

Chair:
Councillor Charles Adje

Deputy Chair:
Councillor Harry Lister

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report covers matters considered by the Executive at our meeting on 22 November 2005. For ease of reference the Report is divided into the Executive portfolios.
- 1.2 We trust that this Report will be helpful to Members in their representative role and facilitate a fruitful dialogue between the Executive and all groups of Councillors. These reports are a welcome opportunity for the Executive on a regular basis to present the priorities and achievements of the Executive to Council colleagues for consideration and comment. The Executive values and encourages the input of fellow members.

ITEMS OF REPORT

Finance

2. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE – SEPTEMBER 2005

- 2.1 We considered the regular finance and performance monitoring report for September 2005 which showed the overall revenue position for each of the services and indicated the emerging pressures amounting to a variation of around £2.3m (around 0.7% of the total revenue budget). While this remained a manageable position within an appropriate tolerance zone, we would be looking to reduce any variation against plan.
- 2.2 In terms of performance, the year to date position as at September 2005 showed that for 76% of indicators performance was on target or close to the end of year target. In addition 81 % of indicators had maintained or improved performance since the end of last year.
- 2.3 Financial regulations required that proposed budget changes be approved by us and those agreed were shown in the table below. These changes fell into one of two categories:
 - budget virements, where it was proposed that budget provision be transferred between one service budget and another. Explanations were provided where this was the case;
 - Increases or decreases in budget, generally where notification had been received in-year of a change in the level of external funding such as grants or supplementary credit approval.
- 2.3 Under the Constitution, certain virements were key decisions. Key decisions were:
 - for revenue, any virement which resulted in change in a directorate cash limit of more than £250,000; and
 - for capital, any virement which results in the change of a programme area of more than £250,000.

Key decisions were highlighted by an asterisk in the table.

2.4 The following table sets out the proposed changes. There were two figures shown in each line of the table the first amount column related to changes in the current year's budgets and the second to changes in future years' budgets (full year). Differences between the two occurred when, for example, the budget variation required related to an immediate but not ongoing need or where the variation took effect for a part of the current year but would be in effect for the whole of future years. We report that we agreed to the virements set out in the following table:

Period	Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Description
6	Social Services	Cap	154		Allocation of Mental Health SCE [R] 2005/06 grant.
6	Chief Executive	Rev *	417		DAAT funding £177k, LDA sub regional partnership engagement programme £240k
6	Chief Executive	Rev	24		GOL Building Safer Communities adjustment £121k(-), ODPM Beacon grant for getting closer to communities £67k, SRB grant for improving the public realm in Northumberland Park £30k, NDC grant for Black Arts in Seven Sisters £20k, SRB grant for Northumberland Park Aspire summer programme £23k, Youth Offending Service adjustment £5k
6	Finance	Rev	22		Programme evaluations: SRB grant for JUNP £10k and West Green £12k.
6	Chief Executive	Rev *	(755)	(755)	Neighbourhoods – SRB budgets removed that were added to base in previous years as on-going.
6	Chief Executive	Rev *	285		Removal/grant reduction of Laurel Health Centre NDC income.
6	Chief Executive	Rev	143	(45)	IRT grant no longer receivable £47k(-), Arts Council – North London sub-regional arts partnership grant £10k, ODPM Local enterprise growth initiative grant £100k, LDA employment ULV framework developing beneficiary consultancies grant £25k, other grants £55k.
6	Environment	Cap *	290		TFL funding for Dukes avenue area.
6	Environment	Cap	138		TFL funding for Priory road bus lane £16k, Local safety schemes £87k, W4 re-routing £10k, Heartland regeneration £25k.

6	Environment	Rev *	150	300	Parking Shop merger with Cashiers.
6	Education	Rev *	751		New allocation of DfES Standards Fund grant.
6	Chief Executive	Rev	100	100	Assumed annual spend for CRB checks.
6	Chief Executive	Rev *	400		Drugs Intervention programme c/f from 2004/05.
6	Chief Executive	Rev	223		Resettlement & aftercare provision.
6	Chief Executive	Rev	20		Heritage economic regeneration funded scheme at Hornsey High Street.
6	Chief Executive	Cap	245		Heritage economic regeneration funded schemes £220k, Conservation area partnership scheme £25k.
6	Chief Executive	Cap *	(1,756)		UCCG profile between years amended.
6	Chief Executive	Cap *	3,000		Unsupported borrowing for IT refresh project.

Children and Young People

3. PRELIMINARY ANALYSES OF RESULTS AT THE END OF KEY STAGES 1,2,3,4 AND POST 16 FOR 2005 AND DATA FOR ATTENDANCE AND EXCLUSIONS

- 2.4 We considered a report which informed us of the provisional results at Key Stages 1-4 and Post 16 for 2005, the analyses of those results and the implications for the School Improvement Programme 2005/6. The report also highlighted the priorities for raising standards during the current and coming years.
- 3.2 We were informed that the results at Key Stages 1 and 2 in Haringey had been improving and tracking the national results. The gap was not closing substantially although the improvement at Key Stage 2 English this year had been very encouraging. At Key Stage 3 the progress was well ahead of the national figures and the closing gap was beginning to show the same pattern as had been seen at Key Stage 4.
- 3.3 At Key Stage 4 there had been a significant improvement which had led to progress at almost four times the national rate since 2001. Haringey had improved from 31% (2001) to 50% 5+ A* - C in 2005. The national result had increased from 50% (2001) to 55.7% in 2005. The greatest improvement had been seen in the schools in the east of the Borough.
- 3.4 Progress for the major ethnic minority groups in the Borough had been good with Caribbean pupils now the fastest improving group with 20% more achieving 5+ A*-C grades since 2002 compared with African pupils at 15% and White UK pupils at 4%. The gap of achievement between ethnic minority groups was now closing while attendance in primary and secondary schools continued to improve.

3.5 Priorities for raising standards were focused on:

- Key Stage 2, especially schools where fewer than 65% of pupils achieved level 4;
- continuing to improve the achievement of pupils from ethnic minorities;
- lower achievers, especially those with special educational needs, and higher achievers, especially those from ethnic minority heritages.

Housing

4. CHANGES TO THE TENANCY AGREEMENT

- 4.1 In April 2005, as part of a review of the Council's tenancy agreement, we approved proposals to consult on demoted tenancies and identity photographs. Consultation then took place between June and October and we have now considered a report which summarised the results of that consultation and which highlighted further stages in the review.
- 4.2 Area Housing Forums were consulted in June and July 2005 and expressed support for the proposals for demoted tenancies and identity photographs. A consultation pack was sent to all secure tenants in September 2005. This comprised information on demoted tenancies and identity photographs, with a questionnaire. Over 400 responses were received. Of tenants who responded to the question on demoted tenancies, 80% supported the proposal, 15% were undecided and only 5% were against it. 87% of respondents favoured a requirement for housing applicants to be photographed, but fewer (74%) supported applying this to existing tenants.
- 4.3 Comments included the following:
- Several tenants said that demotion did not go far enough. They suggested faster and more preventative measures.
 - The North Tottenham Area Housing Forum specifically requested that the Executive again consider the use of Introductory Tenancies.
 - A number of tenants felt that it would not be cost effective or appropriate to photograph existing tenants.
- 4.4 Agencies were consulted through a range of means including by presentations given at the Anti-Social Behaviour Partnership Board and the Haringey Anti-Social Behaviour Liaison Group. In addition, agencies and community groups were consulted via letters. Feedback from organisations included:
- The Council must ensure robust investigations, so that tenants are not unfairly demoted, for example due to malicious reports.
 - Safeguards should be put in place to ensure that vulnerable people are not demoted inappropriately.
- 4.5 In addition to identity photographs, the following amendments to the tenancy agreement were proposed:

- A specific clause requiring tenants to place refuse only in chutes, bins and bulk refuse facilities.
- Amendments to strengthen the Council's right to access to carry out repairs and maintenance (such as gas servicing).

We were informed that these amendments arose from consultation with the Tenancy and Estate Management Panel and the Resident Repairs Panel respectively and did not require consultation under Section 105 of the Housing Act 1985.

- 4.6 In order to amend the tenancy agreement, the prescribed procedure for variation under Section of the 103 Housing Act 1985 had to be followed. This required that a preliminary notice of intention to vary be served on all tenants. The notice needed to set out the proposed variations and their effects, and invite comments. We noted that this preliminary notice would be followed by a notice of variation, specifying the date on which the changes to the tenancy agreement would take effect
- 4.7 We report that, having noted the results of the consultation and the further stages in the review of the tenancy agreement, we approved the introduction of demoted tenancies and an amendment to the tenancy agreement to require identity photographs of tenants. We also agreed that the issue of Introductory Tenancies be considered as part of the on-going review of the Council's tenancy agreement.

Enterprise and Regeneration

5. UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT

- 5.1 We considered a report which advised us that local planning authorities were required to produce Annual Monitoring Reports (AMR) under Section 35 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Regulation 48 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. The AMR covered the period April 2004 to March 2005 and had to be submitted to the Secretary of State by 31 December 2005. The publication of the AMR was also subject to a Best Value Performance Indicator (BV 200c) and the Government was also intending to allocate Planning Delivery Grant to authorities that submitted an AMR by the end of December 2005.
- 5.2 The AMR was used for information purposes to assess the performance and effectiveness of planning policies. It presented available statistical data relating to planning policies in the Council's adopted and emerging Unitary Development Plan. It contained a monitoring framework that identified targets and indicators which would be used to assess the performance and effectiveness of Unitary Development Plan objectives and key policies. The AMR also identified any problems of data collection and analysis.
- 5.3 We report that we approved the Annual Monitoring Report, a copy of which has been placed in the Members Room, for submission to the Government Office for London.

Environment and Conservation

6. DEFRA CONSULTATION – RESPONSE TO PROPOSALS TO CHANGE THE LEVY DEFAULT

- 6.1 The Council would be aware that the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) was largely funded by a levy that was presently paid by the constituent Borough Councils in proportion to their Council Tax bases. This way of apportioning the levy was the 'default' arrangement that applied if no other means of apportionment was unanimously agreed by the Boroughs. A Government consultation paper had been issued which proposed changes to the law so that, from next year onwards, the default arrangement would require the levy to be made up of two parts. One part of which would meet the Authority's disposal costs of the household waste that it received from the Boroughs and would be paid by the Boroughs in proportion to their tonnages of household waste in the most recent completed financial year. The other part would meet all the Authority's other costs, including the transport and disposal costs of civic amenity waste, and would be paid by the boroughs in proportion to their Council Tax bases.
- 6.2 We considered a report which described the proposals and their likely effects for the NLWA levy on the Council and the other constituent Borough Councils and proposed a response to the consultation paper. We noted that, in the last decade or so attention had increasingly been given to the case for payment to be made in proportion to the tonnages that Boroughs delivered to the Authority. The main element in each Waste Disposal Authority's expenditure was the amount of waste that came from the constituent Boroughs for disposal. However, when the levy was apportioned on the default Council Tax base, there was no direct relationship between the expenditure incurred in disposing of the waste from each Borough and the levy each Borough paid.
- 6.3 In consequence, there had been a view in most constituent Councils that the default Council Tax base was unsatisfactory, and that there was a case for a change in the law so that Boroughs would pay on some form of tonnage basis. The higher a Borough's tonnage the more it would pay, and vice versa. This would accord with the "producer pays" principle, would give Boroughs more direct control over their own costs, and would be an encouragement to efficiency savings, the promotion of waste minimisation, reuse and recycling. We also noted that the need for change has been greatly magnified by the substantial increases in waste management costs that were now beginning to be generated by increasing environmental standards being imposed on waste disposal contractors, the Landfill Tax and, in the future, compliance with the Landfill Directive.
- 6.4 We report that although the Government's proposals would be largely cost neutral for Haringey, their intention to introduce the new levy arrangements for the financial year 2006/07 might result in a degree of uncertainty for constituent Boroughs, who were members of Joint Waste Disposal Authorities, until very late in the budget setting cycle, for which reason, whilst supporting the proposed changes, we were calling for transitional relief for those Boroughs who would be adversely affected by these changes in the next financial year.

7. FINSBURY PARK CPZ EXTENSION – REPORT OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION

- 7.1 The Finsbury Park Compulsory Parking Zone (CPZ) was reviewed in June/July 2004, by way of a satisfaction survey in the CPZ and in roads on the periphery of the zone. The feedback indicated support for inclusion from some roads on the periphery. It also highlighted the need to review the distribution of business and pay and display bays to provide for the businesses on Stroud Green Road.
- 7.2 We considered a report in September 2004 which gave approval to proceed with formal consultation for a possible extension of the existing zone. The results were presented to our meeting in June 2005 and we gave approval given to proceed to statutory consultation for a CPZ extension on Scarborough Road, Carlisle Road, Upper Tollington Park, Carlton Road and Cornwall Road. It was also agreed to conduct further consultation with the residents/businesses of Lancaster Road, Connaught Road, Oakfield Road, Dagmar Road and Beatrice Road to ask if, in light of the agreed extension, they now wished to be included, despite their initial lack of support.
- 7.3 We considered a report which set out the feedback from further and Statutory Consultation on the extension to the Finsbury Park CPZ. The report demonstrated that the statutory requirements for making Traffic Management Order's (TMO's) for CPZ's had been satisfied. As a result, it recommended approval to formalise the necessary TMO's for the extension of the Finsbury Park CPZ. Approval was also sought to enter into further Statutory Consultation for modifications to the existing scheme to provide business and pay & display bays at locations, identified in the satisfaction survey, where demand existed and where impact on resident parking was minimal.
- 7.4 We report that having noted the feedback of the further consultation and statutory consultation process and in particular the objections received, we agreed to the extension of the Finsbury Park CPZ for the hours Monday to Saturday 8:30am to 6:30pm, Match day and event Day Controls Monday to Saturday 8:30am to 8:30pm, Sunday 12 noon to 4:30pm. We also authorised officers to make the Traffic Management Order (TMO) and take all the steps necessary for the introduction of a CPZ in the proposed extension area and to proceed to Statutory Consultation for modifications of the existing Finsbury Park CPZ for the relocation of business and pay and display parking bays in the roads specified in the report. Residents would be informed of the decision and works programme in a letter to all properties in the consultation area.

8. STREETSCAPE MANUAL

- 8.1 We considered a report which advised us that, in May 2004, the Audit Commission had inspected the Council's Streetscene Division and had recommended, amongst other things, that the Council develop a design guide to ensure consistency in the appearance of street furniture throughout the Borough.
- 8.2 We were informed that In order to address this recommendation a new Streetscene Manual had been prepared on which consultation had been carried out with internal stakeholders, external bodies and recognised residents' groups. We were also informed that the feedback received showed 100% support for the introduction of Streetscene Guidance, with 73% of respondents agreeing that the draft Manual contained the correct elements although it was highlighted that environmental aspects should be added to the key principles. There were a number of other points that could be adopted in the Manual while others would require further discussion or consideration.

8.3 We report that we agreed, in principle, to adopt a Streetscene Manual to promote consistency in street design and furniture throughout the Borough and to the modification of the draft Manual to reflect comments received during consultation as appropriate. We also delegated authority to approve the content of the Manual to the Director of Environmental Services in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment and Conservation.