PRESENT:

Councillors Allison, Davies, Engert, Erskine, Hare, Jenks, Newton, Scott, Solomon

and Williams

Apologies Councillor Beacham and Bloch

MH1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beacham and Bloch.

MH2. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interests. (SEE MH9 (i))

MH3. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair advised that there had been no notification of any item of urgent business.

MH4. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Chair asked Councillor Williams to give a brief comment on this item.

Councillor Williams referred to the tabled copies of the terms of reference of the Area Committees which were detailed and clear about matters the Committee could consider. The Area Committees were properly constituted decision making bodies of the Council. In terms of public participation there did need to be a brief outline attached to the minutes which gave an explanation of how the public could participate and add agenda items, which could assist in triggering local interest and involvement.

The Chair welcomed the idea of having an appended sheet of how the public could interact and contribute to the Area Committee.

It was

RESOLVED

That the tabled copies of the terms of reference of the Area Committees be noted, and that a briefing sheet be attached to the minutes of the Committee detailing a brief explanation of how the public could participate and add agenda items, which would assist in triggering local interest and involvement.

ACTION BY; COMMITTEE MANAGER - CH - BRIEFING SHEET TO FOLLOW

MH5. THE NEW ENVIRONMENT CONTRACT WITH VEOLIA

The Chair asked that Councillor Jenks give a brief outline of the main points of discussion raised during the Forum part of the proceedings in relation to the new environment contract with Veolia.

Councillor Jenks advised that the main points of concern and comments had been:

- The lack of consultation with regard to the proposed fortnightly collection of all non-recyclables and particular concerns in relation to items such as disposable nappies
- Concerns that the daily 'lilac ' bag collection was not always happening in all ward areas
- Comments in respect of Veolia Ltd having waste management contracts in approximately 16 out of the 32 London Boroughs. Response to question about published accounts: the accounts for Veolia plc (English subsidiary of a French company) can be inspected
- Questions about the levels of pay for Veolia staff (£9 per hour for permanent staff), and the training of staff to help them communicate with local residents
- The need for compost produced from recycling to be available to residents in Haringey
- The issue of the collection of large non-recyclables eg mattresses, fridges and microwaves, and the process for collection of such items

The Chair thanked Councillor Jenks for his summary of the main concerns raised. In reference to the issue of the overall effectiveness of the contract borough wide this could be reviewed through the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

NOTED

MH6. AREA COMMITTEE PLAN

The Chair referred to the proposed Area Plans and her concerns that one area plan for this Committee was too restrictive given that there were four wards in this particular Committee. The idea of 'one plan fits all' needed to be addressed and whether there should indeed be two Area Plans for the Muswell Hill, Alexandra, Fortis Green, and Highgate Area Committee. It was noted that the Veolia contract for this Committee's geographical area was divided into two 'Village' areas because of its sheer size. There needed to be variations because Highgate Ward in particular has issues that are different. The Chair also stressed that there was little need for new statistical information relating to the Ward areas to be collected as this information was provided to all Councillors when elected and therefore it was not necessary to replicate it.

The Chair commented that the main areas of profile that the Committee wanted emphasis on within the plan would be:

- That the plan should concentrate on those in the area who were most needy and the least articulate
- That the consultation on what the plan should contain should be an exercise from 'the bottom up' and not 'top down' and officers should consult local councillors to ascertain the matters of most concern through their casework – this would give a good outline of matters of common concern
- That housing was an issue and Homes for Haringey needed to have some input.
- Concern was raised about the condition of some housing in multiple occupation and hostels and the impact on the occupants
- There needs to be consultation with local resident associations and pressure groups
- That the Police required an input in terms of issues of concern to them in relation to safer neighbourhood matters as well as national initiatives and concerns

The Chair asked if there were any comments from the Committee

Councillor Williams sought clarification as regards to the timetable for the formation of the plan, and commented that in his view the Area Plan should form the main item of business at the next meeting of the Area committee in September. Councillor Williams stressed that all Committee members needed to feed into the plan as part of the overall process and that this was the first step in the consultation process and would aid officers in formulating the plan for consideration in September. The Chair added that the Committee area had very large and wide-spread volunteering communities and that such a resource needed to be tapped to feed in to the process.

Councillor Solomon commented that in terms of the proposed 'village' plan in her view it was vital to have a view of what this area was about and this should be in the form of a vision for the area, and that this was a wonderful opportunity for the Committee to embark upon.

Councillor Hare commented that the area plan did require some synergy in planning terms with Local Area Framework with the vision having some planning element within it as well.

Councillor Newton commented that some residents, particularly the elderly or vulnerable in the area could be asset rich and income poor and the plan needed to be reflective of this.

The Frontline Services representative – Ms Kowalska advised that the formation of the Area Plan was a developmental process and that the process of consultation would be phased. Ms Kowalska, in acknowledging the importance of a 'vision' for the area commented that there would need to be discussions as to the practicalities of having the plan including a vision particularly in terms of meeting the expectations of a vision. There was a process of consultation planned with all stakeholders in the locale of the Area Committee. The Police Safer Neighbourhood Team would be closely liaised with for their input. Ms Kowalska commented further that the plan/profile of the area would always, when published be a snapshot of the area and that there would be a continual evolution and development of the plan as time progressed.

Councillor Williams reiterated the Chair's earlier concerns in relation to the Highgate area given the different issues affecting the area, in particular transport and traffic related issues.

Ms Kowalska responded that the Committee Areas would have likely points of common concern/priority and also some differences and that by tapping into the good local networks particular issues relating to individual areas would no doubt emerge. Ms Kowalska stressed that the plan should not as such be localised to individual priorities for a particular area but concentrate on particular themes per area/ward. By commencing the initial consultation with ward Councillors and main stakeholders between now and September an outline plan would begin to emerge which would form the basis of discussion and formation at the September Committee.

The Chair then summarised and it was:

RESOLVED

- That the comments of the Committee in relation to formation of the Area Plan be noted together with the process for consultation commencing in order to receive an outline plan at the meeting of the Committee in September 2011, and the need for input from all Ward Councillors and liaison with the frontline service to ensure such input;
- ii. That the Chair review the outline plan prior to presentation to the Committee in September 2011 to make any necessary alterations or changes deemed to be necessary.

ACTION; ALL AREA COMMITTEE COUNCILLORS AND FRONTLINE SERVICE TEAM

MH7. POT HOLE REPAIR FUNDING

The Chair asked Councillor Newton to give a summary of the discussions during the area Forum part of the meeting in relation to pothole funding.

Councillor Newton commented that the briefing in terms of the pothole funding plan had been positively received and that the local concerns expressed at the differences in money being spent on repair/resurfacing were lower than expenditure for traffic calming had been allayed and as reported the resurfacing/road repair expenditure had clearly outstripped the traffic calming expenditure.

Councillor Newton referred to the matter of intervention levels and the need for clarification as to the assessment of the levels in order for a repair to be carried out.

The Chair responded that in terms of intervention levels it may be the case that officers could relook at different situations to assess whether the set parameters could be varied. The Chair commented that particular priority should be given to roads with a steep gradient, or cycle paths as both affected cyclists considerably.

The Chair stressed that there was only a limited budget for repairs as detailed and every effort should be made to an equality of funding across the four area wards.

In response to clarification from the Chair the Head of Sustainable Transport – Ms Hancox advised that as yet there was no forward plan for repairs beyond the current financial year 2011/12.

The Chair then summarised and it was:

RESOLVED

That the pothole funding for the Area Committee be noted, and that priority be given to those roads with particularly high gradient or where there is heavy cycle use, noting that where possible there be an equality of funding of repairs across the four ward areas of the Committee.

ACTION BY: HEAD OF SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT – PLACE AND SUSTAINABILITY

MH8. TO NOTE DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS AND DISCUSSION ON VENUES AND AGENDA ITEMS

MH9. TO NOTE DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS AND DISCUSSION ON VENUES AND AGENDA ITEMS

The Chair, in asking the Committee to note the dates of the Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2011/12, commented that the meeting venues should be in each of the four ward areas of the Committee. The Chair gave a caveat to this point by stressing that the purpose of the Committee was to discuss strategic crossward issues and not individual area issues and therefore it was not a 'local discussion' per se.

The Committee **AGREED** that the locations for the meetings should be in the following areas

8 September 2011 – Fortis Green Ward [since changed to 15 September] 12 January 2012 – Highgate ward 29 March 2011 – Alexandra Ward

In response to a request from Councillor Hare in respect of the September date possibly being changed, and in clarifications to when this date had been agreed the Clerk to the Committee and Committee Manager – Mr Hart advised that the dates of the Committees/Forum had been received through the political groups and then agreed by annual Council on 23 May 2011. The practical difficulties in changing the meeting dates in September was due to the political party annual conferences each year at that time, as well as the need to feed the area committee cycle for the September period into the Overview and Scrutiny committee meeting in early October 2011.

In terms of the agenda items for future meetings the Chair and Members **AGREED** that the Committee would mainly concentrate on the following topics:

15 September 2011

- Area Plans
- Budget 2012/13

12 January 2012

 The implications and effects of the Localism Bill on the ambit and function of the Area Committees

29 March 2011

• Transport funding issues

RESOLVED

That the location of the remaining Area Committees and the topics for discussion during 2011/12 be noted as outlined above.

MH10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE

i. Pinkham Way

The Chair asked that Councillor Solomon give a brief comment and outline of the issues raised during the Forum part of the evening. The Chair also advised that any Committee Member who also sat on the Council's Planning Sub-Committee or was a potential substitute member should consider whether they would wish not to comment or give a view on this item as if they did then it would preclude their participation in the agenda item when considered by Planning Sub-Committee in the future.

Councillor Solomon commented on the proposals and process as outlined by Mr Dorfman from the Council's Planning Service which in her view had been somewhat misleading. In particular the information contained on the Council's website in relation to the application being in 'outline'. She stressed that there were no visual plans of the actual size or appearance of the proposals and that the visual concept would only be forthcoming once the outline planning permission had been granted, and a process was then gone through for a designer to draw up a 'mock up of the facilities — only at that point would residents have any idea of its size and appearance and this would be after permission had been given for a certain scale of facility to be built.

Councillor Solomon also commented that this proposed development site, as far as she could gather, was not contained in the London Plan as a strategic site. She added that the planning process for this initiative was an on-going one

and that Members had to be vigilant of the process in order to ensure that residents were fully informed when needed.

Councillor Williams commented that the site was viewed as being a strategic site but this seemed to imply a predetermination of the use of the site already and that this issue was being explored by objectors from a legal perspective.

Councillor Hare stressed that he had earlier questioned whether the Planning officer Mr Dorfman had the necessary expertise to assess an application of such size and that he would wish to know further how he would be investigating the more technical aspects of the application, and how such outcome would be verified.

The Chair reminded Councillor Hare that it was not appropriate for him to question the professional capabilities of an officer of the Council.

Councillor Solomon reiterated her earlier comments that the Committee needed to keep a watchful eye on the progress of the application.

Councillor Solomon then moved the following resolution.

At this point the Clerk to the Committee asked that Members please state if they were abstaining from the proposed MOTION.

Councillor Solomon MOVED

"That this Area Committee opposes the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) plans for a waste facility at Pinkham Way, and calls on the NLWA to drop the plans.

Whilst we recognise the need to plan reasonably for waste disposal, this must not be through the location of huge plant in a residential area with the additional movement of large lorries that will result.

We further oppose plans for the use of the site by Barnet LB as a lorry park. The London Borough of Barnet should make arrangements for the parking of such vehicles in its own Borough. "

The motion was seconded by Councillor Williams.

On a vote the MOTION was carried.

Councillors Alison, Newton and Hare abstained from voting on the MOTION

RESOLVED

That this Area Committee opposes the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) plans for a waste facility at Pinkham Way, and calls on the NLWA to drop the plans.

Whilst this Committee recognise the need to plan reasonably for waste disposal, this must not be through the location of huge plant in a residential area with the additional movement of large Lorries that will result.

That this Committee further oppose plans for the use of the site by Barnet LB as a lorry park. The London Borough of Barnet should make arrangements for the parking of such vehicles in its own Borough.

Councillors Alison, Newton and Hare asked that their abstention to the above resolution be recorded as they could be substitutes for Planning Committee.

ii. Making the Difference 2011/12

The Chair told the Committee that she had been advised earlier that week that there would be a budget of up to £25k for Making the Difference for the Committee area for 2011/12 following some discussion by the Council as to whether this would be possible.

The Chair advised that there were now some logistical issues to overcome given that the available funding had to be spent by 31 March 2012 and therefore there would not be the previous levels of local consultation as before. It was also acknowledged that there were no Neighbourhood Management staff to help deliver projects so that proposed projects would need to come from recognised resident groups with a bona fide constitution within each ward who would also need to implement any funded projects themselves within the budget allocation.

Frontline services were instructed to prepare draft application forms and terms of reference based on the previous areas application material as a matter of urgency. The draft material would be forwarded to the Chair who would circulate to Committee Members to agree any amendments before the application material was distributed. Applications would then need to be forwarded on to groups almost immediately with a response date and that Councillors would need to use their individual contact lists as well as the database of Frontline Services.

Frontline Services would need to check eligibility, viability and value for money of all applications before forwarding them to Committee Members well in advance of the 15 September meeting

The Chair advised that the Making the Difference applications would be discussed and the funding allocation decided on at the 15 September meeting.

ACTION: FRONTLINE SERVICES PROVIDE CHAIR WITH DRAFT MtD APPLICATION FORM AND TERMS OF REFERENCE INCLUDING RESPONSE DATE

iii. Other issues raised by the Committee

- An ability to influence the format of future meetings in order to not have repetition wherever possible between the Forum and Committee, but the recognition that the Area Committee is the a constituted committee of the local authority with the ability to receive deputations, petitions and questions from local residents
- Feedback on how there can be improvements to the Area Committee set up
- An information sheet to all residents telling them what is now happening with the new area committee and forum
- The neighbourhood 'kin' contact list and the need to ensure that this is tapped into, as well as the HAVCO contact list – acknowledging the issue of data base security
- A need for better future advertising of the Committee

There being no other business to discuss the meeting terminated at 21.30hrs.

CIIr Engert

Chair

