

Theme	Question/Comments	Responses	Action
		management and delivery mechanisms in town planning support a framework for all built and natural environment services and professions. This will allow both a demand for stronger generic working and focus on appropriate specialisms. Existing grades of existing job holders applying successfully will be respected. See answer to 1 above	NFA
D. Ringfences	2. What is rationale for grading posts SO1 to PO4? There should be scope for specialisms and different job focus 1, Team Leaders in Carbon Programme should be in the ringfence for Programme Managers positions	Should the JDs for Team Leaders come out at SM1 they would not be eligible. It will also depend on their current grades. This will be checked and resolved before Phase 1 implementation begins. The Council in not formally calling for VR, but staff can request it and management can consider it. More information on Harinet and by speaking to HR	HR policy position will be checked before Phase 1 begins. NFA
E. Voluntary Redundancy	1. What is the Council's current position on VR?	An advice note will be circulated at the end of the consultation period. It is likely that all posts will be recruited by interview and some form of assessment. Team Leaders are managers and line manage a bespoke team. In some cases – in CM they will manage a team that will include programme managers who will operate and manage projects and teams across the Council and across Boroughs/London	NFA
F. Recruitment	1. Will posts be recruited to be interview or management assessment?	Planning officers in all functional areas, (policy, projects, DM, enforcement) need to know and consider all aspects and functions in which ever part of the service they are. They can't do	NFA
G. Job Titles/Roles	1. Some 4 <sup>th</sup> Tier officers "team leaders" and some 5 <sup>th</sup> tier "programme managers" – please explain reason for titles 2. Planning officers in DM are different to Planning Officers in CM who are more project officers		

Theme	Question/Comments	Responses	Action
	3. What will be the difference between CM team leaders and programme managers and how will PMs support TMs?	any of the functions with this type of understanding and ability. Equally having been trained as a planner, staff should, (with appropriate guidance and support) be able to do any function. The Council will expect this flexibility. It is unhelpful to label some officers project officers, when so often processing an application and enforcement case could easily be described as such.	NFA
H. Team Name	1. Team name – Carbon Management – does not help customers	Point noted, however we also need to recognise the lack of drive towards our overall goal of good regeneration and low/lower carbon – and the importance that an integrated planning, housing, environment and transport team must play in delivering this. This is the argument for using the term carbon management.	NFA
I. Management Responsibility	1. Rethinking Haringey says that managers should manage at least 5 reports. This is not always the case in the proposal  2. No career development in DM. Major Projects officer in DM should be under a DM team leader. CM has unnecessary separation of existing policy/projects teams. Time table for change needs to be set out.	Rethinking Haringey is a guide which in general the proposal complies with. The purpose and design of the service also needs to be respected. So in CM “programme managers” will work across the council and across boroughs and in Planning Enforcement, the manager will have responsibility for “planning appeal quality” requiring him to manage 3 staff directly and then supervise up to 20 staff.  Not agreed. Please see answers to A7, C1 and G2 The timetable for Phase 1 and 2 has been set clearly set out.	NFA

Theme	Question/Comments	Responses	Action
	<p>3. Managers are being asked to have full financial, HR and budgetary responsibility over staff as well as deal with work delivery. Will there be training and support? How will it be implemented practically?</p>	<p>All these responsibilities are already in managers JDs. Yes there will be support and training – this has always been available. Implementation will be through a balance of requiring managers to perform to JDs, invest in and use IT, develop techniques of work focus and responsible and supportive delegation, regular work programme management and innovation development, regular attention to training and appraisals and service planning and appropriate prioritisation – and staff motivation and service leadership.</p>	NFA
<p><b>J. Staff Resources</b></p>	<p>1. Overall support for the restructure and CM. But there are insufficient resources to deliver 40:20. (Along with this key comment was submitted information on benchmarking, options for the reallocation of resources, a gap analysis and proposals for review)</p>	<p>The proposed restructure does reduce resources from the individual teams that make up CM – but it then pools those teams to make up for the loss. This to some extent will support the drive for more resources. And in the proclamations of the Council to date, linked to the Green Deal it seems possible that appropriately more resources, through partnership, will follow.</p> <p>Along with this key comment was submitted information on benchmarking, options for the reallocation of resources, a gap analysis and proposals for review – it is exactly this type of creativity that will enable appropriate work and outcome to be delivered.</p>	NFA
<p><b>K. DM/BC Technical Support</b></p>	<p>1. What is the rationale for removing BC and DM technical teams from control by professional heads?</p>	<p>Putting the two technical teams under service management head will support better integration and use of staff resources, which has not happened sufficiently to date. This is not an uncommon arrangement. It will support our development of integration and possibly shared services and wider job skills and opportunities. The customer only sees one</p>	NFA

Theme	Question/Comments	Responses	Action
		<p>building job, not two processes. It is likely that legislation may combine these regulatory processes, particularly for house holder applications</p>	
	<p>2. How will BC be sure to have sufficient support?</p>	<p>See answer to K1.</p>	NFA
<p>L. DM/BC Professional Service</p>	<p>1. DM Planning Applications and Enforcement Team leaders should share direct reports.</p>	<p>Not agreed. Important to balance public service perception, Rethinking Haringey and service design. There is a need for a bespoke enforcement resource otherwise enforcement gets lost in applications work. In addition to changing so that bespoke enforcement officers are also given the chance to do other planning work (applications and briefs), DM application officer will also be asked to mainstream on applications but also carry a small enforcement case load. Team Leader Planning Enforcement will also be asked to manage the quality of Appeals work of all DM officers – in this way both team leaders will have management duties covering all 9 general officers and all 3 enforcement officers. In addition there will be new appointments in the Applications team to introduce new and higher skill levels and a new Major projects officer will offer extra management support and skills. The SO1-PO4 grade range will offer the ability to DM for career development against agreed criteria and an opportunity for the development of some</p>	NFA

Theme	Question/Comments	Responses	Action
		senior planning posts. Putting the existing Enforcement technical support officer into DM Technical support will in time – along with teaching DM and Enforcement officers the “paperless office technique” improve productivity. Salary levels in London vary from Borough to Borough, Haringey is not out of the ordinary.	
	2. DM Planning Enforcement needs more resources – professional and technical. Appeals management needs more resources	See answer to L1	NFA
	3. Applications and Enforcement need to be better integrated	See answer to L1	NFA
	4. Welcome Team Leader pay equalisation	Noted	NFA
	5. Applications Team of 9 is too big and should be around 5-6	See answer to L1	NFA
	6. Applications Team lacks skills on Major/controversial applications	See answer to L1	NFA
	7. DM needs senior officer posts	See answer to L1	NFA
	8. DM team leader posts are not sufficiently well paid. Similar posts in Barnet and Camden are paid more	See answer to L1	NFA
M. Economic Regeneration - Development	1. Given that the Council is not moving ahead with the Oct 2010 PRE structure and how Econ Regen might have been – how will consultation on the new Econ Regen restructure be done and will past comments be taken into account.	The proposed shared service econ regen restructure has been carried out through a parallel process and consultation programme. All consultation comments are being addressed as part of that process.	NFA
N. Planning Projects	No direct comments received – dealt with under P. Carbon Management		NFA
O. Planning Policy	No direct comments received – dealt with under P. Carbon Management		NFA
P. Carbon Management	1. Fuel Poverty officer – should this post be in the Planning or the Housing side of Carbon Management?	This will be decided in Phase 2, though there are arguments for both and what is important is that the post exists and is in Carbon	NFA

Theme	Question/Comments	Responses	Action
	<p>2. Authority for CM to have power over HRA assets needed and there needs to be continuity of service as enabling and asset functions move to CM. Further information on Landlord Consent, Stock Rationalisation and Common Management needed to support area regeneration and estate renewal is needed. Gap analysis needed.</p>	<p>Management CM will be part of the delivery in the Council and with its partners of: housing strategy, stock rationalisation/options, land disposal, HRA independence, estate renewal, site and area planning and development, all housing development and drive for affordable homes and policy and strategy monitoring of indicators and outcomes.</p>	<p>NFA</p>
	<p>3. It would be better to have the 2 design and conservation officers in one of the CM teams to provide consistent approach.</p>	<p>This is not agreed. The two posts will be in CM and it is hoped the consistent approach will be driven not only across CM but all PRE, as it is aimed to be done now with different teams.</p>	<p>NFA</p>
	<p>4. Is there a need for a full time CIL post?</p>	<p>Yes. This is the newest and potentially most difficult part of UK Planning Reform. The post will also lead/coordinate CIP/CIL and work across the Council and possibly North London. Once in place the CIP and CIL will need adjusting and the officer will also be involved in managing key developments and infrastructure development – akin to a generic Major Projects Officer.</p>	<p>NFA</p>
	<p>5. The concept of bringing together key built and environmental planners from across the Council is understood. However the split of transport planners from other transport work (scheme implementation, parking and street services) could reduce integrity and it was criticised by ST Commission. This will be made worse by the split between policy and projects in CM. Putting transport planning into CM rather than leaving it in Frontline and Neighbourhood Services will reduce benefits and synergies. The proposed CM will not support the need to link engineering, behaviour change and transport planning, taking into</p>	<p>The view that transport planners should/must be kept with engineering and or neighbourhood services is relatively subjective since such services are organised in different ways in different authorities. Good synergies are driven by good ways of working rather than structures. The concerns do not balance with the advantages of CM which the commentator agrees are important. The ST Commission was not offered a chance to consider the CM alternative and the arguments for it. The commentator does not acknowledge the lack of integration and joined up thinking and planning</p>	<p>NFA</p>

Theme	Question/Comments	Responses	Action
	<p>account delivery having moved to engineering. CE indicated that the new P&amp;S Director would be consulted and that other options, (co-locating the transport planners with the remaining transport section or neighbourhood services in Frontline) may be considered – so at least proximity to such services would be maintained.</p>	<p>that exists because the transport planners are not integrated with a town planning, development and low carbon team. The commentator admits delivery is moving to engineering and by inference agrees that policy, strategy, programme and project development will remain with the transport planners – exactly the functions of the proposed CM. The Interim Director of P&amp;S keeps the Director in waiting briefed. No changes have been proposed. It is not certain, but likely that PRE will move to RPH and may be physically close to Frontline, but more important is how the services are led and integrated than about where they sit. And in any case they will all be in same Directorate</p>	
	<p>6. Need for more senior staff with specific knowledge about carbon management – decentralised energy, housing re fit and sustainable energy.</p>	<p>Many of these skills exist within the council in sister services (property, capital programme, building control) all of which will come under P+S Directorate. Some of these skills are also in procurement. Carbon management it is agreed touches all services, but for functional reasons its key elements must be different services. The new structure makes carbon management a much more important theme and outcome of P+S and PRE and allocates more senior staff to that function and with higher grade scales. It is in town planning that the main drivers for low carbon living sit in terms of policy and strategy levers. This is the right place and way to manage it with existing resources</p>	NFA
	<p>7. CM will have to report to at least 4 cabinet members – this shows there is not much political support for the integrated service. Briefings to</p>	<p>This comment is a rather “siloist” view. The CM team will reflect for the first time what to date the Director of Environment and Regeneration</p>	NFA

Theme	Question/Comments	Responses	Action
	members will be onerous.	and now the Director of P+S has had to do on their own. The new CM will for the first time provide this senior support. It will help members integrate critical priorities. Briefing could also change – always offering members an integrated view, seeking collaboration and a balanced approach. This approach may in fact be less work, since it is likely that the AD in charge of CM will insist on simple monthly comprehensive briefings with all headings on one briefing going to all cabinet members so as to promote an integrated understanding of CM.	
	8. 17-1-11 Rethinking Haringey – results of public consultation. This shows respondents wanting less money to be spent on CM. Why then is it creating CM?	Environmental Resource staff with responsibility for CM are being reduced from 6 to 3 posts. They will be deployed differently. CM is still a Council policy as it is for London, the UK and EU. The cabinet member for CM is also the cabinet member for Resources - this also shows value for money and a more effective and efficient use of resources.	NFA
	9. Welcome CM proposal. Will the structure be robust enough to also lead on localism and shared services.	The work on localism will be shared across P+S. Resources for Neighbourhood Plans and or Development Orders will need to wait on requests for these since they are not mandatory – but the new Governance structure has devised an approach to such demands. Shared service development with WF and across North London has been lead by PRE, so if there is knowledge and capacity to do it for CM it is PRE.	NFA
	10. CM head post should be open to existing and proposed team leader posts to apply for.	The proposal is council policy. Other existing posts will have this opportunity if the post has to be externally advertised	NFA
	11. CM team leader posts – will applicants have to submit one or two applications?	Two applications, there will be separate recruitment processes for each post.	NFA

Theme	Question/Comments	Responses	Action
	<p>12. CM teams too big; to much responsibility for team leaders; head of carbon may not be needed; the two teams will be rivals</p>	<p>Team numbers are supported by Rethinking. Team leaders also have Programme Managers. Head of CM and indeed CM is needed to support for the first time a function usually carried out by the Director alone. The teams should not be rivals since they will be working to a senior single policy document – the LDF</p>	<p>NFA</p>
	<p>13. CM should be changed back to having small separate discipline teams and there needs to be bespoke support staff.</p>	<p>Good integrated working is not primarily about structures but about ways of working. CM maintains disciplines but puts them together in teams that will do both policy/strategy and projects and matrix working. Other teams function well and are very productive without bespoke admin support. There is a history of Policy and Projects not using staff resources effectively. This will be supported to change.</p>	<p>NFA</p>
	<p>14. Design and Conservation should not be split up and is under resourced and heritage assets will suffer. Splitting could de skill the service.</p>	<p>The integrity of the importance of Design and Conservation will be maintained because those bespoke posts will remain, but be asked to work in a broader sustainable development concept. Productivity will be increased through integrated working and more focused project management. By integrating services heritage assets will gain not suffer.</p>	<p>NFA</p>



## Appendix 7: Timetable

The table below sets out the timetable for the Planning Regeneration and Economy restructure.

Milestone(s) / Deliverables	Target Date
PRE all staff briefing	26.01.2011 and 17.02.2011
Briefing on new proposals with UE SMT Managers	01.02.2011
Formal consultation on Phase 1 of PRE restructure (all Building Control, all Development Management and Planning Enforcement, all Business Development and Technical Support, 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> tier management posts in Carbon Management and Sustainability Service)	12 <sup>th</sup> May – 10 <sup>th</sup> June
Formal briefing to all staff on restructure proposals	12 <sup>th</sup> May 2011 (extra sessions held: 25 <sup>th</sup> May 2011 & 26 <sup>th</sup> May 2011)
Respond to consultation, including any amendments to proposals	w/c 13 <sup>th</sup> June 2011
Corporate Committee (Phase 1)	June 2011
Recruitment process	June -July 2011
Develop new working arrangements (Implementation Plan)	July 2011
Formal consultation on Phase 2 of PRE restructure (posts below 4 <sup>th</sup> tier in Carbon Management and Sustainability Service and, where necessary, other teams)	August 2011
Respond to consultation, including any amendments to proposals	September 2011
Corporate Committee (Phase 2)	October 2011
Recruitment process	October/November 2011



**Appendix 8  
BENCHMARKING EXERCISE (Staff number & Cost Comparisons)**

**Planning Policy, Design & Conservation, Projects (sites), Transport Planning, Housing Enabling, and Environmental Resources**

Authority	Policy (FTE)	Projects (FTE)	Design & Conservation (FTE)	Transport Planning	Housing Enabling	Environmental Resources	Total number of Staff (FTE)	Approximate costs (excluding on costs) £ 000's
Barnet	7	0	5	4	2.5	-	18.5	719
Camden	7	15*	6	9	4	6	47	1722
Enfield	11	0	2	3	1.5	-	17.5	649
Islington	10.5	4	-	6	3.5	8	32	1289
Waltham Forest	10	9 (Olympics)	3.5	4	4	4	34.5	1281
Hackney	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Haringey	8	13	5	4	6	5	42	1438
Haringey (proposed)	3	6	3	4	4	3	23	984

**N.B. On costs have been excluded and would equate to an additional 20%(approx) assuming pension contributions etc are made.**

- \* Camden in addition to sites project teams has developed a place shaping group which includes 6 planners.
- Camden, Islington, and Haringey have signed up to a 40% CO2 reduction target.
- Waltham Forest, Barnet, Enfield, and Hackney have not signed up to the 40%CO2 reduction target and have not made climate change a priority.

## Development Management

Authority	Professional (FTE)	Support (FTE)	Total number of Staff (FTE)	Approximate Costs (excluding on-costs) £000's
Barnet	24	13	37	1385
Camden	33	11	44	1676
Enfield	14.5	5	28	1075
Islington	16	9	32	1235
Waltham Forest	13	5	20	728
Hackney	15	14	29	1180
Haringey	18	10	28	990
Haringey (proposed)	16	9	25	925

- The proposed number of staff for Haringey includes the transfer of Planning Enforcement. All other boroughs include enforcement.

## Building Control

Authority	Professional (FTE)	Support (FTE)	Total number of Staff (FTE)	Approximate Costs (excluding on-costs) £000's
Barnet	15	4	19	630
Camden	23	6.6	29.6	1062
Enfield	11.5	2	13.5	448
Islington	17	5	22	789
Waltham Forest	10	4	14	470
Hackney	15	6	21	715
Haringey	11	3.6	14.6	441
Haringey (proposed)*	11	3.6	14.6	461

Haringey proposed includes 2 structural engineers a service that the other benchmarking authorities outsource on an as required basis; data on these costs are not available. The net impact on costs is neutral as these posts are self funding through fee income.

### **Economic Regeneration – Business Support and Area Management and Employment and Skills**

Through the evidence gathering as part of the Scrutiny Review of Support to Small Businesses an initial benchmarking exercise was conducted, comparing Haringey with Enfield, Waltham Forest and Redbridge. A summary of this exercise follows. All four boroughs have a financial and strategic relationship with North London Business – effectively outsourcing (i.e. a service in the borough that is delivered and managed wholly externally) all responsibilities for Inward Investment Activities in North London. North London Business receive a financial contribution of around £35,000 from each borough to deliver this activity. Redbridge has the most restricted budget for business support and focuses this budget directly on its Town Centres, engaging with businesses through town centre business forums. Waltham Forest has a similar town centre focus, but twice the budget and two town centre managers working on the ground. Enfield has a substantial asset for businesses in the form of Enfield Enterprise Centre and a borough wide Business and Retail Association that covers Town Centre Management duties. Haringey has the widest spread of commissioned services, with a substantial budget and considerable policy expertise. We are now seeking to expand the benchmarking exercise to include Barnet, Hackney, Islington and Camden.

	Haringey	Enfield	Barnet	Hackney	Islington	Camden	Redbridge	Waltham Forest
Core delivery budget (exc. Salaries)	£0	£0	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	£50,000	£0
Area Based Grant	£600,000	£200,000	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	£210,000	£0
LABGI made available	£0	£0	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	£0	£400,000
External Funding leverage (current)	£40,000 (ERDF)	£40,000 (ERDF)	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	£0	£0
Income generated	£0	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	£650,000 (BID levys)	£2.4m (BID levy)	£350,000 (BID levys)	£100,000 (BID levys)

Average number of Businesses Supported annually	720			Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	300	800
Establishment Prof/admin	4/2	2		Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	1	4
Direct Business Support provision	*	*		Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc		*	*
Commissioning of services (managed internally)	✓ (projects through Enterprise Board)	✓ (business advisers in Enfield Enterprise Centre)		Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc		*	✓
Outsourcing of services (managed externally)	✓ (NLB for various duties)	✓ (NLB for various duties)		Tbc	Tbc	Tbc	Tbc		✓ (all TCM and business support)	✓ (NLB for various duties)
Town Centre Manager(s)	*	*	*	*	*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
BID companies	*	*	*	*	✓ (Angel)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Native Enterprise Agency?	Orgs with limited capacity	Enterprise Enfield	Only pan London services	Hackney Business Ventures	Centa Business Services & Prevista	Centa Business Services	East London SBC	Delta Club and Prevista		

## Performance (Demand for Service)

### Development Management

Authority	No of Applications received 01/01/2009 to 31/12/2009	No of Applications received 01/01/2010 to 31/08/2010	Planning Decisions to date by type for the period year ending March 2010		
			Major	Minor	Other
Barnet	3973	3300	68	934	2686
Camden	4051	3206	45	868	1727
Enfield	1893	1892	18	616	1545
Islington	2560	2479	38	673	1179
Waltham Forest	1567	1020	-	-	-
Hackney	2503	1799	62	657	638
Haringey	2172	1548	18	368	1278

### Building Control

Authority	No of Applications received 01/01/2009 to 31/12/2009	No of Applications received 01/04/2009 to 31/03/2010
Barnet	-	-
Camden	1660	1282
Enfield	1795	1412
Islington	1329	-
Waltham Forest	1744	1547
Hackney	589	589
Haringey	1712	1385

NB. The rolling year figure shows a slow down in the number of applications received.

