

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 04 APRIL 2011

DATE OF COMING INTO EFFECT: 11 APRIL 2011

## **Decisions of Cabinet**

29 March 2011

Cabinet Members:

Cllr Lynne Hillan (Chairman)

\* Melvin Cohen, LLB

Andrew Harper

\* Robert Rams

\* Brian Coleman

\* Helena Hart

\* Joanna Tambourides

\* Richard Cornelius

\* Sachin Rajput

\* Daniel Thomas

\* denotes Member present

Cabinet noted that, in accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 2.1.1, the Leader had notified the Democratic Services Manager that Councillor Daniel Thomas should preside over the meeting.

Councillor Daniel Thomas in the Chair.

**1. MINUTES:**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2011 were approved.

**2. ABSENCE OF MEMBERS:**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lynne Hillan and Councillor Andrew Harper.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS:**

No interests were declared.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS:**

Details are appended of the questions asked of, and the answers given by, the Cabinet Members.

**5. STRATEGIC LIBRARY REVIEW (Report of the Cabinet Member for Customer Access and Partnerships – Agenda Item 5)**

Cabinet noted that two petitions had been received in relation to this item, one in the name of Barnet Labour Party bearing 138 signatures and a further petition bearing 3,044 signatures.

For the reasons set out in the Cabinet Members' report, Cabinet

RESOLVED that:

1. Consultation commence on the proposed Strategy and Financial Plan for a ten week period, with a final report outlining recommendations to be submitted to Cabinet for consideration thereafter.
2. The extensive consultation and review activity that underpins the proposed Strategy and Financial Plan be noted.
3. The Equality Impact Assessment related to the proposed library Strategy and Financial Plan be noted.
4. Development of a high-level Implementation Plan incorporating all key changes, aligned with the outcome of consultation activities be approved.
5. The requirement for additional capital expenditure, as outlined in the Cabinet Members' report, which will be subject to a separate report to the Cabinet Resources Committee, be noted.
6. Discussions commence with the Arts Depot Trust regarding the potential co-location and development of a new Landmark Library with arts, cultural and children's specialism within the Arts Depot site.
7. The initiation of negotiations with a neighbouring borough to develop a shared services approach be approved, with recommendations to be submitted to Cabinet for consideration.

**6. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – CORE STRATEGY (Report of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning & Regeneration – Agenda Item 6a):**

For the reasons set out in the Cabinet Members' report, Cabinet

RESOLVED that:

1. The Core Strategy Pre-Submission Amendments (as set out in Appendix A to the report) be approved for a period of at least six weeks of public consultation and subsequent submission to the Secretary of State.
2. Cabinet refer this report to the meeting of the Council on 12 April 2011 for formal approval of the Core Strategy (as set out in Appendix B to the report) and submission to the Secretary of State.
3. The Director of Planning, Housing and Regeneration be authorised, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning and Regeneration, to agree any consequent changes to the Core Strategy for consideration at the Examination in Public.

**7. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES (Report of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning & Regeneration – Agenda Item 6b):**

For the reasons set out in the Cabinet Members' report, Cabinet

RESOLVED that:

1. The Development Management Policies – Submission Draft (as set out at Appendix A to the report) be approved for a period of at least six weeks of public engagement.
2. Cabinet refer this report to the meeting of the Council on 12 April 2011 for formal approval of the Development Management Policies (as set out at Appendix A to the report) and submission to the Secretary of State.
3. The Director of Planning, Housing and Regeneration be authorised in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning and Regeneration to agree any consequent changes to the Development Management Policies – Submission prior to the Examination in Public.

**8. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – NORTH LONDON WASTE PLAN: SUBMISSION DRAFT AND SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (Report of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning & Regeneration – Agenda Item 6c):**

For the reasons set out in the Cabinet Members' report, Cabinet

RESOLVED that:

1. That the North London Waste Plan (NLWP) – Submission Draft (as set out at Appendix A to the report) be approved for, public consultation and subsequent submission to the Secretary of State.
2. That the Supplemental Memorandum of Understanding (as set out at Appendix B to the report) be approved as the formal arrangement for Barnet's continued involvement in the NLWP.
3. That Cabinet refer this report to the meeting of the Council on 12 April 2011 for formal approval of the NLWP Submission Draft and the Supplemental Memorandum of Understanding.
4. That the Director for Planning, Housing and Regeneration, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning and Regeneration, and the other north London boroughs, be authorised to make any minor changes to the North London Waste Plan for future consideration at public examination.

The meeting finished at 7.40pm

## Appendix to Cabinet Decisions, 29 March 2011 – Agenda Item 4

### Mr Tichborne

#### Question

Can the Cabinet confirm that all money raised from selling freehold properties of libraries being shut down will be ring fenced specifically for the purposes outlined in the Library Review and can the Cabinet confirm that no library will be shut until such time as a replacement library as described in the review has been opened?

#### Supplementary Question

Can Cabinet Member provide details of arrangements in place to consult with Barnet residents in relation to the implementation of the Library Strategy?

#### Response to Question

As set out in the library strategy, we intend to use the capital raised from the release of existing library properties to re-invest to make the library service fit for purpose in the future. This capital will be used as one-off expenditure on new building, accessibility improvements, and investment in IT. The investment is necessary to enable the council to make the longer-term efficiency savings that are set out in the proposed strategy.

Cabinet will consider a detailed implementation plan for the final library strategy following a further period of consultation. It is at that point that Cabinet will take decisions on the scheduling of changes to buildings. The implementation plan will need to include a timetable for merging, vacating and rebuilding library buildings. That timetable will need to balance our desire to minimise disruption for customers against the critical need to re-invest in the service in order to make the necessary changes and improvements.

#### Response to Supplementary Question

Further consultation will take place with residents over the next 10-weeks. In addition, presentations will be made to Residents Forums.

**Mr Scott**Question 1

Can the Cabinet please explain why they are endorsing and proposing (with little or no proper consultation), what would be, one of Europe's largest waste treatment, polluting plants on a site which is of significant ecological interest and surrounded by a large residential population, including four local schools and their close-knit communities?

Supplementary Question

Why is the use being proposed to the detriment of public health and contrary to EU legislation?

Response to Question 1

Two major rounds of public consultation have taken place on the North London Waste Plan (NLWP), in January – March 2008 on Issues and Options, and in October – November 2009 on Preferred Options. The NLWP aims to identify sites appropriate for waste use. As part of the process of site identification Pinkham Way has been assessed against a set of criteria including proximity to schools, housing and impact on nature conservation. It has been identified as one of the most suitable sites from a long list of potential sites assessed across the seven north London boroughs.

Pinkham Way is the former Friern Barnet sewage works and is currently fenced off to protect the public from the presence of poisonous giant knotweed. As a former sewage works, the site is zoned for industrial use.

Response to Supplementary Question

The Council would not endorse any scheme that was detrimental to public health.

Question 2

Is the Cabinet aware that the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) proposal to site a mega-waste treatment facility at Pinkham Way is in direct contravention of its own Corporate Plan 2010-2013 which states that, in order for Barnet to continue to be a successful London suburb, it should appropriately plan and thereby preserve, enhance and protect the environment (including sites of importance for Nature Conservation) from the threat of the negative environmental impact of industrial facilities?

Response to Question 2

Whilst the Corporate Plan states that it will protect and enhance our natural and built environment it also identifies the tension between an economically vibrant and developing community and the environmental impact of the activities of that community. Dealing with our waste is one such impact. The NLWP ensures that we appropriately plan and thereby protect residential areas from any environmental impact of new or redevelopment of existing waste facilities.

<p><u>Supplementary Question</u> Will this industrial treatment plant enhance the quality of green space?</p>	<p><u>Response to Supplementary Question</u> The site is designated for industrial use. Neither the construction or operation of the facility will be harmful.</p>
<p><u>Question 3</u> Is the Cabinet not concerned about the Environmental, Social and Physical impact of this proposal on the surrounding residential communities?</p> <p><u>Supplementary Question</u> If you are concerned, why are you not hearing the voice of residents?</p>	<p><u>Response to Question 3</u> The NLWP will enhance our built environment by ensuring that new waste development is located and designed appropriately, provide the opportunity for energy and power to be delivered to residents from new waste development and ensure Barnet develops and grows in an environmentally responsible way that reduces CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and climate change impacts. A health impact assessment will be completed as part of an outline planning application.</p> <p><u>Response to Supplementary Question</u> It is only natural that people will have concerns and will express them wherever a facility is to be constructed. It is up to us to mitigate those concerns.</p>
<p><u>Question 4</u> Is the Cabinet not concerned that there has not been any proper consensus of opinion taken from the surrounding residential communities that would be severely and negatively impacted by this proposal should it go ahead?</p> <p><u>Supplementary Question</u> Why are the Council not listening to residents who are against this proposal, some of whom are here tonight?</p>	<p><u>Response to Question 4</u> Two major rounds of public consultation have taken place on the NLWP, in January – March 2008 on Issues and Options, and in October – November 2009 on Preferred Options. The last round generated 317 questionnaire responses. Exhibitions and public meetings were arranged as part of these consultations including meetings with residents groups local to Pinkham Way. Responses have fed into the Submission Draft and a report on the consultation responses is available on the NLWP website. More recently a series of public exhibitions have been put on by the North London Waste Authority to publicise the more detailed plans for the Pinkham Way site including leafleting 11,000 local homes within 1km of the site. Indeed staff are briefing local groups this evening.</p>

	<p><u>Response to Supplementary Question</u> We are listening to residents and will further listen to those residents. Ultimately what is put on this site is a matter for the Haringey Planning Committee and not for us.</p>
<p><u>Question 5</u> Does the Cabinet consider that removing 6 hectares of mature green space and replacing it with a mega-large waste treatment facility and vehicle depot is in keeping with the primary objectives of planning policy, including the Open Space and Bio-diversity Plan?</p> <p><u>Supplementary Question</u> Is the Cabinet intent on increasing pollution with intensive use? As we have seen in the press recently, London is already the most polluted city in Europe.</p>	<p><u>Response to Question 4</u> The adopted Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for Haringey is the appropriate document to address these matters which designates the site for both nature conservation and employment use.</p> <p><u>Response to Supplementary Question</u> Waste itself is a form of pollution. National government and European policy states that we, as a Council, are compelled to deal with waste in the place that it is produced.</p>
<p><u>Question 6</u> Is the Cabinet not concerned about the potential long-term health risks and costs that this development could pose and be in violation of the basic human right of residents to a healthy existence</p> <p><u>Supplementary Question</u> Is the Council not aware of the cocktail of pollutants and dioxin levels that will result from this proposal resulting in damage public health?</p>	<p><u>Response to Question 6</u> Please see answer to question 3.</p> <p><u>Response to Supplementary Question</u> We don't believe that dioxins will be released from this facility and we would be against any unpleasant facility being constructed here.</p>
<p><u>Question 7</u> Is the Cabinet not concerned about the increase in traffic generation and Environmental Pollution (including noise) that this proposal would generate?</p> <p><u>Supplementary Question</u> Is it the Council's policy to increase traffic and pollution levels in this area?</p>	<p><u>Response to Question 7</u> Traffic impacts will be addressed as part of the planning application process in line with policy set out in the adopted Haringey UDP.</p> <p><u>Response to Supplementary Question</u> It is not our policy to increase pollution anywhere. Of course there will be pollution from extra traffic movements. It will be up to Haringey Council Planning Committee to mitigate those as we</p>

	move forward.
<p><u>Question 8</u> Is the Cabinet not concerned about following good urban space town planning principles and practices which aim to support and strengthen existing communities that have developed strong bonds over many years as opposed to destroying them?</p> <p><u>Supplementary Question</u> Are the council not concerned that this proposal, in the context of residential communities, will be a complete aberration, in town planning terms?</p>	<p><u>Response to Question 8</u> Locating waste management facilities close to where waste is created is the principle set out a national level. Enabling London to become more self-sufficient in managing its own waste is the aim of the Mayor of London. The NLWP aims to deliver these aims which will help to provide better services for less money locally.</p> <p><u>Response to Supplementary Question</u> I don't see it as an aberration in planning terms.</p>
<p><u>Question 9</u> Is the Cabinet not concerned about the town planning issues that would arise with the intervention of an alien industrial plant, imposed on the existing grain of the residential and open-space areas and their adjacent neighbourhoods?</p> <p><u>Supplementary Question</u> Do the Council actually realise that this intervention will conflict with all good town planning practice?</p>	<p><u>Response to Question 9</u> The submission draft NLWP provides policy to ensure proposals for new waste facilities protect the amenity of local residents.</p> <p><u>Response to Supplementary Question</u> I don't believe that that is so.</p>
<p><u>Question 10</u> Barnet Council's Corporate Plan states that Barnet should appropriately plan and thereby protect a residential area from any impact of new waste facilities. Why therefore would Barnet Council not wish to protect their own residents from the inappropriate intervention of a new waste facility such as that proposed at Pinkham Way?</p> <p><u>Supplementary Question</u> If Barnet Council wish to protect their residents, why have these same residents not been consulted over this proposal?</p>	<p><u>Response to Question 10</u> Please see answer to question 2</p> <p><u>Response to Supplementary Question</u> Residents have been consulted. Consultancy meetings have been held and there will be further consultations on the Plan itself and then there will be a further opportunity to get involved in the Haringey planning process.</p>



<p><u>Question 11</u> What would the Cabinet say to the majority of local residents and businesses who are still unaware of the proposal, and those that are aware who have strongly expressed their views that it should not proceed?</p> <p><u>Supplementary Question</u> From this point forward, how will you proceed knowing that residents have not been consulted?</p>	<p><u>Response to Question 11</u> Please see answer to question 4. Haringey will undertake further consultation as part of the planning application process.</p> <p><u>Response to Supplementary Question</u> A further round of consultation will be taking place.</p>
<p><u>Question 12</u> The Pinkham Way site proposed in the North London Waste Plan is identified in Haringey's Biodiversity Action Plan of October 2009 as a site of importance for Nature Conservation. How does this correlate with the proposed use as a recycling waste treatment plant by NLWA?</p> <p><u>Supplementary Question</u> Will placing a waste treatment plant on this site benefit residents?</p>	<p><u>Response to Question 12</u> The NLWP recognises that the site is identified for nature conservation importance as well as for employment generating uses. It identifies that there must be no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site and should incorporate features that enhance biodiversity in the wider area.</p> <p><u>Response to Supplementary Question</u> The plant will not be harmful. The site is a former sewage works. The odour levels from the waste treatment plant will be significantly lower than were previously experienced at the sewage works.</p>
<p><u>Question 13</u> Why is Barnet supporting a development which will increase risk to the physical and mental health of local people, particularly children and older people?</p> <p><u>Supplementary Question</u> Do the Council understand the long-term ramifications of this proposal?</p>	<p><u>Response to Question 13</u> Please see the answer to question 3.</p> <p><u>Response to Supplementary Question</u> We believe that we do understand. Barnet are part of the Haringey process.</p>