

Appendix 2

Wards Corner Project – Conclusions and recommendations of Overview and Scrutiny Committee, responses to recommendations

Overall comments on the report			
<p>Haringey Council is not the freeholder, leaseholder, nor operator of the market, and therefore there are limitations on the actions the Council can lawfully undertake to impact on a number of the concerns addressed by the Scrutiny Report.</p> <p>That said, Haringey Council is fully committed to securing the future for the Seven Sisters Market including the Latin Village. During the redevelopment, there will be a temporary market just across the road, and when the market moves back to the original site, returning traders have a clear list of commitments, including reduced rent and the guarantee of equivalent space made by the developer, Grainger, and backed up by a committed council.</p>			
	Recommendation	Response (Agreed / Not agreed / Partially agreed)	Who and when
1.	<p>The Council should negotiate with its development partner Grainger to revise the terms of reference for the Market Traders Steering Group to cover the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democratic elections of trader representatives. • Appointment of Independent Chair [acceptable to the trader representatives]. • Role of the Council’s Town Centre manager to be clearly defined. • Regularised reporting arrangements between the Steering Group and the Council to allow any relevant issues where the Council has a 	<p>The Council has consistently stressed the vital importance of ensuring, alongside Transport for London and Grainger, that facilitation and management of the market has the confidence of the traders.</p> <p><u>Steering Group</u> The Future of the Seven Sisters Market Steering Group (‘Steering Group’) was established by Grainger in 2016 to progress discussions with traders on proposals for the temporary market at Apex House and the new permanent market when it moves back to Wards Corner. The Steering Group, which is a Grainger initiative, is not covered by provisions in the s106 agreement; while the Council has been keen to support it, it is not governed by any formal agreement between</p>	<p>The Council has shared the report into the s106 agreement with Grainger (and traders) which had a number of recommendations including those in relation to the Steering Group.</p> <p>The Council however has no powers to compel either Grainger or the traders to implement the recommendations.</p> <p>No actions identified.</p>

	<p>regulatory role to be communicated promptly to appropriate departments and service areas.</p> <p>The agenda items, minutes and actions arising from meetings of the steering group to be shared with senior managers at the Council.</p>	<p>Grainger and the Council.</p> <p>The Council's investigation into Grainger's section 106 obligations relating to the Wards Corner scheme (published in December 2019) made the following relevant recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Developer reconstitutes the Steering Group with clearly defined terms of reference and a democratic way of operation. 2. That the Council has a formal observer role in the Steering Group (and any successor). <p>The investigation report also included a commitment that any issues arising at Steering Group meetings which relate to performance of the planning obligations will be brought to the prompt attention of the Planning Department. This will be achieved by regular formal reports to the Planning Service from the Regeneration Service, at least quarterly.</p> <p>The Terms of Reference for the Steering Group and the circulation of its agendas, minutes etc are ultimately a matter for all its members to agree. The Council will continue to stress the importance of putting in place appropriate structures that can command the confidence of its participants and stakeholders.</p> <p><u>Market Facilitator</u></p>	
--	---	---	--

		<p>The Section 106 agreement does include obligations to the Market Traders to help them continue trading from both the temporary and permanent market. This includes the requirement to appoint a Market Facilitator whose role is to: promote the interests of the non-English speaking traders; provide business support and advice; assist Traders to continue trading in the Market and the Temporary Market; advertise the proposed relocation; advertise the new markets; and to assist individuals working at the market to find suitable alternative employment if they decide not to relocate.</p> <p>Whilst the review was ongoing Grainger reverted to holding all-trader meetings to keep traders up to speed on matters affecting the future of the market.</p> <p><u>The Council's role</u> The Council's representative on the Steering Group is the Town Centre Growth Manager (TCGM). The TCGM's core role in relation to the Steering Group has been focussed on Town Centre Management/Business Support type activities. The TCGM did not act on behalf of any of the Council's wider functions, notably the Council's regulatory/enforcement, corporate land ownership or wider regeneration functions. There never was any expectation that these council functions would be discharged through the Steering Group.</p> <p>As the market heads towards the first of two moves, the Council is very keen to work alongside an appropriately appointed Market Facilitator to support the traders and other businesses at Seven Sisters to</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>secure a successful future for this Market and for the area more widely.</p> <p>Ward Members were invited to previous Steering Group meetings and will continue to be invited and actively encouraged to attend any reinvigorated Steering Group.</p> <p>This recommendation is therefore partially agreed for the reasons set out above.</p>	
2.	<p>The Standards Committee to review Part Four (Rules of Procedure), Section G (Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules), and the section under which officers are expected to provide evidence in Scrutiny Reviews. The presumption should be that officers should be expected to provide evidence to Scrutiny Reviews unless there are strong reasons for refusal. In reviewing this section, the opinion of the trade unions should be sought to ensure the protection of staff at all levels of the organisation.</p>	<p>Haringey Council recognises and values the vital role of the scrutiny process to the effective and accountable running of the Council.</p> <p>This Council is proud to work with trade unions to ensure employees' rights at work are upheld. The Council has an agreement in relation to arrangements that set out the appropriate level of seniority of officers appearing before Scrutiny Panels.</p> <p>The Council notes the desire of the Panel to question an officer outwith these agreed arrangements. The Council continues to believe that the existing arrangements are appropriate and that officers who participated in this process were able to provide the necessary information to assist the Scrutiny Review.</p> <p><u>Background</u> Existing arrangements require that senior officers (at second or third tier) attend Scrutiny Review Panels to explain matters within their remit in relation to:</p>	No actions identified

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Any particular decision or series of decisions;b) The extent to which the actions taken implement council policy, andc) Their performance. <p>At the discretion of their Director, council officers below third tier may attend, usually accompanied by a senior manager.</p> <p>These arrangements ensure that officer involvement in scrutiny reviews is appropriate to their level of seniority.</p> <p>In this instance, the Assistant Director for Regeneration and Economic Development attended scrutiny panel on two occasions and provided written responses covering questions raised by the scrutiny panel.</p> <p>The Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning did not agree to a request for a more junior manager attend the Panel on the basis that either the questions raised could be dealt with either through the Assistant Director at the Panel sessions or through subsequent written responses.</p> <p>The OSC/HRSP report has provided no evidence to suggest that this arrangement is not fit for purpose in general, or that in this particular case the necessary information could not be obtained via the existing arrangement.</p> <p>The recommendation is therefore not agreed, though ultimately it will be a matter for the Standards</p>	
--	--	--	--

		Committee if it wishes to review Section G (Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules).	
3.	<p>The Council should ensure that the ongoing investigation into the compliance with the section 106 obligations should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the conflict of interest between the market facilitator role and market operator role, when they were the same person, could not have been recognised earlier. • What due diligence had been undertaken in the appointment of the Market Facilitator. • What checks and balances were in place to ensure that the Market Facilitator is acting fairly, independently and in the interests of the traders as outlined in the S106 obligations. • When the S106 obligations commenced and what the causal factors were in their becoming operational. • To identify any procedural failings in the prescribed six-monthly reporting arrangements for the section 106 agreement and take action if the report back obligation is incomplete. • To publicly clarify the position on the section 106 agreement, given the Panel heard evidence suggesting there had been a breach. • How a failure to monitor the S106 agreement occurred and could continue for so long while breaches of the S106 agreement were 	<p>The Council wholeheartedly agrees with the importance of obligations contained within all s106 agreements being met.</p> <p>This is partially agreed as the Council’s planning department has completed an investigation into the question of whether some of the section 106 obligations have been breached. A number of the issues raised by the Panel are covered by this investigation. The findings of which have been published. The key findings of the investigation are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The appointment of Quarterbridge as Market Facilitator did not breach the obligations but it was accepted that the relationship between Quarterbridge and the Traders had broken down and was not working for the purpose of the Market Facilitator obligations; 2. Prior to the Deed of Variation (DoV) being completed, the traders and all interested parties were consulted through the planning process on the proposed appointment of Quarterbridge as Market Facilitator. There was no objection raised to the DoV on this element. It is not agreed that there were any procedural failings on the part of the Council; 3. The case for an independent Market Facilitator is clear and is reiterated in the report; 4. The obligation relating to the six-monthly 	No actions identified

	<p>repeatedly reported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How failure to monitor the S106 agreement had an impact on the council's public sector equalities obligations. <p>The investigation should analyse the impact of this, what remedies may be available and establish measures to ensure that there is no repetition in future.</p> <p>The conclusions should be submitted to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government.</p>	<p>reporting is no longer in force as it was deleted as part of the DoV. Notwithstanding this, there is no evidence that this was ever done or not done. Officers who were responsible for this on both the Developer's and Council's side are no longer in post;</p> <p>5. It is not considered that there was failure to monitor the s106 agreement although it has been agreed to improve communications between the Planning and Regeneration teams as set out in the report and consequently it is not agreed that the Council failed in its PSED.</p> <p>The full report of the investigation is available on the Council website:</p> <p>https://www.haringey.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning/major-projects-and-regeneration/seven-sisters-regeneration</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government's (SoS) involvement in the Wards Corner project only relates to the decision to confirm the CPO. It would not be appropriate to report findings of any investigation being undertaken by the Planning Authority to the SoS as the wider issues relating to the s106 or the development agreement are not a matter for them.</p>	
4.	<p>Any replacement market facilitator should be genuinely independent and hold the confidence of all parties. The Council should request Grainger to appoint an</p>	<p>The Council concurs with this recommendation. It firmly believes, and has consistently made clear, the absolute necessity of there being an independent Market Facilitator, and a process which can command</p>	<p>Grainger to appoint a temporary Market facilitator to discharge the obligations as set out in the s106 obligations and</p>

	<p>independent, qualified market facilitator. This needs to be done in full consultation with the traders. It is essential that adequate due diligence is carried out ahead of any appointment.</p>	<p>the confidence of all the key stakeholders. Therefore, this recommendation is agreed.</p> <p>The Planning Authority has made its own recommendations on the Market Facilitator role as part of its investigation. The key recommendations are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Developer, with the assistance of the Council, procures a temporary Market Facilitator pending the appointment of a permanent Market Facilitator. 2. That the Developer widely advertises the post of the Market Facilitator. 3. That the Market Facilitator should be independent from the Developer and anyone connected with the running of the market. 4. That the Developer meets with the Council and traders bi-annually to review the progress towards meeting the obligations in the principal agreement. 5. That the Developer randomly selects two traders, from a pool who have indicated their willingness to participate, to assist in the identification, selection and appointment of the Market Facilitator. 6. That before the placing of the advertisement for the post, the Developer develops shortlisting and weighting criteria to be used in the selection and appointment of the Market Facilitator. The Developer should consult the Council and traders before finalising such criteria. 7. That the shortlisting and interviewing be 	<p>satisfy the recommendations from the s106 investigation. It is expected that the temporary Market Facilitator appointment will be made in January 2020.</p> <p>A permanent Market Facilitator is expected to be appointed around the second half of 2020. The timeline towards this is to be finalised between Grainger and the Council in January 2020.</p>
--	---	---	---

		<p>carried out by a panel comprising representatives of the traders, the Council and the Developer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">8. That, when appointing a Market Facilitator, the Developer takes into account the views of the traders selected to participate in the identification, selection and appointment of the Market Facilitator unless there are material considerations which outweigh the traders preferred candidate. In that case the Developer should submit a report to the Council explaining the considerations and for the Council to agree to that assessment in writing.9. That the traders and any interested parties report any future alleged non-compliance with the provisions of the principal agreement to the Interim Manager – Planning Enforcement and Appeals for investigation in the first instance.10. That the Developer develops a set of Key Performance Indicators (“KPIs”) which will be used to measure the Developer’s progress towards the objectives of the agreement.11. That the temporary Market Facilitator and the permanent Market Facilitator present progress reports to the Steering Group or its successor(s) OR, in the alternative, report progress directly to the Council. The report should be presented every 6 months.12. That the Developer reconstitutes the Steering Group with clearly defined terms of reference and a democratic way of operation.13. That the Council has a formal observer role in	
--	--	--	--

		the Steering Group (and any successor).	
5.	The Council Planning department should carry out a review of how all S106 conditions are monitored and enforced. In particular, with regard to people who share protected characteristics under S149 of the Equality Act. The public needs to be confident that the monitoring and enforcement of such conditions are rigorous, robust, and pursued in the interests of residents and that these procedures are transparent.	<p>On 12th September 2019, the Council published a review of how s106 and CIL agreements were being managed by the Council. Given that the review was presented to the Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Panel it is not necessary to hold a further review. The Council is focused on implementing the actions that were identified as part of that review.</p> <p><u>Background</u> The Planning Service commissioned an independent review of its S106 and CIL procedures in January 2019. The review conclusions state that “Haringey Council has S106 and CIL systems in place which align with the principal legislative and regulatory requirements. There are elements of good practice in the Council’s approach” and “The Assistant Director of Planning maintains a good oversight of the systems including in particular expenditure from the S106 and CIL funds by ensuring compliance with relevant legislation or individual S106 agreements”. However, “there are a number of deficiencies that reduce the efficiency, effectiveness and resilience of the service”</p> <p>The following actions have been identified with the dates set for doing them by in brackets:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finalise a S106 Procedure Manual (December 2019) 2. Undertake training for all Development Management and Land Charges officers on 	The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability is responsible for the implementation of the Action Plan In line with the agreed completion dates.

		<p>S106 processes in order to clarify their role in this process and with reference to the S106 manual (February 2020)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Initiate procurement for specialist S106/CIL software and initiate making records ready for transfer of records from old to new system (April 2020) 4. Create manual 'backup' copies of folders containing S106 master spreadsheets more regularly (done) 5. Increase the CIL/106 staff resource by introducing 1 additional post at a more senior level and upgrading the current post. (post filled by April 2020) 6. Ensuring that a single manager within planning has a greater role in the day to day management ensuring adherence to the manual/ protocols across the council. (done through the appointment of a permanent full-time Head of Planning Policy) <p>The recommendations made in this report and the follow up actions identified subsequently are currently being implemented.</p> <p>There is no evidence – in that review, or in this scrutiny report – that current practice neglects the Equality Duty. Therefore, this recommendation is not agreed.</p>	
6.	The Council should take the necessary steps to assure itself that in monitoring, reviewing and enforcing its Section 106 planning obligations, it pays due regard to	As stated in answer to recommendation 5, an independent review of the Council's operation of its CIL and Section 106 procedure took place earlier in the year and was presented in September to the Housing	No actions identified

	<p>its Public Sector Equality Duty. The cabinet should further ensure that these steps are taken within a reasonable period of time.</p>	<p>and Environment Scrutiny Panel.</p> <p>This recommendation is not agreed as there is no evidence – in that review, or in this scrutiny report – that the Equality Duty has been neglected.</p>	
7.	<p>The Panel noted that there could be a perception of a conflict of interest between the Planning and Regeneration departments and recommends providing a separation of the two services in order to provide for clearer understanding</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges that there can be conflicting priorities between those delivering housing and regeneration initiatives and those implementing planning policy. This administration has taken the decision to have separate Cabinet Members for Finance and Strategic Regeneration and Climate Change and Sustainability (including planning) in order to help manage this.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Planning service has a regulatory role which affects many different departments of the Council and given that all officers in the Council report ultimately to the chief executive, it is not possible to completely separate that regulatory role from the rest of the Council in terms of management.</p> <p>Instead, management and officers ensure that the planning service – in line with the law, and with common practice across the country – carries out its regulatory role with independence and professionalism. The Council can find no evidence in this report that the current arrangements create unmanageable conflicts, that any individual decision has been made inappropriately, or that there is any widespread perception of a problem and therefore this recommendation is not agreed.</p>	<p>No actions identified</p>

<p>8.</p>	<p>The Council, in its regulatory health and safety role should work with TfL, Grainger and any other stakeholders to draw up a plan of action to address all outstanding and ongoing maintenance work at Seven Sisters Market in order to secure a working environment which complies with all regulations.</p>	<p>It is important to remember that the Council does not own either the leasehold or the freehold of the Seven Sisters Market which includes the Latin Village Market. Therefore, the Council has only two regulatory functions relating to Health and Safety at Seven Sisters Market, namely Building Control and Environmental Health and Safety.</p> <p><u>Seven Sisters Market – Day to Day Maintenance and Health & Safety</u></p> <p>The freehold of the building which the Seven Sisters Market (SSM) is situated is owned by London Underground Limited (LUL) and managed by TfL. Market Asset Management Limited (MAM) has a lease of the ground floor of the building occupied by SSM.</p> <p>MAM is responsible for the internal maintenance of SSM with insurance maintenance and repairs of the structural shell of the building remaining the responsibility of LUL. Both LUL and MAM have Health and Safety responsibilities for SSM and the building. The Council holds no such responsibilities.</p> <p>TfL in its role as freehold owner of the Wards Corner building has commissioned a series of inspections to assess the structural and overall condition of the building and to ensure it complies with all applicable legal requirements. These inspections commenced on the 18th November 2019 and are scheduled to be completed by mid-January 2020.</p> <p>TfL wrote to all the traders in early November to notify them of this investigation and held an all traders</p>	<p>TfL investigation ongoing and currently due to report in January 2020.</p> <p>Regulatory Services are visiting the Market and working with those that have regulatory responsibilities (health and safety, food and licensing) to ensure that there is a general compliance and that any issues that have been highlighted by Scrutiny are looked into and actioned.</p>
-----------	--	--	---

		<p>meeting to answer traders' questions in advance of work starting.</p> <p><u>Building Control</u> Building Control's statutory responsibility relates to building work and not to ongoing maintenance work. Building Control do not have record of any building works being undertaken at the premises over the last 7 years and have not received any notification of either unlawful building work or any reports of dangerous structures.</p> <p><u>Environmental Health & Safety</u> The role of the regulatory service in Environmental Health is to ensure compliance with various statutory provisions mainly in food safety, health and safety and licensing. This role would not extend to fire safety (responsibility of London Fire Brigade) or drawing up action plans for improvements as this could result in a conflict of interest or could prejudice any regulatory action that could follow. The Council is able to advise on regulatory compliance, codes of practice or comment on any action plan (with regard to food safety, health and safety and Licensing) drawn together by the various businesses or individuals whose primary role is to ensure regulatory compliance.</p> <p>This is partially agreed as set out above and the Council in its health and safety, food and licensing roles will ensure ongoing compliance of regulatory functions within its remit of the market according to risks and problems which are identified.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>9.</p>	<p>In light of the disturbing allegations the Panel heard in the evidence sessions from former housing association residents, we recommend that the council explore the lessons that could be learned from working with housing associations to rehouse vulnerable residents.</p>	<p>The Council was concerned by evidence presented to the Review about the way existing tenants were treated by Housing Associations. The Council has learned lessons from what has happened in this instance and has committed to a different approach in the future.</p> <p>Whilst this recommendation is agreed, it should be noted however that it is unusual for the Council to be involved in directly rehousing existing tenants of Housing Associations. Typically, this is the responsibility of the Housing Association.</p> <p><u>Lessons that have been learnt</u></p> <p>In situations where a development ultimately results in the demolition of inhabited residential properties to facilitate major improvement works, it is vitally important that the Council is involved in liaising with all current residents at the earliest opportunity regardless of what type of tenancy individual residents hold and who their current landlord is. In practical terms this involves the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The relevant team within the Council working with all residents in such areas, signposting them to alternative accommodation. This also involves each resident having a dedicated contact point for information both within the Council and with their current landlord. 2. Council staff identifying at the earliest possible stage any individuals or households where there may be potential concerns. Work then takes place to provide practical assistance to 	<p>The mitigation measures outlined are now in place and being reviewed regularly by the rehousing team (sitting within the Estate Regeneration team), working closely with colleagues across other departments and relevant external agencies as may be required.</p>
-----------	---	---	--

		<p>help the individual or family through the rehousing process. In relevant cases this involves Council officers working with any dedicated teams the other landlord may have.</p> <p>3. All residents within such an area have a 'needs assessment' completed by Council officers. This is a formal mechanism whereby existing support networks helping the individual or family are identified, or more importantly in this context, where such support is identified as being necessary but not yet in place. Such gaps can then be filled either through the Council itself, (eg social services), or another supporting agency.</p> <p>4. Individuals and families who are asked to move often feel particular pressure when trying to find alternative accommodation. Such pressure is intensified if the individual or family have vulnerability issues. It is therefore important that such individuals and families are supported through the rehousing process as outlined above, but also have access to additional support mechanisms once their new tenancy has started. This requires support packages that will enable the residents to sustain their tenancies.</p>	
10.	<p>The Panel strongly recommends that the Cabinet make a public statement in response to the Special Procedure reports from the UN, covering all the issues raised, in relation to Wards Corner.</p>	<p>The Council takes the promotion of equality and the protection of minority rights very seriously and places the highest priority on them.</p> <p>The Council would like to have had the opportunity to respond to the UN Rapporteur, however, Foreign and</p>	<p>No actions identified</p>

		<p>Commonwealth Office has directed that it is for the Government only to respond to correspondence from the United Nations Special Rapporteur (UNSR) and therefore the Council was specifically asked not to respond or otherwise intervene.</p> <p>This is because the Government does not want an inter-state mechanism (i.e. UNSR) arguing it has the right to expect a response from any parties other than state representatives. Therefore, this recommendation is not agreed because it cannot be agreed.</p>	
11.	<p>In light of the change in emphasis towards the provision of social housing, at both local and regional levels, the Panel recommends that the Council should explore the feasibility and cost benefits of all approaches for a full or partial buy-out of interests at the Seven Sisters market and whole site</p>	<p>The Council is in a Development Agreement (DA) with Grainger for the development of this site. The DA does not allow the Council to 'buy out' either fully or partially the property interests already acquired by Grainger.</p> <p>The Council owns just 3 residential properties on Suffield Road which are part of the DA. The Council has no other land interests on this site. Grainger has secured, or has agreements to purchase, c.95% of the wider site.</p> <p>The Council cannot exit the DA unless there has been a default of a fundamental nature and as there has been no default, there is no way for the Council to simply walk away from the DA.</p> <p>If the Council decided to terminate the DA outside of its provisions, then it would be in breach of its obligations to Grainger who would have a right to sue the Council for this breach which is expected to include Grainger's</p>	No actions identified

		<p>expenditure on the project since 2004. As at February 2019 Grainger has spent c£19m on property acquisitions and project development fees/costs. Any substantiated further losses and costs incurred by Grainger as a result of the Council's breach of the DA will also be factored into payments that Grainger will expect to be repaid e.g. loss of profit.</p> <p>The Council is committed to securing the future for the Seven Sisters Market including the Latin Village. During the redevelopment, there will be a temporary market across the road, and when the market moves back to the original site, returning traders have a clear list of commitments, including reduced rent and the guarantee of equivalent space made by Grainger. For the reasons set out above, this recommendation is not agreed because it cannot be agreed.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has limited influence over this matter, it is absolutely committed to achieving a positive outcome, bringing stakeholders together, to deliver a vibrant market.</p>	
12.	<p>The Council should set up a task force to work with West Green Road/Seven Sisters Development Trust, Save Latin Village and Wards Corner CIC & relevant community groups to develop their ideas for a partnership and a plan. This will encompass all the obligations of the Council's Public Sector Equality Duty consider establishment of social housing on the site and explore the feasibility and desirability of retention of the heritage characteristics of the existing buildings.</p>	<p>As stated above, the Council cannot walk away from the Development Agreement.</p> <p>The current scheme will deliver the homes and wider improvements this area has needed for decades. Consequently, this recommendation is not agreed.</p> <p>With regard to the future of the Seven Sisters Market itself, a Member-led Policy Advisory Group, supported by an independent consultant, has been looking at</p>	<p>Local Planning Authority action</p>

		<p>establishing a viable model for the management and maintenance of the market in future that seeks to balance the needs and interests of the key stakeholders. This work will be reporting separately. This process has engaged with the majority of permitted traders, alongside other key stakeholders.</p> <p>With regard to the Community Plan, the Local Planning Authority consulted with the key stakeholders and the local community as part of the determination of the revised planning application, which was approved (subject to conditions) on 20th November 2019.</p>	
13.	<p>If the above recommendation is not accepted, the taskforce should work with Grainger and relevant community groups such as West Green Road/Seven Sisters Development Trust, Save Latin Village and Wards Corner CIC to develop their ideas, and co-ordinate any combined solution. Any such solution should meet the obligations of the S106, take account of the many changing economic and political circumstances since 2012, include a social/affordable housing element and embrace the aspirations of the wider community in relation to the cultural heritage of the built environment.</p>	<p>As stated above, the Council cannot walk away from the Development Agreement. Instead the Council is focused on the best possible outcome for the community including the Sevens Sisters Market.</p> <p>With regard to the Market itself, a Member-led Policy Advisory Group, supported by an independent consultant, has been looking at establishing a viable model for the management and maintenance of the future market that seeks to balance the needs and interests of the key stakeholders. This process has engaged with the majority of permitted Traders, alongside other key stakeholders. This work will be reporting separately.</p> <p>With regard to the Community Plan, the Local Planning Authority consulted with the key stakeholders and the local community as part of the determination of the revised planning application, which was approved (subject to conditions) on 20th November 2019.</p>	<p>Policy Advisory Group and Local Planning Authority Action</p>

		<p>As set out above, the separate review of section 106 arrangements has now concluded, and action is being taken to implement its findings.</p> <p>Based on the above approach, the specific recommendation is not agreed.</p>	
<p>14.</p>	<p>The Regeneration department should ascertain and publish details on the amount of public money, including grants, which have been allocated to this development. This report should include reasons funds were allocated, the source and purpose of the funding and establish the amounts spent, what it was spent on, and how much remains.</p>	<p>This is agreed and the Council can confirm that the only public funding that has been allocated/paid in respect of the Wards Corner project is as follows, details of which are already in the public domain.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. £1.5m interim gap funding has been paid to Grainger Seven Sisters Ltd against site acquisition costs paid on the Wards Corner site. The funding was paid by the Council using funding from the Bridge New Deal for Communities initiative (NDC) i.e. as Accountable body. In addition, a further £500k of gap funding is to be provided to Grainger SSL by way of a deduction to the sale price of the Council owned property within the Wards Corner development. The total £2m of gap funding is repayable to the Council (with interest and a possible 'additional consideration'), subject to conditions, in the event a minimum profit level (20%) is realised on the completed development. 2. The Mayor of London through TfL has agreed to provide £284,500 of funding to the Council to provide financial support to the small businesses to assist in resourcing the 	<p>The Assistant Director for Capital Projects and Property will assess overage in accordance with the terms of the Development Agreement with Grainger. The overage calculation date is 24 months from completion of the development.</p>

		temporary relocation of Seven Sisters market following its temporary closure.	
--	--	---	--