and school children, it was explained that Public Health did carry out an alcohol campaign and provided talks in schools.
- Page 43, paragraph 18.7 – MS Barrett to look at whether the last bullet point regarding DVDs was now needed.
- Page 44, paragraph 18.11 – Ensure that GDPR was also referred to.
- Page 47 – more guidance was sought regarding how cheap, strong alcohol was defined. The Licensing Officer confirmed that this was a mandatory condition and that trading standards officers did carry out checks on this.
- Page 47, paragraph 9.15, it was suggested that persons who were alcohol-dependent may be drawn to particular premises if they were licensed to sell alcohol at earlier times than other premises. It was also felt that this could be the case for later opening times also.
- Page 48 – In response to a question regarding CCTV, it was confirmed that some premises kept the recordings for a period of 28 days also.
- Page 50, paragraph 20.4, it was confirmed that the code of practice was still under review.
- Page 69 – Ms Barrett would look at the list of addresses for the location of various teams within the council and ensure that they were correct.
- Page 75 – In response to a question regarding alcohol deliveries, given the changing environment, it was explained that the sale of alcohol was what was covered in the policy and that was what was being conditioned.
- In response to a request for clarification regarding the licensing and planning regimes, it was explained that although these were separate, there were instances where the hours of operation within the planning permission were considered, to ensure these were aligned with the licensing conditions.

The Licensing Officer noted the comments made by the committee and would make the minor amendments to the policy, where necessary. The Chair added that this was a live document which would be operational for the next 5 years and therefore there would be items added or amended during this time, where appropriate.

### **The Committee RESOLVED:-**

- 1. To accept the changes and proposed further amendments following the public consultation.**
- 2. To refer the latest revision of the policy to Full Council for ratification.**

## **6. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

14 January 2021

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....



**Report for:** Regulatory Committee - 14 January 2021

**Title:** Planning Services 2020/21 Quarter 3 Update

**Report authorised by:** Rob Krzyszowski, Interim Assistant Director, Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability

**Lead Officer:** Dean Hermitage, Head of Development Management  
Bryce Tudball, Planning Policy Team Manager  
Bob McIver, Head of Building Control

**Ward(s) affected:** N/A

**Report for Key/  
Non Key Decision:** For information

1. **Describe the issue under consideration**  
A report on the work of the Planning Service during October to December 2020.
2. **Recommendations**  
That this report be noted.
3. **Reasons for decision**  
Not applicable.
4. **Alternative options considered**  
This report is for noting and as such no alternative options were considered.
5. **Planning Services 2020/21 Quarter 3 Update**

#### **Development Management**

- Applications during 2020/21 (1<sup>st</sup> April – 15<sup>th</sup> December): **2,280**
- Applications in same period 2019/20: **2,270**
- Number of cases on-hand end of November 2020: **549**
- Appeals decided during 2020/21 (1<sup>st</sup> April – 15<sup>th</sup> December): **39**
- Appeals dismissed (won) during 2020/21 (1<sup>st</sup> April – 15<sup>th</sup> December): **31**
- Cumulative performance (applications in time) 2020/21 (1<sup>st</sup> April – 15<sup>th</sup> December):
  - **Majors: 100%**
  - **Minors: 94%**
  - **Others: 97%**
  - **PS0: 91%**

Appendix One explains the categories of applications.

## Performance overview

- 5.1 Performance is at 100% for 'Majors' applications and remains at the top quartile in London. Our performance for 'Minor' applications has remained in the top quartile in London at 94%. 'Other' applications are also maintained at top quartile in London at 97%. Performance remains steady and we expect to continue to be top quartile in all categories, despite the year's challenges.
- 5.2 The Government has three measures of performance which the Council must remain within thresholds for. If we breach these thresholds we will be designated as a poorly performing planning authority and developers will then have the option of applying directly to the Planning Inspectorate for planning permission. This would mean that we don't get the fee income for that application but we are still required to undertake the consultation. In addition we lose the democratic right to determine the application. The first of these measures is our performance on a two year rolling period for determination of major applications. We are at 100% for this measure (the threshold is 50%). The second of the government thresholds relates to performance on minor and other applications over a two year period. We are at 97% on this measure (the threshold is 70%). The third of the government thresholds relates to overturns of refusals of applications on appeal and relates to minor and other applications. We are at 1% on this measure (the threshold is to remain below 5%).
- 5.3 So far in 2020/21 (1<sup>st</sup> April – 15<sup>th</sup> December) we have decided a total of 14 'Major' applications compared to the 13 decided during the same period in the previous financial year. The average time of decision has increased from 130 to 234 days between these time periods, but all of these have been subject to planning performance agreements / extensions of time which are mutually agreed with applicants and encouraged in national guidance. The level of major applications submitted this year has reduced over previous years.
- 5.4 During 2020/21 (1<sup>st</sup> April – 15<sup>th</sup> December) we have decided 319 'Minor' applications compared to the 306 'Minor' applications decided during the same period in the previous financial year. The average decision day increased from 76 to 84 days (a result of Covid-19 lockdown preventing public consultation earlier in the year, and thus slowing the process).
- 5.5 During 2020/21 (1<sup>st</sup> April – 15<sup>th</sup> December) we have decided 799 'Other' applications compared to the 782 'Other' applications decided during the same period in 2019/20. The cumulative average decision time has slightly increased from 61 days at the start of the year to 63 days (again due to lockdown), but this is again falling month on month; it peaked at 67 days in Q2.
- 5.6 The length of time taken to validate an application is at an average of 6 days, however this is a product of the systems thinking approach where there is a delay before validation rather than before decision. This statistic is quite static.
- 5.7 The end to end times and the overall numbers of applications received, approved, and refused over previous years is set out below. Reducing the end to end times further will continue to be a focus for the coming year:

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021 (1 <sup>st</sup> April – 15 <sup>th</sup> Dec)
<b>Received</b>	2951	3479	3907	4019	3399	3574	3094	2280
<b>Approved</b>	2372	2807	2935	3255	2659	2963	2576	1764
<b>Refused</b>	338	470	709	506	385	356	314	341
<b>Average day</b>	73	76	69	61	54	62	63	65

5.8 Officer caseloads are at around 40 throughout the 2020/21 financial year, peaking in Q3 at around 45. The number of on hand applications has increased compared to this time last year notwithstanding our new approach as well as a focus on resolving a backlog of long standing applications. As of the end of November 2020, there were currently 549 on hand applications. The number of applications over 26 weeks is now at around 97. These cases are all complex or awaiting section 106 sign off.

#### Pre-application advice

5.9 During 2020/21 (1<sup>st</sup> April – 15<sup>th</sup> December) there have been 95 pre-application meetings generating a total of £224,445 of income compared to £249,555 generated from 105 pre-application meetings last year within the same period. In the same period there have been 61 householder pre-application meetings generating £19,200 of income compared to £24,922 generated from 72 last year within the same period.

5.10 The use of Planning Performance agreements (PPAs) during the period 2020/21 (1<sup>st</sup> April – 15<sup>th</sup> December) has generated £266,409 in income from these agreements, compared to £201,872 last year within the same period. The team is encouraging the use of PPAs for a wider range of work.

5.11 Meeting the deadline for providing advice following pre-application meetings is steadily improving and continues to be a focus for the team.

#### Planning Decisions

5.12 The Planning Committee has met 6 times in 2020/21 so far (June, July, September, October, November and December) and resolved to grant planning permission for a zero carbon industrial park, 152 homes (10 of these were new council homes), a further 281 homes under Reserved Matters approval, and more than 5,000sqm of commercial, business and cultural uses.

5.13 It resolved to refuse against officer recommendation 3 applications totalling 28 residential units, approx 250sqm of commercial space and co-living use.

5.14 The final government threshold relates to overturns of refusals (officer and committee) on major applications on appeal. We are currently at 8.7% on this measure (the threshold is to remain below 10%). It should be noted that because the number of major applications that we determine is relatively low it does not need many appeals to be lost to bring us close to this threshold. One more loss would take us over the threshold. We have 2 major appeals pending.

- 5.15 The measure used to measure quality of planning decisions is the percentage of the total number of decisions made by the authority on applications that are then subsequently overturned at appeal, once nine months have elapsed following the end of the assessment period.
- 5.16 The nine months specified in the measure enables appeals to pass through the system and be decided for the majority of decisions on planning applications made during the assessment period. The assessment period for this measure is the two years up to and including the most recent quarter for which data on planning application decisions are available at the time of designation, once the nine months to be allowed for beyond the end of the assessment period is taken into account. For example, a two year assessment period ending March 2021 will be used for designation decisions in Q1 2021/22. This allows for applications to be decided between April 2019 and March 2021 and a 9 month lag back to September 2018 for appeals to be decided (31 months). The average percentage figure for the assessment period as a whole is used.
- 5.17 The threshold for designation on applications for both major and non-major development, above which a local planning authority is eligible for designation, is 10% of an authority's total number of decisions on applications made during the assessment period being overturned at appeal.
- 5.18 Haringey's performance at present is as follows:

Type of application	Number of apps	Number of appeals	Number of overturns	% (Threshold 10%)
Majors	46	6	4	8.7%

- 5.19 The Service has been relatively successful in defending major appeals. We have 2 live appeals on major applications (Guildens, Courtenay Avenue and 10 Gourley Street) with one awaiting validation (300-306 West Green Road). It is possible our decisions may be overturned. The number of major applications dealt with over the past 2 year period is falling. It is possible that we will be at or over the 10% threshold at the end of this year. Bearing in mind a fall in the number of applications being submitted, losing a major appeal becomes significant.
- 5.20 Potential performance figures in March 2021 taking account of the appeals:

Type of application	Potential Number of apps	Number of appeals	Current Number of overturns	Potential % (Threshold 10%)
Majors (no more losses)	40	6	4	10%
Majors +1 further appeal loss	40	7	5	12.5%

- 5.21 Obviously the Service is doing all it can to defend these appeals and process new major applications promptly. Even if we win all our pending appeals it is possible we will be at the 10% threshold (as the number of major applications overall in the rolling 2 year period is falling).
- 5.22 Before any designation is confirmed, local planning authorities whose performance is below one of the thresholds will be given an opportunity to provide clear evidence to justify corrections to any data errors and to set out any exceptional circumstances (supported by evidence) which, in their opinion, would make a designation unreasonable. A period of at least two weeks (as specified by the department) will be allowed for this, and all such arguments will be taken into account before final decisions are made. Requests that exceptional circumstances should be considered are judged against two general tests:
- a. whether the issue affects the reasonableness of the conclusions that can be drawn from the recorded data for the authority, over the assessment period; or
  - b. whether the issue had a significant impact on the authority's performance, for reasons that were beyond its control.
- 5.23 If we do breach the threshold we will construct a case against designation with potential mitigating factors. This would include reference to our exceptional performance in all other areas and the impact of Covid19 on reducing the overall number of major developments which has served to amplify appeal overturns.
- 5.24 The Secretary of State will decide once each year whether any designations should be lifted, at around the same time as deciding whether any new designations are to be made. Exceptionally de-designations may be made at other times.
- 5.25 In assessing whether a designation should be lifted, consideration is given to:
- a. the potential capability of the designated local planning authority to deal effectively with applications for major or non-major development, as appropriate, in the future; and
  - b. the effectiveness of the designated local planning authority in dealing with the relevant category of applications during the period of its designation.
- 5.26 Soon after a designation is made the local planning authority is expected to prepare an action plan addressing areas of weakness that it identifies as having contributed to its under-performance. In doing so the authority should draw upon sector support, particularly any support that is available through programmes funded by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. The authority will need to agree the action plan with the Department.
- 5.27 A designation will be revoked if the Secretary of State is satisfied that:

- a. the designated local planning authority has provided adequate evidence of sufficient improvement against areas of weakness identified in an initial assessment of its performance; and provided that the designated local planning authority,
  - b. would not, at the time that decisions about de-designation are made, remain eligible for designation on the basis of the data available at the time;
  - c. has completed, within the timescale specified, any administrative tasks required of the authority in association with applications made directly to the Secretary of State in the area, in at least 80 per cent of cases during the designation period; and
  - d. has not, in the view of the Secretary of State, caused unreasonable delay in progressing and signing any section 106 agreements associated with applications submitted directly to him during the designation period.
- 5.28 If, having considered these criteria, the Secretary of State concludes that the designation should remain in place, the local planning authority will be given at least two weeks to set out any exceptional circumstances (supported by evidence) which, in its opinion, would make a continued designation unreasonable.

### Planning Enforcement

- Enforcement complaints received during 2020/21 (1<sup>st</sup> April – 15<sup>th</sup> December): 591
  - Enforcement notices served during 2020/21 (1<sup>st</sup> April – 15<sup>th</sup> December): 54
- 5.29 Of the complaints 87% were acknowledged within one working day of receipt. This measure is down from 93%, and a result of software (Iplan) outages and a rising number of incomplete / incomprehensible complaints.
- 5.30 The Planning Enforcement Team continues to seek prosecutions against owners who have failed to comply with existing enforcement notices. In addition to the prosecution proceedings, there has been a concerted effort in securing confiscation sentences under the provisions of Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA) 2002. There are a number of prosecutions which are still going through the courts (these take a significant length of time).
- 5.31 In December 2020 officers secured a confiscation order of just over £500k against a landlord who had deliberately refused to comply with the requirements of two enforcement notices at two of his properties. The Council will get a share of that amount (approx 1/3) with the largest share going to central government.
- 5.32 Planning Enforcement officers have a backlog of site visits as a result of the Covid-19 lockdowns. In addition, there are ongoing site access issues partly due to the need for social distancing which might impact on service delivery for the remainder of the year.
- 5.33 As per government advice, the enforcement team is taking a positive approach to allowing retail premises (when not affected by Tier 4 Covid-19 restrictions) to

stay open longer and take deliveries later during December and January, to assist with social distancing on high streets.

### Member Training & Site Visits

- 5.34 The last Member visit, to the Thamesmead estate, took place in October 2019. A daylight/sunlight training session took place in January 2020 and general principles and decision-making session in June 2020. Further training sessions are being planned for January (Secure by Design) and March TBC. A learning site visit is unlikely to take place in 2020/21.

### Planning Policy & Infrastructure

#### New Local Plan

- 5.35 The timetable for preparing the **New Local Plan** is set out in the table below.

Document	Regulation	Date
<b>New Local Plan First Steps Engagement consultation</b>	Reg 18	November 2020-February 2021
<b>Draft Local Plan consultation</b>	Reg 18	2021
<b>Proposed Submission Local Plan consultation</b>	Reg 19	2021
<b>Submission &amp; Examination</b>	Reg 22-25	2021/22
<b>Adoption</b>	Reg 26	2022

- 5.36 On 13 October 2020 Cabinet approved consultation on the **New Local Plan First Steps Engagement document**. The consultation was launched on 16 November 2020 and runs for 11 weeks until 1 February 2021. Alongside the First Steps Engagement document the council is also consulting on an **Integrated Impact Assessment Scoping Report** and is carrying out a **Call for Sites**.
- 5.37 A comprehensive **Communications and Engagement Plan** has been prepared to ensure compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and support the objective of achieving effective, representative engagement with the public and key stakeholders. During December the Planning Policy Team continued working with key partners to ensure broad engagement on the New Local Plan, including the Haringey Youth Advisory Board, High Streets Network, and the Voluntary and Community Sector through the Bridge Renewal Trust. The Planning Policy Team held 6 virtual consultation events during December 2020 and a further 12 will take place during January 2021 along with more targeted engagement in schools.
- 5.38 In line with national policy and guidance the New Local Plan must be informed and supported by a relevant and up-to-date evidence base that is adequate and proportionate. Consultancy ORS is currently finalising a new Strategic Housing

Market Assessment (SHMA) and Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) for the New Local Plan and for the Council's new Housing Strategy, jointly with the Housing service. In January 2021 the Council will be commissioning an Employment Land Study, a Retail and Town Centre Needs Study, a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and a Biodiversity/Sites of Nature Importance (SINC) Review to inform the emerging Plan.

Housing Delivery Test and the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development (PIFSD)

- 5.39 The **Housing Delivery Test** is an annual measurement of housing delivery introduced by the Government in 2018. The Government's formal Housing Delivery Test results for 2020 have not yet been published but may be published imminently. The expected results indicate that the consequence of the 2020 Housing Delivery Test for Haringey is that the '**Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development**' (PIFSD) will soon take effect. Should this be confirmed by the Government, this will affect how planning applications need to be determined.
- 5.40 Haringey's housing completions have been below a 75% Government 'Housing Delivery Test' threshold over the last 3 years. Subject to this being confirmed through the 2020 Housing Delivery Test measurement, in accordance with the NPPF, the Council's housing planning policies will be deemed out of date and the PIFSD will apply. The consequence of this is that national policy expects the council to grant permission for housing schemes unless:
- i. the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
  - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF.
- 5.41 The Council will be required to adopt this approach from the day following the publication of the 2020 Housing Delivery Test measurement by the Government. Paragraph 12 of the NPPF is clear that the PIFSD does not change the statutory status of the development plan (i.e. the Local Plan & London Plan) as the starting point for decision making. The law still says any determination on a planning application must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is not part of the development plan but the PIFSD as part of the NPPF will be a significant material consideration. While the policies in the borough's development plan will still have primacy, the Council will need to give an increased amount of weight to the NPPF and PIFSD when making planning decisions.
- 5.42 The Council has already published a Housing Delivery Test Action Plan to set out what it is doing to boost housing delivery which was considered by Regulatory Committee in July 2020 and approved by Cabinet in the same month.



- 5.43 The other London boroughs predicted to also be facing the PIFSD when the 2020 results are announced are Enfield, Redbridge, Barking & Dagenham, Havering, Bexley, Tower Hamlets, Southwark and Kensington & Chelsea.

Other planning policy workstreams

- 5.44 On 26 October 2020 the Council responded to the Government's **Planning for the Future: White Paper consultation** setting out a range of concerns with the proposed planning reforms in the White Paper including impacts on resourcing and democracy, affordable housing/infrastructure delivery, and climate change mitigation.
- 5.45 On 30 November 2020 the Council responded to the Government's **Accessible Homes consultation** stressing the importance of the highest standards of safe, inclusive and accessible design of new development and indicating support for the Government's intention to raise accessibility standards for new homes.
- 5.46 On 3 December 2020 the Government launched a **Supporting housing delivery and public service infrastructure consultation**. This seeks views on a proposed new permitted development right for the change of use from Commercial, Business and Service use (Class E) to residential (Class C3) to create new homes, measures to support public service infrastructure through the planning system, and the approach to simplifying and consolidating existing permitted development rights following changes to the Use Classes Order. The Government introduced a new Commercial, Business and Service use class (Class E) on 1 September 2020 grouping together a range of uses commonly found on high streets and town centres and providing for movement between such uses without the need for a planning application (while such uses are often found in town centres, in practice the use classes apply everywhere). Having simplified the change of use between retail, commercial and leisure uses, the Government now wants to build on this providing further flexibility to allow this broader range of uses to change to residential use. Current permitted development rights already provide for shops, financial and professional services, and offices to change to residential use. It is now proposed to draw these together into a single right that provides for the change of use from any use within the Commercial, Business and Service use class (Class E) to residential (Class C3). This proposal is of significant concern to officers and a robust Council response will be submitted to the consultation ahead of the 28 January 2021 deadline.
- 5.47 In December 2020 the **New London Plan** moved closer to being finalised following an exchange of correspondence between the Mayor of London and the Secretary of State. On 21 December 2020 the Mayor published a 'Publication London Plan' and submitted it to the Secretary of State for his agreement ahead of the Mayor publishing the final London Plan, expected around February 2021.
- 5.48 The **North London Waste Plan (NLWP)** examination hearings took place on 20-21 November 2019. In response to the issues raised in the examination, the NLWP team prepared a schedule of proposed modifications to the Plan which were consulted on from 29 October 2020 to 10 December 2020. The representations received have been analysed and together with the NLWP

team's responses will be submitted to the Inspector for consideration. The Inspector will then prepare his report on the soundness of the Plan which will be issued in due course and if positive, will allow adoption later in 2021.

- 5.49 Consultation was carried out on the **Draft Highgate School Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)** from 26 October to 21 December 2020. Virtual consultation events were held on 25 November and 9 December 2020 comprising an officer presentation and a moderated question and answer session. The presentation and a summary of the questions and answers has been published on the council's website.
- 5.50 An **Article 4 Direction** to prevent changes of use from office to residential without planning permission was agreed by Cabinet in March 2020 and legally 'made' on 16 April 2020. Consultation on the direction ran from 26 June to 7 August 2020 following a delay due to the Covid-19 crisis. The consultation responses are currently being collated and analysed. Subject to this analysis the Direction could take effect in June 2021. It is possible that the Government's new proposed Class E to Residential permitted development right could have implications for confirmation of the direction.
- 5.51 On 17 December 2020 the Council confirmed three new **Article 4 Directions** to withdraw permitted development rights in the following **Conservation Areas: Noel Park, Peabody Cottages and Tower Gardens**. The directions came into effect on 21 December 2020 and replaced the previous directions which were each over a decade old. Having regard to consultation feedback, the decision was taken not to confirm the new direction for the **Rookfield Estate**. This decision will enable the Council to give further consideration to the scope of the replacement Article 4 Direction and will allow regard to be had to the Rookfield Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP) which is currently being drafted and is due for consultation and completion in 2021. The existing Article 4 Direction for the Rookfield Estate will remain in effect and continue to provide protection against some of the potential harms from permitted development.
- 5.52 An eight week consultation from 18 December 2019 to 11 February 2020 on the **CIL Partial Review: Draft Charging Schedule (DCS)** proposed increasing the CIL rate for residential development in the eastern zone of the borough from £15 per square metre to £50. The DCS also proposed an increase in the CIL rate for student accommodation from £15 to £85 and to introduce CIL charges for two new specialist housing uses which are Build to Rent at a rate of £100 and warehouse living at £130. The next stage is for the DCS to be submitted for independent examination and, subject to that examination being successful, will require final approval by the Council to take effect in 2021. A key issue that will be scrutinised as part of the examination will be the financial viability of the increased charges, particularly in the context of the Covid-19 crisis and the consequential economic impact and uncertainty.
- 5.53 Cabinet on 8 December 2020 approved £14.6m of **Strategic CIL (SCIL)** monies being spent on a range of projects:
- Wood Green Youth Space £940,000
  - School Streets £1,500,000

- Active Life in Parks £500,000
- Tottenham High Road Strategy £342,000
- Tottenham High Road & Bruce Grove Station £569,000
- Turnpike Lane Improvement Project £600,000
- Penstock Tunnel and Public Space £134,000
- Wood Green Common / Barratt Gardens / Tower Terrace £750,000
- Wood Green Decentralised Energy Network (DEN) £650,000
- Tottenham Hale DEN £1,500,000
- North Tottenham DEN £1,400,000
- Good Economy Recovery Plan:
  - Making High Streets Fit for Purpose £500,000
  - Market Trading Investment £60,000
  - Streetspace Plan projects for Walking & Cycling £5,100,000
  - 'Welcome Back' to town centres – signage / commissions at key gateways £100,000

5.54 The **Authority Monitoring Report (AMR)** 2018-19 was published in January 2020 and was subsequently reported to Regulatory Committee for information. The Planning Policy Team has started preparing the AMR 2019-20 which will be published in early 2021.

### **Building Control**

- Fee earning applications received 2020/21 (Apr – Dec\*) – 1134
  - Fee earning applications received 2019/20 (Apr – Dec\*) – 1683
  - Fee income from applications 2020/21 (Apr – Dec\*) – £421K
  - Fee income from applications 2019/20 (Apr – Dec\*) – £462K
  - Site inspections 2020/21 (Apr – Dec\*) – 3,743
  - Site inspections 2019/20 (Apr – Dec\*) – 4,793
- \*September = 20 December

5.55 Fee earning applications over the corresponding period still show a decrease overall due to Covid-19, although the fee income is better and recovering due to the type of work that we are currently doing and it is still hoped that some of this income deficit can be recouped via the Government's income compensation scheme. Building Control continues to be asked to check applications outside of our borough (a sign that we are considered contactable, approachable and reliable), although we have to be careful in not taking on more applications than we can service, especially as the work on the major sites in the borough is becoming more surveyor intensive, requiring more and more inspections. Fee income looks positive, partly due to larger projects, such as Clarendon Road and Tottenham Hale schemes being on site. The new THFC Stadium has now hosted a number of events (including a number of matches 'Behind Closed Doors' as part of the Premier League/Government's 'Project Restart' initiative). The permanent Safety Certificate has now been issued to THFC and they held two events with 2,000 fans although this was short lived as the borough went to Tier 3 and subsequently Tier 4 Covid-19 restrictions. Building Control continues to be a key link between the Council and THFC.

5.56 Dangerous Structures have as always been ever prevalent, both within normal office hours and outside office hours with the team being called upon over 135

times so far since 1st April, including several major dangerous structures that have been classed as major incidents. During this period we have also served 3 formal Dangerous Structure Notices.

5.57 BC consult continues to grow in stature providing affordable expert advice to other Council services. This advice ranges from party wall agreements to feasibility studies to structural surveys to structural repairs to bridge inspections and strengthening to highways related works and so on. The consultancy work continues to grow and is widely used by colleagues in Homes for Haringey and continues to be respected throughout the Council. This growth has also been reflected in the fee income for this service, with the gross income for this area of work continuing to be around £400K. This continues to be a growth area of work and may need additional staff in the coming months.

5.58 In July 2020 the Government issued the draft Building Safety Bill. The Government accepted the recommendations of the Hackitt Review and this draft Bill, which, alongside the existing Fire Safety Bill and fire safety consultation will set out the biggest improvements to building safety in nearly 40 years. The Bill has passed through the pre-legislative scrutiny stage and the MP's raised around 40 points the most interesting one questioning why the option to choose your Building Control provider has not been totally removed? Haringey Building Control along with colleagues across London has already developed an action plan that we are beginning to action that has put us in a very good position to be able to respond to the proposed challenges, this includes implementing ISO Standards that have been developed on our behalf by Local Authority Building Control (LABC), signing up to the LABC fire safety validation process, holding meetings with both the London Fire Brigade (LFB) and the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and discussing schemes (from a fire safety point of view) with colleagues in Planning at a very early stage in the planning process. Building Control has successfully achieved the ISO accreditation and successfully passed the first audit with no non-conformities and all the surveyors in Building Control have successfully passed the Level 6A fire safety competency exams, which makes Haringey Building Control one of the most competent Building Control offices in the country, being ideally positioned for the challenges within the draft Building Safety Bill. The challenge for Building Control going forward will be retaining the qualified surveyors in a competitive market and recruiting apprentices that can then go on to become Building Surveyors who will succeed our senior staff, who are all in a similar age bracket.

5.59 This year has been challenging for everyone, due to Covid-19. Clearly applications, site visits and fees are down in this period, but are slowly continuing to recover. Other aspects of our work have continued to return to normal, with elements at the same level or greater than at the same period last year. The staff in Building Control have continued to carry out site visits and ensure that building works can continue throughout Haringey.

## **6. Contribution to strategic outcomes**

6.1 The Planning Service contributes to all Priorities of the Borough Plan.

## **7. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

Planning Applications are on the Planning Register on the Council's website and the Local Plan Documents are also on the Council's website.

## **APPENDIX ONE**

### **Definitions of Categories of Development**

#### **Major Development**

- 10+ dwellings / over half a hectare / building(s) exceeds 1000m<sup>2</sup>
- Office / light industrial - 1000+ m<sup>2</sup> / 1+ hectare
- General industrial - 1000+ m<sup>2</sup> / 1+ hectare
- Retail - 1000+ m<sup>2</sup>/ 1+ hectare
- Gypsy/traveller site - 10+ pitches
- Site area exceeds 1 hectare

#### **Minor Development**

- 1-9 dwellings (unless floorspace exceeds 1000m<sup>2</sup> / under half a hectare)
- Office / light industrial - up to 999 m<sup>2</sup>/ under 1 hectare
- General industrial - up to 999 m<sup>2</sup>/ under 1 Hectare
- Retail - up to 999 m<sup>2</sup>/ under 1 hectare
- Gypsy/traveller site - 0-9 pitches

#### **Other Development**

- Householder applications
- Change of use (no operational development)
- Adverts
- Listed building extensions / alterations
- Listed building demolition
- Application for relevant demolition of an unlisted building within a Conservation Area
- Certificates of Lawfulness (191 and 192)
- Notifications
- Permissions in Principle (PiP) and Technical Detail Consent (TDC)

#### **PS0**

Approval of details, discharge of conditions, non-material amendments