Dear Member,

This is formal notice advising you of the above meeting. The Agenda is set out below. Supplementary Items will only be added if pursuant to the Council’s Constitution.

Andrew Kilburn  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

### MEMBERSHIP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Councillor R. Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Councillor Adam Gladstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td>Angie Bean Tarsem Bhogal, Matt Davis, Peter Herrington, Michael Lewis; Asim Mahmood, Sean Meiszner, James O'Rourke Sheila Smith – Prior, and Richard Sweden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-elected Voting Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>Rob Fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Governor Representatives</td>
<td>Mr. Bill Ravenscroft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS.

2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST. Members are required to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in any matter, which is to be considered at this meeting.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

4. MINUTES. The Minutes of the meeting of the Management Committee held on 1 July 2009 are attached for confirmation. (Attachment)

5. ARCADE SITE – FUTURE DEVELOPMENT (Attachment)

6. OUTCOME OF DAY SERVICE RE-PROVISION CONSULTATION (Attachment)

7. WALTHAM FOREST CHILDREN’S TRUST (Attachment)

8. NORTH LONDON WASTE PLAN PREFERRED OPTIONS (Attachment)

9. FEEDBACK ON REFERENCES TO CABINET. Members are asked to note the feedback on references to the meeting of the Cabinet held on 7th July 2009. (Attachment)

10. MANAGEMENT OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME. Members are asked to suggest potential items for inclusion in the Work Programme for the period up until the end of the next municipal year. A copy of the Cabinet forward plan is attached for information. (Attachment)

11. TIME LIMITED SCRUTINY PANEL UPDATE. Members are requested to review the existing time limited panels which have been previously approved by the Scrutiny Management Committee; consider the introduction of a time limited panel request pro-forma and to consider the request from the Finance Scrutiny Sub Committee to establishment a time limited scrutiny panel to review contract arrangements. (Attachment)

12. COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION REQUESTS (Attachment)
Waltham Forest Council and Committee Meetings

All Council/Committee Meetings are held in public unless the business is exempt in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1972.

Most meetings are held at Waltham Forest Town Hall which is an accessible venue located in Forest Road E17 between Waltham Forest Magistrates Court and Waltham Forest College. The nearest underground and railway station is Walthamstow Central, which is approximately 15 minutes walk away from the Town Hall. Buses on routes 275 and 123 stop outside the building.

There is ample parking accommodation for visitors for meetings held at Waltham Forest Town Hall including parking bays for people with disabilities.

There is a ramped access to the building for wheelchair users and people with mobility disabilities.

The Council Chamber and Committee Rooms are accessible by lift and are located on the first floor of Waltham Forest Town Hall. Induction loop facilities are available in most Meeting Rooms. Electronic copies of agendas, reports and minutes are available on the Council’s website. The link is www.walthamforest.gov.uk/index/council/committees copies of agendas, reports and minutes are also available for inspection at Waltham Forest Town Hall and local libraries.

Contact officers listed on the agenda will be able to provide further information about the meeting and deal with any requests for special facilities.

Contact details for report authors are shown on individual reports. Report authors should be contacted prior to the meeting if further information on specific reports is needed or if background documents are required.
LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 1 JULY 2009

PRESENT:

Councillor Robert Sullivan (Chair) (RFS)
Councillor Adam Gladstone (Vice-Chair) (AG)
Councillor Mohammed Asghar (MA)
Councillor Tarsem Bhogal (TB)
Councillor Matt Davis (MD)
Councillor Peter Herrington (PH)
Councillor Michael Lewis (ML)
Councillor Sean Meiszner (SMz)
Councillor James O’Rourke (JOR)
Councillor Sheila Smith – Prior (SSP)
Councillor Richard Sweden (RS)

Officers Present:
Moira Bishop
Andrew Kilburn – Chief Executive (AK)
Neil Murphy – Committee Manager
Shifa Mustafa (SM)
Paul Rogers, - Interim Head of Scrutiny

There was one member of the public present.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS
   Apologies were received from Councillor Asim Mahmood, and from Canon Peter Hartley. The Committee noted the appointment of Councillor Asghar as a substitute for Councillor Mahmood.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
   There were no declarations of interest.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
   There were no requests to address the Management Committee.
4. MINUTES
The Minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee held on 13 May were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

5. ST JAMES’ STREET LIBRARY – FUTURE USE
The Chief Executive reported that a report on the future use of the former library had been withdrawn both from this agenda and the Cabinet as it was recognised that the proposed use for the building had generated much public hostility. Consequently a new more suitable site for the Drug Action Team centre was to be sought and the Library site offered for sale.

While Members welcomed the announcement some concern was expressed at the proposed disposal of the Library site in the current economic situation as it was believed that this would depress the value of any sale price achieved.

6. LOCAL AUTHORITY / NHS WALTHAM FOREST INTEGRATION
The Chief Executive presented a report to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee that outlined the current working relationship between NHS Waltham Forest (NHSWF) and the London Borough of Waltham Forest and identified the prospects for closer joint working in the future. It was reported that joint working could have many features and characteristics but that a model was proposed based on the integration of the two organisations.

The report proposed a joint investigation into actions and detailed analysis in order that a further report can be prepared on which judgments and decisions can be made in November 2009.

It was noted that an appendix to the Chief Executive’s report had been classified as Private and Confidential, but that Members were unconvinced of the necessity for this. Accordingly Members agreed that the appendix should be considered in public.

Members of the Committee raised a number of specific issues, which they asked should be addressed before the integration proposals were progressed, and stressed that generally the Social Care Ethos pursued by the Council should not be lost in any amalgamation. The issues raised are detailed below.

| Comments MD | While in principle I recognize the necessity of this as a way forward we must ensure that structures are in place to maintain public accountability for services. Adult Social Care must not disappear into the NHS abyss. The appointment of a joint Finance Officer seems fairly logical, but any other joint appointments will require close scrutiny – I am not convinced that savings would result - there is too much work for one person to manage. We must ensure that we have a clear plan of what we are going to do before any steps are taken toward amalgamation. |
| Comment RS | We need to ensure that we get favorable conditions from any amalgamation, we must also keep the delivery of services local if they are best dealt with in this fashion. |
| Comment AG | I have real reservations regarding the secondment of the Chief Executive of NHSWF to cover Adult Services when the current interim post holder leaves. Should this position be made permanent at some time in the future it will suggest that there was something underhand here. It would be much better to recruit a further external interim manager to run the |
Comment MD | Would it not be more proper for any amalgamation to be considered at a meeting of the Council – it is after all a major shift affecting the whole borough.

Arising from this the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee RESOLVED to request that the Cabinet

a) ensure that a clear and detailed plan of any proposed new management structures is presented to Scrutiny before scheme proposals are progressed further;

b) delete recommendation (iii) of the Chief Executive’s report and that that the Chief Executive arrange for a further interim appointment to manage the Council’s Adult Social Care functions within LBWF upon the departure of the current Interim Executive Director of Adult & Community Services in July 2009, as per the process detailed in recommendation (ii) of the Cabinet report Integrated Working: London Borough of Waltham Forest and NHS Waltham Forest (7th July 2009).

c) amend recommendation (iv) to read “agree the establishment of a Working Group comprising representatives of the two organisations to oversee the development of this work. The Council’s representatives to be the Leader, Deputy Leader, Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care, and a representative from the Conservative Group, the Chief Executive and the Strategic Director for People, Policy and Performance together with a specialist representative with expertise in Adult Social Care.”

d) ensure that any final decision on the integration of the Authority with NHS Waltham Forest be referred to a meeting of the Council for informed debate.

7. BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE (BSF) – TRANSFER OF SCHOOL SITES TO TRUSTS.
Moira Bishop presented a report relating to the transfer of sites associated with George Mitchell and Norlington schools and Cann Hall Primary School and Tom Hood Community Science College to the Leyton Trust and Cann Hall Trust respectively.

Members were concerned that they had not received information requested at the Meeting held on 13 May 2009 relating to the legal framework surrounding the necessity for the conversion of schools to trust status and BSF together with specific issues relating to the Leyton Cricket Ground.

Accordingly it was agreed to defer consideration of this matter and reserve the right to call in any decision taken by the Cabinet pending the submission of a report on these issues.

8. JOINT MULTI BOROUGH MULTI AREA AGREEMENT
The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee received a report seeking the Cabinet’s approval in principle to enter into a multi area agreement with the 4 other Olympic host boroughs and central government.
It was noted that the proposed Multi Area Agreement (MAA) was being developed across the five Host Boroughs and intended to support ambitions for a lasting legacy from the regeneration brought about by the hosting of the Olympic Games. The agreement addressed specific areas:

- worklessness & skills
- housing and developing communities
- public realm

Having considered the report Members raised a number of detailed concerns but were generally dissatisfied with the level of legacy that the agreement would generate and the paucity of ambition and aspiration shown by the report.

The following questions reflect the discussion on the item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment MD</th>
<th>I am disappointed at the content of the report. It suffers from a poverty of aspiration, this however I blame upon the political lead given to Officers when drawing up this document. There appear to be no benefits to the Borough other than to those areas adjacent to the Olympic sites. The whole idea of an Olympic Legacy seems to have disappeared.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response AK</td>
<td>I have to agree with the gist of these points but the report should be seen as a starting point for joint working initiatives and thus a bigger stick with which to deal with Central government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment SMz</td>
<td>I welcome the new street enforcement powers mentioned in the report but I believe that these should be reserved for trouble hot spots arising from the games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment AG</td>
<td>I do not believe that this vision is palatable to the public – we have not achieved what we promised, I am also concerned at the impact that the report could have on the homeless, there is a commitment to have dealt with the rough sleepers problem by 2012 but where are they to go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response SM</td>
<td>I think that the report has some positives that the public will be happy with, plans to deal with worklessness and housing issues must be popular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ML</td>
<td>There does not seem to be any sign of the vast job opportunities that were forecast with the games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment PH</td>
<td>The same can be said for a legacy of facilities in the borough we have missed the opportunity for developing training grounds and the like for Olympic Sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question RS</td>
<td>Does the MAA compromise our nomination rights to Olympic housing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer SM</td>
<td>These will be unaffected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question JOR</td>
<td>Does the MAA usurp the authority's powers under the New Roads and Street Works Act?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer SM</td>
<td>No these are actually enhanced by the Agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discussion closed at this point.

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee RESOLVED to ask the Cabinet to review the poverty of ambition and aspiration for Waltham Forest in the Multi Area Agreement and re-direct Officers to seek better borough Wide outcomes from the Agreement to be agreed in a final document.
9. **SUB COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMMES**
Members received and noted the work plans for the Overview and Scrutiny sub committees.

10. **FEEDBACK ON REFERENCES TO CABINET**
The Management Committee noted a report on the decisions taken by the Cabinet on the 20th of September after having considered the recommendations made by Scrutiny relating to:
   - Halls Update – Effects of New Charging Policy on Community Groups
   - Building Schools for the Future – Leyton Learning and Leisure Project

11. **MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - WORK PROGRAMME**
The Management Committee reviewed the Cabinet Forward Plan and agreed that the following reports be considered at our next meeting.
   - Proposal For The Future Use Of The Former St James’ Street Library Premises
   - Leisure Capital Programme
   - North London Waste Plan
   - Integration of Children’s Services

Additionally Members expressed some disquiet at the veto currently being exercised by Portfolio holders over Member attendance at development and training courses. Accordingly the Chair undertook to raise this matter with the Party Whips and report back to our next meeting.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. This report advises of the options available for the future of the Arcade site and seeks Cabinet approval to the recommended course of action.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

2.1. For Cabinet Decision

2.1.1. Cabinet is requested to authorise officers to proceed with a procurement exercise to identify a developer for a Leisure centre led mixed use scheme of development on the Arcade site. The Leisure Centre would replace the current indoor facilities at Pool & Track. St Modwen and other developers will be invited to tender.

2.1.2. To note that a recommended development partner and outline scheme proposal would be reported back to Cabinet for consideration and approval following the procurement exercise. That report would also indicate in more detail the proposed financial arrangements and would, if appropriate, seek approval for the financial package, which might include a proposal that the Council becomes funder for the development.
3. **REASON FOR DECISION**

3.1. The significance of the site and its development, which is a key priority for the Council.

**PROPOSAL**

3.2. The Compulsory Purchase Order for the acquisition of the Arcade site was made in 2003 and possession was taken in August of that year. The site was then the subject of demolition and clearance.

3.3. The selection of a development partner (St Modwen plc) and completion of a development agreement for a mixed use scheme was completed in December 2007. The development agreement with St Modwen will continue to the end of December 2009 unless both parties agree to abandon the current agreement at an earlier date.

3.4. Until the recent financial and property downturn a scheme had been evolving which included an 8 screen cinema, an 80 bed hotel, retail and restaurant space, with residential units above.

3.5. The effect of the economic downturn has been that a scheme is no longer viable in the form originally envisaged for the following reasons:

3.5.1. A reduction in the region of 40% in commercial property values

3.5.2. Bank funding for developments of a speculative nature is extremely difficult to obtain.

3.5.3. The retail market has now become very selective about new space, and retailers are reluctant to commit to schemes without significant incentives or inducements

3.5.4. Private residential values have also seen significant reductions, and at present very little if any private housing is being constructed.

3.6. All told these factors have combined to prevent a scheme being able to progress.

3.7. In May 2008 Cabinet agreed that the Pool and Track facilities (not including the track) should be reprovided on a town centre site.

3.8. Initial work undertaken with St Modwen indicates that a new Leisure Centre could be physically accommodated within a form of mixed-use development on the Arcade site.

3.9. Although St Modwen have indicated that they could deliver such a scheme it would be necessary for the Council to undertake a new procurement exercise in order to meet EU procurement regulations. Such a process will ensure that St Modwen and other potential developers have an opportunity to submit proposals. Due to the importance of proceeding with the
development of this key site, an accelerated process could be used in the tendering exercise.

3.10. St Modwen understand that procurement legislation requires the Council to tender this revised development opportunity and have indicated that they would be prepared to enter into a legal agreement with the Council which would enable such a tendering exercise to take place, notwithstanding the current development agreement, and which would not result in any financial liability falling on the Council.

3.11. If Cabinet does not wish proceed with a procurement exercise to include a new Leisure Centre in the scheme, no other proposal is likely to be financially viable until the commercial and residential property markets improve. Market commentators are not predicting an upturn until 2011 at the earliest. There is the option of extending the development agreement with St Modwen until this time, or if not pursued a tendering exercise for a new developer of the site (without a leisure centre) would then need to be undertaken (taking at least 6 months); after which the selected developer would commence design, consultation and seek occupiers and prelettings, given the need for risk mitigation.

3.12. The timescale for such a scheme could therefore be 4 years at the earliest to a start on site.

3.13. Works have been undertaken to the site to enable short term uses to be provided. This will ensure that the site can be of beneficial use to the Town Centre during the procurement period.

4. OPTIONS CONSIDERED

4.1. Procure a developer for a Leisure Centre led development as part of a mixed-use scheme, which would allow proposals to be brought forward in the next 12 - 18 months.

4.2. Defer development of the site for a significant period and awaiting the recovery of the financial and property markets. This option would lose current cinema and hotel interest, and put off indefinitely the time when a viable development may be possible. This is not recommended.

4.3. Develop the site for housing alone. This is not recommended as such a development would not meet the Council’s regeneration vision for the Town Centre.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1. Although St Modwen has previously undertaken consultation on their proposals, there has been no detailed public consultation at this stage on the inclusion of a Leisure Centre.
5.2. The Council’s own property finance and legal officers have been supported by external specialist advice.

5.3. External consultants are finalising a report on the land, which currently contains the Pool & Track facilities, together with the Town Hall and Colleges, allotments and playing fields. This review includes consultation with key stakeholders. This review considers how this significant land holding (held by the Council and the adjoining colleges) could become more fully utilised and provide an important resource for local residents, and provide a wide range of facilities.

5.4. Significant further consultation will be undertaken with users (and potential users) of the Leisure facilities, if a decision to proceed with the procurement of a replacement is made.

5.5. Any scheme of development proposed for the Arcade site will involve significant pre-planning consultation and public consultation.

6. **IMPLICATIONS**

   6.1. **Financial**

   6.1.1 The current capital programme, as agreed by Cabinet on the 26th June 2009, proposes a leisure centre in Walthamstow town centre. This is to be funded by an allocation of £10m from the disposal of the Pool & Track site for a replacement facility within the Arcade development. This allocation is therefore not transferable to other projects.

   6.1.2 The Prudential code allows the Council to decide on its own borrowing limits. These must take account of the authority’s financial position, Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and in particular affordability, as funding capital expenditure has an ongoing revenue cost to repay loan capital and interest. The MTFS has been developed in the context of significant funding challenges and consequently no assumptions have been made in respect of prudential borrowing, as it will be unaffordable.

   6.1.3 Therefore, any proposal, which requires the Council to be the funder for the Arcade development, must be robust enough to cover the full revenue cost of prudential borrowing without putting the Council at risk.

   6.2. **Legal**

   6.2.1. The Public Contracts Regulations 2006 require the Council to tender the opportunity to deliver a scheme that would include a Council owned Leisure Centre because this would be a significantly different development from the scheme previously tendered.
6.2.2. A new procurement process for the revised scheme would indicate (if approved) that the Council would consider becoming the funder for such a scheme, subject to careful financial review. The Council has the power under section 1 of the Local Government Act 2003 to borrow money for any purpose relevant to its functions or for the prudent management of its financial affairs.

6.2.3. In the current economic climate the European Commission has approved the use of the accelerated restricted procedure for the procurement of major projects which will benefit economies by a quicker distribution of public funds into the market. No definition of major projects is given but government advice is that the accelerated procedure may be used where a faster procurement will be of benefit to industry.

6.2.4. The Council will need a formal agreement with St Modwen, prior to the commencement of any procurement exercise, to ensure they would take no action against the Council for a breach of the current development agreement.

6.3. Human Resources
6.3.1. None at present

6.4. Health Impact Assessment
7.4.1. The provision of modern leisure facilities will also assist in meeting the Council's key objective of ensuring that residents are fit and healthy for work.

7.5 Equality Impact Assessment
7.5.1. A more detailed EIA will be undertaken once the details of any proposal are known.
7.5.2. An EIA has been undertaken for the temporary use.
7.5.3 All new facilities constructed will be fully accessible in accordance with Document M of the building Regulations, and those areas developed for Council services would meet the Council’s own access standards.
7.3.4 The Arcade site is located at a key junction in the Town Centre and a mixed development scheme will seek to ensure that the widest range of services will be available to the communities of the borough in a very accessible location.

7.4 Climate Change Impact Assessment
7.6.1. A mixed-use scheme of development would provide opportunities for energy sharing and the overall reduction of the carbon footprint created by the new development.

7.6.2. In taking forward any form of development or use the Council would seek to minimise the footprint.

7. CONCLUSION

7.1. An opportunity to deliver a Leisure led mixed-use scheme to currently exists. This opportunity may not be available in the future. Therefore it is recommended that Cabinet approve this report and authorise officers to undertake a procurement exercise.
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Signed: Date 27 August 2009

Director of Environment and Regeneration
Approval by the Portfolio-Holder (before inclusion on the Cabinet agenda)

I have cleared this report for inclusion on the Cabinet agenda.

Signed .............................................. Date ..............................................

Portfolio Member for Investment and Enterprise
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 Waltham Forest has adopted a strong commitment to the Government’s personalisation agenda because it has recognised the importance of increasing the amount of choice and control people have over their own services. Consultation with day service users and carers on how to best support them in this demonstrates that Waltham Forest is making good, early progress implementing personalisation. The consultation and piloting of personalised services demonstrates that there is capacity...
within the community to offer people choices tailored to their individual needs and preferences, which will contribute to improved health and wellbeing for of Waltham Forest’s older residents. There is also the opportunity to provide services to more people within available resources.

1.2 In January 2009, Cabinet authorised the piloting of personalisation for day opportunities for older people. The pilot was part of the Council’s strategy for implementation of the Putting People First agenda, agreed by Cabinet in October 2008.

1.3 The pilot scheme comprised:
- Reassessment of service users and carers of the Crownfield Road Day Centre, the Morley Centre, and the Dementia Support Service
- Person-centred planning to develop an individually tailored support plan for all users
- A programme of taster sessions to support older people and their carers to try a range of community activities and services. Voluntary and community providers visited the day services to promote their activities, and service users signed up to their choice of 42 different taster sessions.
- Formal consultation with service users, carers, staff, voluntary organisations and other stakeholders on the personalisation of day services, including the reprovision of services via personal budgets, and the potential for Crownfield Road Day Centre services to be phased out as people move to a range of alternative provision within the community.

1.4 The outcomes of the pilot scheme can be summarised as:
- A high level of interest in trying out alternative activities, with almost all users having voluntarily signed up for one or more taster sessions. Photos, feedback and case studies are attached in appendix 1.
- A high demand for personal budgets. Of the 109 registered users at Crownfield Road Day Centre at the start of the pilot, 76 have already moved into alternative provision, and more have requested to move.
- Positive feedback and improved wellbeing reported by service users and carers trying alternative activities
- A positive response to the new choices, resulting in:
  - existing users making more requests about what they want to do (including complaints which some were previously reluctant to make for fearing of losing their service)
  - some people assessed as needing support who were not attending the day centres are accessing support for the first time
- The range of very affordable community activities means the Council is able to support larger numbers of people to access preventative and specialist services within existing resources
- There is a larger range of accessible services and activities (including transport) in the community than previously realised by most staff or service users
High demand for a directory of community services
A high level of interest and progress by the voluntary sector in developing accessible services and activities which older people can buy with a personal budget as an alternative to the existing range of services
Identification of lessons learned and further work required to continue the roll out of the personalisation agenda, including more voluntary sector capacity building, which is informing the development of the Personalisation Board’s project plan.

1.5 This report outlines proposals for the personalisation of day opportunities for older people, in response to the outcomes of the pilot scheme.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1. For Cabinet Decision

2.1.1. Cabinet is requested to consider the outcome of consultation and agree the proposals outlined in section 5, which are summarised as follows:

A. Reprovision of day services via personal budgets, to implement the Government’s Transformation of Adult Social Care and Putting People First agendas.

B. Development of a Dementia Resource Centre, to provide support brokerage to older people plus a timetable of specialist dementia health and social care services, including some day respite, with health and voluntary sector partners

C. Cessation of the remaining services at Crownfield Road Day Centre in response to user demand for personal budgets for alternative provision.

3. REASON FOR DECISION

3.1 The re-provision of day services and the closure of Crownfield Road Day Centre is a key decision to implement the government’s Transformation of Adult Social Care and Putting People First agendas, and due to the significant impact on day services within the Borough.

4. POLICY CONTEXT
4.1 National Context

4.1.1 The Government’s strategic agenda for the future of adult social care is the personalisation of services to give individuals more control over their own care. The Government has set out guidance to achieve a “radical and sustained shift in the way that services are delivered, ensuring that they are more personalised” in the following key publications:
- Our Health, Our Care, Our Say Command Paper, Dept of Health January 2006
- Putting People First: a shared vision and commitment to the transformation of adult social care, December 2007.

4.1.2 The Government guidance includes measures for advising all users of their “personal budget” (the social care component of an “individual budget”) and supporting them to choose and purchase their own services from everything available within the community. To avoid confusion with the Council’s wider Transformation agenda, this will be referred to as the “Personalisation agenda”.

4.1.3 The Personalisation agenda, in practice, means a fundamental shift in the way Adult Social Care manages its financial resources, as people choose to have funding instead of Council services, to purchase and manage their own care. The challenge for local authorities is to restructure budgets to be flexible to fund individual choices.

4.1.4 In addition, frontline Council services will for the first time be marketing their services and competing with community providers for customers who are shopping for services with personal budgets, instead of relying on Council referrals for business. Local authorities must therefore ensure that frontline provider services are competitive, offering services people want to buy, at a unit cost which offers good value for money.

4.2 Local Context

4.2.1 The Council’s performance in implementing the personalisation agenda is being measured by National Indicator 135 (Number of People on Self-Directed Support), which contributes to the Council’s corporate performance assessment.
PROPOSALS

5.1 Reprovision of Day Activities via Personal Budgets

5.1.1 The roll-out of personal budgets to all Adult Social Care clients will be informed by the outcomes of the pilot scheme. Specifically, the proposals are:

5.1.2 Older people assessed as needing support to access day activities should be offered support brokerage following assessment. It is proposed that resource centre staff be trained in support brokerage to offer person-centred planning and individually tailored brokerage of day activities, although users may also choose independent support brokers.

5.1.3 Reinvesting in support brokerage to assist users and carers identify and manage their own choice of services is a more strategic approach which will enable the Council to support more vulnerable residents of Waltham Forest, including self-funders and those eligible for day services who are currently not using the day centres. If the proposals are agreed, the reinvestment of resources will enable this.

5.1.4 It is proposed that the cost of personal budgets for day services be considered by the Personalisation Board in the development of the resource allocation system, to ensure that personal budgets are sufficient to fund user choices, including support service costs, such as transport and support broker fees.

5.1.5 It is estimated that the cost of reproviding day activities for all of the users of Crownfield Road and some users of the Morley Centre, is likely to be in the vicinity of £330,000 (based on an estimated 33 users per day at an average cost of £40 per person per day, for 250 days per year).

5.2 Dementia Resource Centre

5.2.1 It is proposed that the dementia support service (providing outreach support to people with dementia) and the Morley Centre (day centre for people with dementia) be integrated and modernised to form a Dementia Resource Centre.

5.2.2 This centre will operate from Essex Hall, Billet Road, Walthamstow, and will deliver a varied timetable of health, therapy, social, recreational and educational activities, in partnership with a range of health and voluntary sector providers, as well as taking people out into the community to
access more services and activities and to offer all users more choices.

5.2.3 The staff will be trained to become support brokers, so they can support many more people than just those who use the centre-based services.

5.2.4 The Resource Centre will continue to provide an all-day respite function for those with the highest care needs, or those whose partners work, but will also offer a range of sessions on a drop-in, appointment or enrolment basis for users, carers and self-funders.

5.2.5 A directory of community activities and day services accessible to disabled and older people has been developed in close partnership working with Culture and Leisure and Learning Disabilities, and in consultation with more than 160 community service providers known to Adult Social Care, as well as those on the databases used by Culture & Leisure, and by Learning Disabilities. The combined database will be updated and promoted by the resource centre, and will contribute to the Council directory of community services identified in the project plan of the Personalisation Board (formerly the Transformation Board). An extract of the database is included in Appendix 2, to give an idea of the number and range of alternative services available within the community.

5.3 Reprovision of Crownfield Road Day Centre Services

5.3.1 The number of registered users of the Crownfield Road Day Centre dropped from 109 in October 2008, to 77 in July 2009. At the time of writing, a further 57 had requested transfers, leaving 20 registered users.

5.3.2 In view of the numbers of people transferring out of Crownfield Road Day Centre, it is proposed that building-based services be phased out, staff redeployed, and the Crownfield Road budget be redirected to personal budgets and to the development of the Dementia Resource Centre, which will include support brokerage to larger numbers of older people to access community activities and services, and the maintenance of a directory of day opportunities for disabled and older people.

5.3.3 The total cost of running the centre is £930,000 per annum, exceeding the £822,700 budget.

5.3.4 The centre does not provide the range of health and therapy services and structured sessional activities provided by examples of best practice elsewhere (eg. Newham Resource Centre).
5.3.5 The unit cost of running the service, as calculated in July 2009 with 77 registered users, is approximately £162 per person per day. This is continuing to increase as more people move out of the service. The 2007/08 London average cost of older people’s Local Authority day centres is £31 (published by University of Kent for the Department of Health). Our high unit cost is due to very high vacancy rates, and high building, staff and transport costs. All of the identified alternative provision costs significantly less than Crownfield Road (for example, William Morris Day Centre costs £36, the Asian Seniors costs just under £13, NTA Day Centre costs £35, Subco costs up to £87 including transport for the highest need users, Crest costs less than £5 plus transport).

5.3.6 It has been established through consultation and taster sessions that there is ample provision and capacity within the community to provide for all of the users of the Crownfield Road Day Centre. Almost all users have either moved on already, or identified their preferred alternative providers.

5.3.7 It is recognized that a minority of stakeholders are resistant or opposed to the proposal to close the centre, and that it is important to work with service users, carers and lead professionals to manage the transition. This is being supported through reassessments, person-centred planning, carers assessments, taster sessions, and an equalities impact assessment and action plan (see appendix 3).

5.3.8 It is important to note that a decision to keep Crownfield Road Day Centre open:

- Would not release funds for the development of the dementia resource centre, which is where the increasing demand is, including support brokerage, more preventative services, and a community directory of day opportunities, which would be available to all disabled and older people, including self-funders and those who do not wish to use a day centre.

- Would result in an overspend on the Crownfield Road budget of at least £250,000. This is due to the service currently running over budget by £110,000 due to increased and unavoidable transport, building, meals and staffing (single status) costs, as well as funding users who have already taken up or requested direct payments for alternative services.

- Would further increase the Crownfield Road Day Centre unit cost, making it less attractive and affordable to users once personal budgets are rolled out.

6 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED
6.1 Consideration has been given to ways in which the Personalisation and Putting People First agendas could be implemented without ceasing services at Crownfield Road Day Centre. A feasibility assessment of the alternatives considered is attached in Appendix 4. The alternatives, including operating Crownfield Road at reduced capacity and opening days, all require additional investment to meet current cost commitments, which exceed the budget. In the context of the Smarter Spending Programme, further investment is not considered to be a viable option, or good value for money in the context of Personalisation.

7 Contribution to the Council's Annual Performance Assessment

7.1 The personalisation of day services will contribute to the following national indicators (key ones in bold):

- NI 7 Environment for a thriving third sector
- **NI 8 Adult participation in sport and active recreation**
- NI 9 Use of public libraries
- NI 10 Visits to museums and galleries
- NI 11 Engagement in the arts
- **NI 124 People with a long-term condition supported to be independent and in control of their condition**
- **NI 125 Achieving independence for older people through rehabilitation/intermediate care**
- **NI 130 Social Care clients receiving Self Directed Support per 100,000 population**
- NI 133 Timeliness of social care packages following assessment
- NI 135 Carers receiving needs assessment or review and a specific carer’s service, or advice and information
- **NI 136 People supported to live independently through social services (all adults)**
- **NI 141 Percentage of vulnerable people achieving independent living**
- **NI 142 Percentage of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living**
- In addition to the above, it is anticipated that personalised day activity support will help to prevent and reduce social isolation, depression and related health conditions, contributing to reduction in hospital admissions, residential care and various health indicators, although this is less directly measurable.

8 CONSULTATION

8.1 The consultation report is attached at Appendix 5.
8.2 The consultation builds on that which was undertaken in 2008. The feedback from the 2008 consultation, including some opposition to the proposal to close Crownfield Road Day Centre, was taken into account in reshaping new consultation proposals agreed by Cabinet in January 2009, for consultation in April-June 2009.

8.3 Consultation has been undertaken with unions, staff, service users, carers and voluntary organizations, via letters, consultation papers, formal consultation meetings and personalisation workshops.

8.4 Consultation has involved letters and consultation papers being sent to more than 170 voluntary organisations, and more than 450 service users, carers and day service staff.

8.5 Formal written responses to the consultation were received from one union, one service user, one relative, and one local resident (attached in appendix 5, addenda 1-5).

8.6 Formal consultation meetings were attended by three service users and two carers. The low take-up of formal consultation by service users and carers may be due in part to the high take-up and positive feedback from the person-centred planning and timetable of taster sessions, and in part to “consultation fatigue” following good attendance rates at informal consultation meetings in 2008. As a result, it is possible that concerns people may have about the proposed closure of Crownfield Road Day Centre may be underrepresented, despite measures to encourage all positive and negative feedback.

8.7 A timetable of taster sessions is ongoing, for service users and carers to try alternative day activities and services. At the end of June, 42 taster sessions had been held, hosted by 17 organisations in a range of venues. Feedback has been recorded from those participating in the taster sessions. Feedback has been incorporated in appendix 1.

8.8 The consultation, person-centred planning and taster session feedback demonstrates:

- A high level of interest from service users and carers in trying new things.
- Service users and carers are more confident to say what they don’t like and what they would prefer to do or try
- A higher than previously thought variety of opportunities for older people in the community, including support services such as assisted transport, so that all existing service users can be catered for in the community in a way which meets needs better than at present.
- A high level of satisfaction expressed by older people and carers, both with the person-centred planning process and with the range of choices available to them.
• there is concern from some Crownfield Road Day Centre users and their carers over the potential for closure of Crownfield Road and fears over coping with change

• ideas for supporting Crownfield Road Day Centre users and carers through the transition – for example, with specific taster sessions in other services, moving of friendship groups together, and with carers assessments and additional carers support.

• A high level of interest in direct payments for independent, individual or small group activity, with some innovative ideas (eg. Pooling of direct payments by one friendship group to take a short break to the coast together).

• Consensus that a directory of community activities and services is a high priority, to signpost people to what’s on in Waltham Forest which is accessible to disabled and older people.

8.9 Redeployment opportunities for affected staff at Crownfield Road have been identified in the Dementia Resource Centre, learning disabilities day services and the residential care homes, as well as other services across Adult Social Care and the wider Council.

8.10 Discussions with providers so far demonstrate that there is more than sufficient capacity (including real vacancies) within the private and voluntary sector to reprovide for all of the existing Crownfield Road users, including services for those with the highest care needs (eg. Hoists, manual changing, assisted transport or challenging behaviour).

8.11 Community transport are already preparing to deliver more personalized services and to work with providers. Many traditional providers are already switched on to the personalisation agenda and are offering a variety of outreach activities in addition to centre-based placements.

8.12 The Health, Adults and Older Persons Scrutiny Sub-Committee considered this proposal at its meeting on 5th November 2008 (see appendix 6 for minutes). Recommendations made by the Sub-Committee have been taken into account in developing the proposals. Specifically:

- The Adult Social Care Building Manager has visited voluntary sector providers with the project management staff to assess accessibility of buildings

- The support brokerage function will be in-house as part of the remaining day service, but will complement independent support brokerage to offer user choice.

- High quality services for people with high care needs exist already within the voluntary sector. The Commissioning
Service will continue to work with providers on personalisation through its provider forum to meet the full range of needs.

- Independent advocacy is available through the Council's voluntary sector contracts, and will be provided to Crownfield Road Day Centre should a decision be made to reprovide its services.
- Carers have been offered assessments and carers services through the consultation. They have also participated actively in the person-centred planning process and the taster sessions, and have had very constructive input into the service user’s exercise of choice about what they do.
- Transport solutions have been identified for all users who have already moved, from a number of sources including day service providers, community transport (group or individual transport), public transport, and private hire vehicles.
- Friendship groups have been kept together wherever they have chosen to move together. There have also been some innovative ideas from friendship groups about how to use direct payments to establish their own user-led group activities.
- The personalisation agenda will see the expansion of the range of opportunities available to older people, and probably an increase in take-up of day opportunities by those currently eligible for day services who are not using the day centres.

9 IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Financial Implications

9.1.1 Crownfield Road Day Centre’s budget for 2009/10 is £822,700 (£700,600 plus corporate recharges). The actual cost of the service in 2008/09 was £930,000. For 2009/10 the daily budgeted unit cost (based on full capacity) is £83.00 per person per day, however given current activity levels, the actual unit cost is around £162.00 per day. This is very high compared with similar services elsewhere in London.

9.1.2 The proposals include full year contribution of £250,000 to the medium term financial strategy to meet the needs of Waltham Forest residents within resources.

9.1.3 The costed proposals are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Summary of Proposal</th>
<th>Total Cost/ (Saving)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Reprovision of day services via personal budgets</td>
<td>Personal budgets for all Crownfield Road users plus other eligible users taking up alternative provision, estimated at an average of £40 per person per day</td>
<td>330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Development of a Dementia Resource Centre</td>
<td>Creation of additional posts plus a sum for commissioning specialist health, therapy, or support services or activities</td>
<td>120,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Closure of Crownfield Road Day Centre</td>
<td>Closure by end of March 2010, or upon satisfactory alternative provision for all users.</td>
<td>-700,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Financial Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1.4 The full breakdown of cost estimates is included in appendix 9. Costs and savings are full year equivalents assuming full implementation by the beginning of the 2010/11 financial year.

9.2 Human Resources

9.2.1 There are 21 staff currently employed at Crownfield Road that will be affected by these proposals. Should these proposals be accepted then the Council's personnel procedures will apply and it is believed that all can be re-deployed to avoid compulsory redundancy.

9.2.2 Opportunities have already been identified in the Morley Centre, Dementia Support Service, Residential Services, and Learning Disabilities day and residential services. In addition any other suitable posts within the Council will also be considered.

9.2.3 In the event that individuals are unsuccessful in being placed in suitable alternative employment then the Council's Redundancy Scheme will apply.

9.3 Legal

9.3.1 The Council is required to provide, whether at centres or elsewhere, facilities for occupational, social, cultural and recreational activities for
people who are ordinarily resident in its area but it does not impose a duty to provide facilities in any particular day centre.

9.3.2 Proposals to close a day centre, such as Crownfield Road, requires consultation with those affected, including staff and a decision should not be taken until such consultation has occurred.

9.3.3 A social work assessment of each service user prior to any closure (as is proposed) is essential.

9.3.4 Under the Human Rights Act 1998 everyone has the right to respect for his or her private or family life, home and correspondence. However this is not an unqualified right and may be interfered with in accordance with the law and in pursuit of a legitimate aim and provided the interference is proportionate.

9.3.5 Any decision will need to take into account the statutory duties on local authorities in relation to equalities issues of sex, race and disability.

9.3.6 Subject to social work assessment and a decision to provide services, the Council is required to make direct payments where the service user consents to the arrangement. It is envisaged that personal and individual budgets will also be paid in a similar way in future.

9.3.7 Through the Putting People First initiative, the council is expected to roll out a system of personal budgets (an allocation of funding given to users after an assessment which should be sufficient to meet their assessed needs) for all users of adult social care, from 2008.

9.4 Health Impact Assessment

9.4.1 As with equality, the reassessment of all service users by a social worker will ensure that their social care needs, and where known, their health needs, are appropriately addressed and managed through the transition, and that new services are best suited to their health and social care needs.

9.5 Equality Impact Assessment
9.5.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out on the proposed closure of Crownfield Road Day Centre. All affected users will be reassessed by a social worker prior to closure to ensure that all equalities needs as well as care needs can be appropriately addressed in alternative services, and in the managing of the transition.

9.5.2 The Personalisation agenda includes one-to-one support brokerage from a named broker who supports an individual user to identify their needs and wants and to tailor a range of solutions to their individual preferences, including equalities issues. This is a better solution to addressing equalities impacts than can be provided in a one-size-fits-all service. A more detailed assessment of the equalities impact of personalisation will be undertaken as part of a future Cabinet report on the broader personalisation agenda.

9.5.3 Advocacy services are available within the voluntary sector and can be commissioned at short notice for any users who require support to voice their views, to ensure their views are heard and taken into account.

9.5.4 HR will oversee the redeployment process to ensure that it is a fair and equitable process for all staff and that new staff arrangements take account of all known equalities needs.

9.6 Climate Change Impact Assessment

9.6.1 The reduction in centre-based activity will contribute to reduced carbon emissions from its transport and building services.

10 CONCLUSION

10.1 The proposals outlined in this report are designed to reconfigure services within existing resources and increase investment in the community and voluntary sector via personal budgets to give more older and disabled people a choice of services to tailor day activities to their needs and the needs of their carers. The proposals will implement the Putting People First and Personalisation agendas, and contribute to the Council’s performance on a range of national indicators.

10.2 The proposals have been developed in consultation with service users, carers, staff and unions, the voluntary sector, Culture and
Leisure, and the Primary Care Trust for a joined-up approach to achieving shared objectives, including reduced social isolation, improved health and wellbeing, and reduced hospital and residential admissions.

10.3 The process of consultation and taster sessions to give people choice has been conducted in a thorough and sensitive manner. If the proposals are agreed, this approach will be continued, to ensure service users and carers have more choice and control over their own care.

10.4 The feedback and outcomes from taster sessions so far indicate that significantly improved performance in delivering improved outcomes to older people can be achieved from the personalisation of Adult Social Care, and that personal budgets achieve excellent value for money for service users, carers and the Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval by the Portfolio-Holder (before inclusion on the Cabinet agenda)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have cleared this report for inclusion on the Cabinet agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: Philip [Signature]  
Date: 28 August 2009

Portfolio Member for Health, Adults and Older People
### Costed Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Cost Calculation</th>
<th>Total Cost/ (Saving)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Reprovision of day services via personal budgets</strong></td>
<td>Reprovision for all existing Crownfield Road Day Centre users @ £40 per person per day x 23 people per day x 250 days per year</td>
<td>230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution to direct payments budget for Morley and Crownfield Road users who have already left the services to take up direct payments since start of taster sessions in 2009 (based on 10 users per day x £40 x 250 days p/yr). (Currently contributing to direct payments overspend.)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal of Proposal A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>330,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Development of a Dementia Resource Centre</strong></td>
<td>Creation of 2 x Sc4 Day Activity Coordinator Posts (funded by Supporting People)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of 1 x PO1 Senior Brokerage Officer Post</td>
<td>40,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of 1 x PO1 Carers Support Worker Post (funded from Carers Grant)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Training in Support Brokerage - 27 staff x £450</td>
<td>12,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deletion of Vacant Coordinator post</td>
<td>-40,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of additional escort hours</td>
<td>32,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioned specialist services &amp; activities</td>
<td>75,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal of Proposal B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>120,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Closure of Crownfield Road Day Centre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-700,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Contribution to Medium Term Financial Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>250,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1

Taster Session Feedback and Case Studies

A programme of taster sessions was held from April 2009. This started with voluntary organisations visiting Crownfield Road Day Centre to present information on their services and activities, and offering people the opportunity to sign up for taster sessions, whereby they visit the service to try it out, with the assistance of Council staff. Signing up to taster sessions was voluntary, and carers were also invited to attend with service users. Service users and carers were also welcome to request taster sessions at the service of their choice in addition to those we organised. Feedback forms were completed by service users at the end of each taster session. The comments (positive and negative) and selected photos from taster sessions in June 2009 are reproduced here. Taster sessions are ongoing.

Learning to use a computer at the “Silver Surfer” session at the Disability Resource Centre

“I was shown how to use a computer, which until now has been a mystery to me. I want to learn more and email my family.”

“I have always wanted to learn how to use a computer as my grandchildren are always talking about them and I am going to use this opportunity to learn how to use a computer.”

“I used to be a typist and using the computer felt very natural to me and brought back memories.”
“I was good at bowls and I want to go regularly.”

“I was pleased to be outside. It’s better than being stuck indoors and in the same surroundings.”

“I haven’t been out somewhere different for ages. I didn’t think I could, but I have and I want more.”

“It has never interested me, playing bowls. But now that I have tried it, I would like to take up bowling.”
“Swim 4 Life” Free Swimming for Over 60s at Leyton Lagoon
Organised in partnership with Culture & Leisure

“I am actually quite nervous about getting into the swimming pool, so I am taking small steps to get used to the pool, and hopefully I will soon feel confident in joining the other ladies as they look like they are having a great time.”
Other Venues, Services & Activities

“I am having reflexology done on my hands with my favourite lavender oil, which is very therapeutic and relaxing. I enjoy being pampered.”

“I was pampered and I loved it!”

“I have not done embroidery for a long time, but it all came back to me whilst I was stitching the cloth.”
Comments:

“I am very competitive, especially when it comes to playing dominoes as I have been playing since I was young. It brings back memories.”

“Different, enjoyable, friendly – like being back home.”

“I would like to attend with my friends.”

“I liked being with other men.”

“I thought the traditional pub atmosphere was great.”
Other Service User and Carer Comments

“We love our new service, it has opened doors for us both. To be able to worship again is wonderful”.

“My husband needs specific care, and has been much calmer since he attended Subco. He meets with people of his own culture, and is responding well. I like the attitude of the staff, who treat him with respect and dignity.”

“Crownfield Rd wasn’t for me. I want stimulation, mental and physical. I am going to try some of the other activities I’ve been told about, and see what I want to settle on.”

“I really, really liked going to Abba. The music, food and pampering was the best and I want to go again as soon as I can.”

“I tried the taster session with the bowling club. Years ago I used to bowl. Anyway, I had such a good time, that I’ve got their timetable and will go under my own steam. I’ve left Crownfield Road now.”

“We have discussed my mother’s needs and preferences in detail, and will be trying Abba and NTA. Hopefully they will better meet her dietary, cultural and spiritual requirements.”

“My Mum needs a lot of assistance and does not get as much out of Crownfield Road as I think she should. She goes to give me a break. She is going to try the Morley Centre and I have also been invited to pop along to see what she thinks and what is on offer. We’re looking forward to it.”

“I tried two other services, and whilst I wasn’t keen on one of them, I really enjoy Crest at Gainsfield Crt. The staff and other attendees are friendly and good fun, I can’t get a word in edgeways, and the food is really good, as is the programme. I attend every week now, and hope that some of my friends from Crownfield Road will also join.”

“Friendly, compact, peaceful”

“Pleasant and comfortable venues”

“Would like to attend with my friends”

“Played bowls and enjoyed it”

“I was good at bowls and want to go regularly”

“Nice to have a change”

“Liked the staff”
“Sing song was fantastic”

“I was pleased to be outside, its better than being stuck indoors and in the same surroundings”

“I haven’t been out somewhere different for ages. I didn’t think I could, but I have and I want more”

“I enjoyed the Quiz”

“I liked the music.

“I loved Subco and want to keep going with my group of friends”

“I tried somewhere I didn’t like, but would like to try other things.”
**Case Studies**

All of the case studies below are taken from person-centred planning sessions with service users and carers by staff from Crownfield Road Day Centre, the Morley Centre, Dementia Support Services and residential care managers. These case studies are based on the service users’ and carers’ own words, as recorded by staff and read back to them to confirm accuracy, and have been used with their permission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mr and Mrs B | Mr B is very physically dependant with high personal care needs, requiring manual toileting, hoisting and bathing by two staff. Crownfield Road Day Centre was not able to meet his needs, with insufficient staff to deliver the required level of manual handling, and insufficient equipment, hoisting or manual toileting facilities. Mrs B also has care needs. They are a close couple who wanted to move together to services which could meet their needs. They have had a joint reassessment of needs, and person-centred planning. As a result, they trialled and accepted placements together at Newham Resource Centre, just over the border from Crownfield Road Day Centre, which they attend 3 days per week. The resource centre specialises in high care needs and has all the facilities, equipment and staffing to meet Mr B’s needs. We have also organised accessible transport. They both enjoy the new service, saying that they now get culturally appropriate food and activities, but especially that Mr. B can now join in with a religious service which he is very excited about.  
*“We love our new service, it has opened doors for us both. To be able to worship again is wonderful.”* |
| Mr R       | Mr R has complex care needs and gets very frustrated, often presenting at Crownfield Road Day Centre with challenging behaviour. He attended a taster session at Subco, a day service for Asian elders. His wife (and primary carer) noted that at Subco he was calm and quiet and seemed to respond very well to his time there. She was very happy with the answers she got from Subco staff to questions about the care they could provide her husband. She is also very pleased that the service and food is culturally appropriate. Mrs R said that even if Crownfield Rd did not close, they would need to improve as she is unhappy with the care provided.  
*“My husband needs specific care, and has been much calmer since he attended Subco. He meets with people of his own culture, and is responding well. I like the attitude of the staff, who treat him with respect and dignity.”* |
| Mr S       | Mr S is an active and independent service user who stopped using Crownfield Road Day Centre, which he said that he didn’t enjoy, as he sat with two other service users and played cards all day, and they didn’t offer activities he did enjoy. As a result, he was not getting any day services. After person-centred planning, |
we were able to support Mr S to identify a number of alternatives which might meet his needs. Mr S is trying a number of taster sessions to consider his options.  

“Crownfield Rd wasn't for me. I want stimulation, mental and physical. I am going to try some of the other activities I've been told about, and see what I want to settle on.”

| Mrs T | Mrs T was a Crownfield Road Day Centre user who was very quiet and withdrawn, and spoke little. She needed a high level of personal care, particularly with frequent toileting. She attended a taster session at the Abba day service, which she enjoyed so much she started crying. Although she couldn’t physically dance to the music played, she was able to move her upper body and hum. She also said she really enjoyed being pampered following hand massage / manicure. Crownfield Road staff commented that she has really come out of her shell and was completely animated. They also observed that she needed significantly less personal care, as her toileting became less frequent with her increased level of social and musical stimulation.  

“I really, really liked going to Abba. The music, food and pampering was the best and I want to go again as soon as I can.” |

| Mrs S | Mrs S attended a lawn bowls taster session. She enjoyed it so much she asked for a bowls club timetable. She has now left Crownfield Road Day Centre and made her own arrangements to join the bowling club.  

“I tried the taster session with the bowling club. Years ago I used to bowl. Anyway, I had such a good time that I’ve got their timetable and will go under my own steam. I've left Crownfield Road now.” |

| Mrs N | We visited Mrs N and her son to explore what she might like to try. She is wheelchair bound and cannot weight-bear, she had a stroke which left her without the use of her right side and she needs assistance with eating, a soft diet and to be hoisted when using the toilet and transferring. She has home care services three times daily, as well as Crossroads home sitting service once a week. She is not happy with the service she receives at Crownfield Rd, but attends to give her son a well earned break. She is going to try the Morley Centre, and her son will visit whilst she is there so he can talk to the manager and see what is on offer.  

“My Mum needs a lot of assistance and does not get as much out of Crownfield Road as I think she should. She goes to give me a break. She is going to try the Morley Centre and I have also been invited to pop along to see what she thinks and what is on offer. We’re looking forward to it.” |

| Mr N | Mr N attends Crownfield Road Day Centre two days a week. He has been on two taster sessions, one at the Disability Resource |
Centre which was not suitable for him and he tried Crest at Gainsfield Court on Thursdays which he now attends regularly. Mr N is very happy with Crest and says it is very well organised. He says he can’t get a word in edgeways, he prefers being part of a social group without dementia. He says they are a friendly group and very chatty, and he is kept active and the food is better than the day centre. He finds there is a good programme of activities. He has become disappointed with Crownfield Road Day Centre as he says the new staff there are happy to put on music and just sit there, and some staff do not realise that service users need more. Staff spend time in the lobby and not in the lounge, he does not see enough of the staff. Things have become very haphazard and not organised, there are no activities that suit him. He pointed out that a member of staff treats them like they are 6 year olds. He likes the older staff. He complained about the length of time it takes to get out of the centre to get home - he feels it is very disorganised as it is the driver who comes to call them out. The standards have dropped and he is hoping more service users will join him at Crest.

“I tried two other services, and whilst I wasn’t keen on one of them, I really enjoy Crest at Gainsfield Crt. The staff and other attendees are friendly and good fun, I can’t get a word in edgeways, and the food is really good, as is the programme. I attend every week now, and hope that some of my friends from Crownfield Road will also join.”
## Appendix 2 – Alternative Services & Activities

### Alternative Services and Activities

A directory of activities and day services which are accessible to older people was compiled in order to support people to make informed choices about what they do. The database below is an extract from the directory (as of June 2009). The directory is undergoing constant updating and expansion, and is being used in conjunction with the directories also held by Learning Disabilities and by Culture and Leisure. The full database includes more detailed information on the care services provided, including transport, and degree of accessibility (compiled in consultation with providers, and through site visits by day service staff and the buildings manager to those catering for higher need users).

**Day care within a residential care setting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>On offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paternoster House</td>
<td>Waltham abbey - 7/8 miles from chingford. Country ride</td>
<td>Activities, reablement, life skills training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Francis Residential Care home</td>
<td>Highams Park, E4</td>
<td>Join in with activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Ives Lodge</td>
<td>Chingford, near BR station E4 7AJ</td>
<td>Sessional activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Centre-based day care within a day centre setting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>On offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEWHAM RESOURCE CENTRE – purpose built day centre</td>
<td>200 Chargeable lane, Plaistow E13 8DW</td>
<td>Activities, Stroke survivors Group, cultural events, music and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubCo Trust Day care for Asian elders</td>
<td>Plashet Road, Upton Park E13</td>
<td>Cultural food, and variety of culturally appropriate activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abba Day care for people from the African Caribbean</td>
<td>Based at Newham Resource Centre, Chargeable Lane.</td>
<td>Cultural day care. Could provide personal care if part of the care plan/agreed level of service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drop in Day Centres**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>On offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WF Disability Resource Centre</td>
<td>Warner Road Walthamstow E17</td>
<td>Activities for people under 65 (although there are some people who are over 65) Drop in, and organised activities Inc Silver Surfers, Diselderly Conduct Group, low vision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| New Testament Assembly (NTA) | 214 Langthorne Rd, Leytonstone E11 | Day care (via Social Services). Take wheelchair users and assist with transfers etc. |

### Drop in Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity / Session</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qalb Centre - Asian Womens Centre</td>
<td>Ferguson Centre Low Hall Lane Walthamstow E17 8BY</td>
<td>Thursdays 1.30pm - 4.40pm</td>
<td>Friendly weekly womens social gathering, with light refreshments and social activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Club</td>
<td>St Andrews Church Colworth Road Leytonstone E11</td>
<td>Mondays 1pm - 4pm</td>
<td>A meeting place for seniors to have a cup of coffee, meet with old friends and even learn to use a computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthamforest Blind Association</td>
<td>Frederic St Community Centre Frederic St Walthamstow E17 8AD</td>
<td>Tuesdays 1pm - 4pm</td>
<td>Drop in centre includes social outings, one to one advice, mobility training, recreatinal activities and home visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alzheimers Cafe</td>
<td>St Andrews Church Church Road Walthamstow E17 6AR</td>
<td>3rd Monday of the Month 10.30am - 12.30pm</td>
<td>This will be a relaxed and friendly time, where all can enjoy each others company and participate in quizzes, listen to music and more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Club</td>
<td>The Forest Centre 33 Clyde Place Leyton E10 5AS</td>
<td>Last Wednesday of each Month 2pm - 4pm</td>
<td>Offers a range of activities, including Bingo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Mornings</td>
<td>Barclay Christian Centre Leyton E10</td>
<td>Tuesdays 10.30 - 12pm</td>
<td>Come along for tea, coffee, biscuits and a chat, also to play pool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lunch Clubs with Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>On offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CREST for activities, lunch and company, for &quot;lively minded&quot; older people</td>
<td>3x sites Tuesday Albany Court, Walthamstow Wednesday South Chingford Methodist Church pm only Thursday Gaysford Court, Cathal Road</td>
<td>Medium to low needs. Don’t provide personal care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Morris Day Centre, Day care 10.00 – 4.00</td>
<td>Erskine Road, Walthamstow E17</td>
<td>Low to medium support offered. Some personal care, but not showering, hoisting etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Christian Centre</td>
<td>102 Erskin Rd E17</td>
<td>Lunch club weekly. All welcome. Includes transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Support Groups:

#### AFRICAN and AFRO CARIBBEAN SUPPORT NETWORK
- **Name:** AFRICAN and AFRO CARIBBEAN SUPPORT NETWORK
- **Location:** 2nd Floor Community Place 806 High Road Leyton E10 6AE
- **On offer:** Variety of activities and support for BME with learning disabilities and their families. Willing to run a group(s) depending on need identified - Drop in on a Saturday & Monday.

#### Alzheimer's Society – Café every 3rd Monday in month (this might change)
- **Location:** St Andrews Church Hall, E17 6AR
- **On offer:** Café for Alzheimer’s sufferers and their families. Café is currently held at St Andrews Church Hall on a 3rd Monday of the month until March 2009, then Morley Centre on a temporary basis.

#### Asian Seniors Group
- **Location:** Wood Street, Walthamstow
- **On offer:** Use of facilities – all accessible incl. loos and shower. Wood Street, currently use Shern Hall Methodist Church 3x week for gentle exercise. Activities, cultural events etc.

#### Facilities/rooms which are accessible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>On offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barclay Mission</td>
<td>752 High Road, Leyton E10 6AA</td>
<td>Use of facilities – all accessible incl. loos and shower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN MUSLIM FEDERATION</td>
<td>MF Hall, Trinity Close Leytonstone E11</td>
<td>Use of facilities and kitchen. Has a shower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Christian Centre</td>
<td>102 Erskin Rd E17</td>
<td>Use of facilities including Green Leaf building close by, kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Christian Centre</td>
<td>Score Complex, 100 Oliver Road, Leyton E10 5JY</td>
<td>Use of premises. Disabled access, pool, double hall, single hall, kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilion Community Centre</td>
<td>Managed by Community based Housing Assn (CBHA)</td>
<td>Use of premises. Disabled access, pool, double hall, single hall, kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springboard Housing Assn</td>
<td>2A Cloughton Road, London E13 9PW</td>
<td>Use of facilities at Sutton Court, Walthamstow. Includes kitchen. Groups can use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Court</td>
<td>25 Cambrian Road, Leyton, E10 7JJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Groups

#### Community based Housing Assn (CBHA)
- **Name:** Community based Housing Assn (CBHA)
- **Location:** Across Schemes & Pavilion Community Centre.
- **On offer:** Use of premises. Disabled access, pool, double hall, single hall, kitchen.

#### Stroke Association
- **Name:** Stroke Association
- **Location:** 1. George’s House, 127 Dames Road London, E7 0DZ
- **On offer:** Use of premises. Disabled access, pool, double hall, single hall, kitchen.

#### Fi & Mobile
- **Name:** Fi & Mobile
- **Location:** Lady Park Road Forest E17
- **On offer:** Use of premises. Disabled access, pool, double hall, single hall, kitchen.

---
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Disability Action | Warner Road Walthamstow E17 | Reaching Out project. Activities and home support including phone calls. Provide info and support to people with disabilities inc older people. Befriending, socialising, trips etc.

### Community Activities which are accessible to older and disabled people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity / Session</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body Moves Keep Fit Session</td>
<td>Leytonstone Library</td>
<td>Monday 10.30am - 11.30am</td>
<td>This is a mixed ability session which will help to improve &amp; maintain your health in fun,sociable way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ Short Mat Bowls</td>
<td>Sea Cadets Unit, Pimp Hall Nursery,, Kings Road, Chingford E4 7HR</td>
<td>Wednesdays 10am 12 noon Thursday &amp; Fridays</td>
<td>Beginners welcome no need to book in advance just turn up and play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ Badminton Sessions</td>
<td>Leyton County Cricket Ground, High Road Leyton E10</td>
<td>Every Wednesday 10am 12noon</td>
<td>Beginners welcome no need to book in advance just turn up and play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Synthetic Green Bowls Club 50 +</td>
<td>Lloyd Park Forest Road, Walthamstow E17</td>
<td>Tuesday &amp; Thursday 10- 1200 Monday Evenings From May 6.30 - 8.30pm</td>
<td>The social side of the game compliments the health benefits with chance to socialise and make new friends over tea and biscuits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilatates 50+</td>
<td>St Mary’s Church of England Primary School The Drive Walthamstow E17 3BN</td>
<td>Every Wednesdays 7.00 - 8.00pm</td>
<td>Improve your muscle tone and flexibility with Pilates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults With Disabilities</td>
<td>The Pavilion 100 Oliver Road Leyton E10 5JY</td>
<td>Every Saturday 10am -12noon</td>
<td>Qualified instructors oranise a varied sport and leisure programme in the pavilion. This includes indoor curlig,boccia, carpet bowls, table tennis and more refreshments included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Pastimes Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>Bramley Close Off Higham Hill Road Walthamstow E17</td>
<td>Every Monday 1pm -4pm</td>
<td>A long- running self-help group who meet to paint, make cards, silk dye and natter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginners, Keep Fıt Classes</td>
<td>United Reform Church off Station Road</td>
<td>Every Tuesday 8pm -9pm</td>
<td>Keep fit classes aimed at helping residents lose weight and tone up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness For Fun</td>
<td>Kelmscott Leisure Centre 243 Markhouse Road Walthamstow E17 8RN</td>
<td>Every Thursdays 8- 9-pm</td>
<td>Friendly, mixed group playing team. We’re non- competitive and play for fun. You’ll find yourself getting fit without even noticing. Adults of all ages and abilities welcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Yoga</td>
<td>North Chingford Methodist Church Station Road Chingford E4</td>
<td>Every Thursdays 8pm - 9pm</td>
<td>A revitalising and relaxing workout which includes a blend of stretching, balance, posture work and relaxation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Jazz Jam</td>
<td>The Castle 15 Grosvenor Rise East E17 9LB</td>
<td>Every Sunday 7.30pm</td>
<td>Jam sessions featuring Jazz bands and local jazz musicians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Group</td>
<td>Walthamstow Library</td>
<td>Last Tuesdays of the Month 7pm - 8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Book Group</td>
<td>The Peking Chef Restaurant 178 Hoe Street E17</td>
<td>3rd Wednesday of every Month 7.30pm - 9.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Good Life Club</td>
<td>Jubilee Hall Greenleaf Baptist Church Greenleaf Road Walthamstow E17</td>
<td>Wednesdays 1pm - 3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higham Hill Walking Group</td>
<td>Higham Hill Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Thursdays 11am by the Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Dancing in Waltham Forest</td>
<td>United Services Club Chingford E4</td>
<td>Sundays Beginners 7pm - 8.30pm, Imp/Int. 8.30pm - 10.30pm, Tuesdays Intermediate 8-11pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Piano</td>
<td>Ye Olde Rose and Crown Theatre Pub 53 Hoe Street Walthamstow E17 4SA</td>
<td>Every Sunday 2pm - 5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loosends Social Club</td>
<td>Royal Oak Public House Kings Head Hill Chingford E4</td>
<td>1st Friday of every Month from 9pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lung Club</td>
<td>The Jubilee Centre Cathall Road Leytonstone E11</td>
<td>Last Tuesdays of every Month 1pm - 3.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal British Legion Leyton</td>
<td>George Mitchell House 31 Dunton Road Leyton E10 7AF</td>
<td>2nd Tuesday of every Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Chi Classes for Beginners</td>
<td>Frederic St Community Centre Frederic St Walthamstow E17 8AD</td>
<td>Every Tuesday 7.15pm - 8.45pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence Tea Dance Club</td>
<td>Leyton Parish Hall Lindley Road Leyton E10 6QT</td>
<td>Thursdays 1pm - 3.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing-along Group for Singers and Musicians</td>
<td>Wathamstow/ Leyton/ Leytonstone</td>
<td>Mondays 8pm - 10pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Singing Room E17</td>
<td>St Gabriels Family Centre Havant Road Walthamstow E17</td>
<td>Thursdays 7.30pm - 9pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bees Knees Womens Quilt Making</td>
<td>Priory Court Community Centre 11 Priory Court South Countess Road Walthamstow E17 5NB</td>
<td>Tuesdays 12pm - 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge for Beginners</td>
<td>Horsley Road Chingford E4 7HX</td>
<td>Wednesdays 2.30pm - 4.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Club</td>
<td>Chingford Horticultural Society Hall Larkshall Road Chingford E4</td>
<td>Wednesdays 1pm - 3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chingford Green Short Mat Bowls Club</td>
<td>T S Acorn The Sea Scouts Hall 48 Kings Road Chingford E4</td>
<td>Wednesdays 10am - 12pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity / Session</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crest Activity Group</td>
<td>Albany Court, 3 Albany Road, E10</td>
<td>Every Tuesdays 11AM 4.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Activity Exercise / Complementary Therapy</td>
<td>Albany Court, 3 Albany Road, E10</td>
<td>Every Thursday 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Chi</td>
<td>Albany Court, 3 Albany Road, E10</td>
<td>Every Fridays 5.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Group</td>
<td>Baytree 2 Dells Close, Chingford E4 7TW</td>
<td>Every Tuesdays 10.00am - 4.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>Baytree 2 Dells Close, Chingford E4 7TW</td>
<td>Every Wednesday 2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Activity Group</td>
<td>Baytree 2 Dells Close, Drysdale Road Chingford E4 7TW</td>
<td>Every Thursday 10.00am- 4.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Chi &amp; Bingo</td>
<td>Baytree 2 Dells Close, Drysdale Road Chingford E4 7TW</td>
<td>Every Fridays Tai Chi 11.30am Bingo 7.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Club</td>
<td>Dames House 127 Dames Road London E7</td>
<td>Every Mondays 2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Bar</td>
<td>Dames House 127 Dames Road E7</td>
<td>Every Tuesdays 9.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Bingo/Fish&amp; Chips</td>
<td>Dames House 127 Dames Road London E7</td>
<td>Alternate Wednesdays Cash Bingo 6.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prize Bingo</td>
<td>Dames House 127 Dames Road London E7</td>
<td>Every Thursday 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Bar</td>
<td>Dames House 127 Dames Road London E7</td>
<td>Every Fridays 10.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>Gainsfield Crt 18 Cathal Road Leytonston E11 4NS</td>
<td>Every Mondays 2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest Activity Group</td>
<td>Gainsfield Crt 18 Cathal Road Leytonston E11 4NS</td>
<td>Every Thursdays 11.00am - 4.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sessions provided by Springboard (Sheltered Housing Provider)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity / Session</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chess club for all levels</td>
<td>Tom Oakham Centre 6A Weale Road Chingford E4</td>
<td>Mondays 7.15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Sounds</td>
<td>The Outset Centre 2a Grange Road Walthamstow E17 8AH</td>
<td>Every Thursday 10am - 1pm If you have a flair for interviewing, radio drama, music or talking to your local community, as well as an interest in gaining some new technical skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity / Session</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Card Games</strong></td>
<td>Gainsfield 18 Cathall Road E11</td>
<td>Every Fridays 7.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Group</strong></td>
<td>Glebelands 33 Curch Road E10</td>
<td>Every Wednesdays 2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residents Get Together</strong></td>
<td>Nicholson 32 Forest Road E17 6JP</td>
<td>Every Mondays 2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tai Chi</strong></td>
<td>Nicholson 32 Forest Road E17 6JP</td>
<td>Every Tuesdays 2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bingo</strong></td>
<td>Nicholson 32 Forest Road E17 6JP</td>
<td>Every Wednesdays 7.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Games Afternoon</strong></td>
<td>Nicholson 32 Forest Road E17 6JP</td>
<td>Every Thursdays 2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Film Night</strong></td>
<td>Nicholson 32 Forest Road E17 6JP</td>
<td>Every Fridays 7.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gentle Exercise</strong></td>
<td>Suffolk 23 Cambrian Road Leyton E10 7JJ</td>
<td>Every Mondays 3.00PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Tea</strong></td>
<td>Suffolk 23 Cambrian Road Leyton E10 7JJ</td>
<td>Every Thursdays 4.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coffee Afternoon / Bingo</strong></td>
<td>Millennium House 28 Southcote Road Walthamstow E17 7AQ</td>
<td>Every Mondays 2.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shopping With Door To Store</strong></td>
<td>Millennium House 28 Southcote Road Walthamstow E17 7AQ</td>
<td>Every Tuesdays 10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tai Chi</strong></td>
<td>Millennium House 28 Southcote Road Walthamstow E17 7AQ</td>
<td>Every Thursdays 11.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coffee Morning</strong></td>
<td>Wingrove House 41-49 Sewardatone Road Chingford E4 7TA</td>
<td>Every Wednesdays 11.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gentle Exercise Class</strong></td>
<td>Wingrove House 41-49 Sewardatone Road Chingford E4 7TA</td>
<td>Every Fridays 12.30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Reaching Out Project (Disability Action)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity / Session</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture Vultures Club</strong></td>
<td>Hale End Library Castle Avenue Highams Park E4 9QD</td>
<td>11am-1pm 3rd Thursday of the month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visually Impaired People’s Group</strong></td>
<td>Hale End Library Castle Avenue Highams Park E4 9QD</td>
<td>Every 3rd Week 2pm- 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Club</strong></td>
<td>Hale End Library Castle Avenue Highams Park E4 9QD</td>
<td>Thursday of 1st full week of the month 11am - 1pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity / Session</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hale End Library, Castle Avenue, Highams Park, E4 9OD</td>
<td>Wednesday of 1st full week of the month 2pm - 4pm</td>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>Reaching Out Project (Disability Action) Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow Green Library, Cathall Road, E11 4UF</td>
<td>Friday of 1st full week of the month 2pm - 4pm</td>
<td>Every day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Avenue United Reformed Church, Malvern Avenue E4</td>
<td>Friday of 4th Week in the month 2pm - 3.30pm</td>
<td>As arranged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle Exercise Classes</td>
<td>Various Run With Liveability WF</td>
<td>11.30am -12.30pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Or Activities</td>
<td>Various Run With Liveability WF</td>
<td>As arranged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Safety Checks</td>
<td>1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td>Every day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td>As arranged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td>Every day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td>As arranged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td>Every day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching Out Project (Disability Action) Services</td>
<td>Every day/ Every day/ As arranged</td>
<td>Every day/ As arranged</td>
<td>The group studies local history and trace their own family history under the guidance of a class tutor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Resource Centre (All venues DRC, Waltham Road)</td>
<td>Information And Advice</td>
<td>Location: 1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Befriending For Housebound and Visually Impaired Older Adults</td>
<td>1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women's Exercise</td>
<td>1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Games</td>
<td>1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td>The group studies local history and trace their own family history under the guidance of a class tutor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needle Craft - Embroidery</td>
<td>1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic IT</td>
<td>1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family History</td>
<td>1A Warner Road Walthamstow E17 7DY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix 2 – Alternative Services & Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Activity</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older Women’s Group</td>
<td>Every Mondays</td>
<td>@ 1.30pm- 3.00pm</td>
<td>Galley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Every Tuesdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am- 1:00pm</td>
<td>Room Rainbow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>Every Tuesdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am- 1:00pm</td>
<td>Room Galley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxation Group</td>
<td>Every Tuesdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am- 1:00pm</td>
<td>Room Rainbow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Vision Group</td>
<td>Every Tuesdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am- 1:00pm</td>
<td>Room Galley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressmaking</td>
<td>Every Wednesdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 3:30pm</td>
<td>Room Rainbow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex &amp; Relax Exercise</td>
<td>Every Wednesdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 3:30pm</td>
<td>Room Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>Every Wednesdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 13:00pm</td>
<td>Room Galley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic IT</td>
<td>Every Wednesdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 13:00pm</td>
<td>Room Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>Every Thursdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 3:30pm</td>
<td>Room Galley/Rainbow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Exercise</td>
<td>Every Thursdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 1:00pm</td>
<td>Room Galley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>Every Thursdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 3:30pm</td>
<td>Room Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Sign Language</td>
<td>Every Thursdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 1:00pm</td>
<td>Room Galley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellery Making</td>
<td>Every Thursdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 3:30pm</td>
<td>Room Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>Every Thursdays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 3:30pm</td>
<td>Room Galley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop In Games</td>
<td>Every Fridays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 3:30pm</td>
<td>Room Galley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>Every Fridays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 1:00pm</td>
<td>Room Rainbow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older People’s Group</td>
<td>Every Fridays</td>
<td>@ 11.00am - 1:00pm</td>
<td>Room Galley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Older women have an exercise session and then relax with social time.*

*The class tutor helps the users to do craft projects, e.g., card making, glass painting, plaster models.*

*The class tutor teaches the users to do basic movements so they can keep fit. They occasionally go on trips and go out for meals.*

*Learn how to communicate with Deaf people using Sign Language.*

*Members of the Centre can drop in to have a chat and play games.*

*Various projects to do with garden and other activities.*

*Older people meet and socialise.*
## Appendix 2 – Alternative Services & Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity / Session</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learn how to improve their literacy and numeracy skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>Every Fridays @ 1.30am -3.30pm Room Rainbow</td>
<td></td>
<td>The class tutor helps the users to do craft projects, eg card making, glass painting, plaster cast models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Box</td>
<td>Every Fridays @ 1.30am -3.30pm Room Galley</td>
<td></td>
<td>The group listens to some music then discusses it sometimes singing as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Surfers</td>
<td>Every Fridays @ 2.00am -3.30pm Room Page</td>
<td></td>
<td>Older people learn how to use the computer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Green Leaf and Emmanuel Christian Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity / Session</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Fit</td>
<td>Greenleaf 67 – 69 Greenleaf Road, Walthamstow, E17 6QP</td>
<td>Wednesday @1.30 -3.30pm Friday 1.30 -3.30pm</td>
<td>Seeks to provide indoor short mat bowling as an enjoyable yet active activity for service users regardless of disability. It seeks to bring together individuals who may be wheelchair bound yet active, with those who may suffer mild dementia as well as those that are more mobile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reading Room</td>
<td>Greenleaf 67 – 69 Greenleaf Road, Walthamstow, E17 6QP</td>
<td>Monday @ 1.30 -3.30pm</td>
<td>This is an interactive activity whereby the group have a Reader who reads from the local or national newspaper and facilitates discussion of the topics read. Participants can bring their own reading material to discuss with the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialise</td>
<td>Greenleaf 67 – 69 Greenleaf Road, Walthamstow, E17 6QP</td>
<td>Tuesday @ 1.30 -3.30pm</td>
<td>Is an afternoon of social interaction in which table top activities are provided. Table top activities include dominoes, draughts, scrabble, pools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Access</td>
<td>Greenleaf 67 – 69 Greenleaf Road, Walthamstow, E17 6QP</td>
<td>Tuesday @ 1.30 -3.30pm</td>
<td>For those who wish to do shopping online. This would be a part of the Socialise session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch Club</td>
<td>Greenleaf 67 – 69 Greenleaf Road, Walthamstow, E17 6QP</td>
<td>Daily 12.30- 1.30pm</td>
<td>A healthy home cooked 2-course meal is provided at the start of the above sessions but this is optional. Refreshments are provided mid afternoon. Once a month these will be a demonstration of cooking from another culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – SERVICE USERS

Older People’s Day Service Reprovision Proposals

Date of Assessment: 06.07.09

Directorate: Adults and Community Care

Head of Service: Sandra Howard

Names and Roles of the people carrying out the EIA:
Catherine Searle, Interim Head of Provision & Independence

Why is the Equality Impact Assessment being done?

- Proposals to change the way day services are provided to deliver the Transformation and Putting People First agendas, including:
  - Modernisation and Transformation of dementia services to deliver the national dementia strategy
  - Support Brokerage and Person-Centred Planning for all day service users
  - Personal Budgets and Direct Payments for day activities
  - Closure of Crownfield Road Day Centre, including transfer of service users to alternative provision

1. Introduction and Background

1.1 Proposals have been outlined to modernise day services in accordance with the Putting People First agenda and the Transformation agenda (under the direction of the Transformation Board).

1.2 The proposals are to modernise the way day services are provided to older people to offer more choice of services and activities, improve access and improve health and social care outcomes for service users and their carers.

1.3 The proposals affect:

1.3.1 77 users of the Crownfield Road Day Centre which is proposed for closure,

1.3.2 48 users of the Morley Centre,

1.3.3 77 users of the dementia support service,

1.3.4 an undetermined proportion of our 3,500 service users who have been assessed as having needs which would be met by the transformed services, but who are currently not using the day services. Anecdotal
evidence suggests that current day centre users are a minority of the people assessed as needing support.

1.3.5 self-funders, who would benefit from support brokerage and information, advice and signposting to a wide range of community services.

1.4 The Putting People First agenda is clear that whilst a day centre can meet some needs for some people, no single building-based service is sufficient to meet the diversity of needs of all the older people needing support, including cultural and social diversity, language, ethnic and religious needs, disability, frailty, dementia and mental health needs, sexual orientation and age. Neither can they achieve all of the health and social care objectives for older people which requires a broad range of social, mental health, dementia, rehabilitation, therapy, health, cultural and other support services from a range of providers.

1.5 The Transformation of services will support people to develop an individually tailored support plan which taps into all of the available services and activities across the community, thus meeting the needs of all of our service users instead of the relatively small number who use day centres.

1.6 Informal and formal consultation has been undertaken with all services over a period of ten months, including all of the registered service users and carers at Crownfield Road Day Centre, via meetings, letters, focus groups, questionnaires and informal discussion. Separate consultation has been undertaken with the Rahaat (Asian Muslim Women’s) group at Crownfield Road, with a Gujarati interpreter and translation of the proposals and Frequently Asked Questions document.

1.7 A full reassessment of all service users and carers at Crownfield Road and the Morley Centre by qualified social workers is underway, to ensure that current, individual needs are properly understood and inform the development of individually tailored day activity plans.

1.8 The proposals include the provision of direct payments and personal budgets, and more investment in the community and voluntary sectors, to offer older people more choice of services to meet individual needs. Consultation has been undertaken and is ongoing with 166 organisations who have been identified as potential providers of alternative day services. More than 23 of these have been visited so far to establish capacity, needs they can meet, and other essential information.

1.9 42 Taster sessions have been held in 17 different services for individuals or small groups of service users and their carers to try alternative services and activities. Feedback from users and carers has been recorded and has been largely very positive.
1.10 The proposals will also offer more choice to the users of the Morley Centre (specialist dementia day centre) and the dementia support service. Dementia services are in increasing demand, with numbers of people with dementia expected to continue to rise nationally.

1.11 It is recognised that older gay lesbian and transgender people are often isolated and afraid to “come out”. These proposals will allow them to access support and wellbeing activities in organisations and groups where they feel comfortable.

1.12 The proposals will also offer a range of BME services for those who would like some or all of their day services to be provided in culturally-specific groups. A number of BME organisations have expressed interest in providing day activities, in addition to those already available.

1.13 The support brokerage function will also signpost older people who are not eligible for Council funding to services and support. This will contribute to the prevention agenda for all older people. We will do this in partnership with health and the voluntary sectors and by the implementation of our resource allocation system which will allocate a fair budget and set up a system that will allow people to self refer.

1.14 The proposed closure of Crownfield Road Day Centre will also involve the redeployment of its staff to other Council services. This will retain staff skills and offer upskilling to deliver modernised services to achieve an excellent standard of service and to support more people.

1.15 Of paramount importance is to ensure that existing service users are matched to support and day activities that promote their wellbeing and independence in friendship groups or independently within the wider community. A timetable of taster sessions in alternative services throughout the community is ongoing with health, leisure, community and voluntary sector partners which is supporting people to trial new services and make informed choices with the support of carers and a social worker through the transition period. The Crownfield Road Day Centre will not close until all users have been supported to make a satisfactory transition to alternative services.

2. Profile of Crownfield Road Day Centre Users

2.1 A preliminary needs analysis has been undertaken of Crownfield Road Day Centre users, to inform discussions with community and voluntary sector providers of alternative day services, to ensure that all known needs can be met in alternative provision. Reassessments are being undertaken for all service users. Since the start of consultation, 32 service users have left Crownfield Road Day Centre, either taking up direct payments to pursue alternative opportunities,
or due to dissatisfaction with the service. Where people have stopped attending Crownfield Road Day Centre with no alternative provision, contact has been made to offer person-centred planning and direct payments to find more suitable alternative provision.

2.1.1 Age equality: Of the 77 users of Crownfield Road Day Centre, 31 are aged 75-84, 28 are 85+, 28 are 65-74 and 4 are under 65. There are a number of younger adults (under 65) with dementia who are currently using older people’s services.

2.1.2 Disability equality: Of the 77 users of Crownfield Road Day Centre, 28 have a physical disability or age-related frailty. 26 have a mental health or dementia diagnosis, 19 with a dual diagnosis (eg. Frailty/physical disability plus dementia/mental health diagnosis), and 3 with learning disabilities.

2.1.3 Gender equality: 70% of Crownfield Road users are female and 30% male.

2.1.4 Race equality: The users at Crownfield Road are 50% white British, 18% Indian, 9% Pakistani, 13% Black Caribbean, and 10% various other ethnic backgrounds.

2.1.5 Religion/Beliefs: 61% of users identify themselves as Christian, 14% as Muslim, 5% as Hindu, 3% Sikh, 17% unknown. 15 people at the Crownfield Road Day Centre are members of the Rahaat group (mostly Asian women). Almost all of the Rahaat group members attend one day per week on Mondays for separate Rahaat activities. Almost all of these already attend other services in addition to Crownfield Road.

2.1.6 Sexual Orientation: not recorded.

3. Questions this assessment addresses

3.1 What kind of equality impact could there be?

The possible key negative impacts include:

- Age impact - requiring people affected by age-related conditions or limited mental capacity to take on more control of their care than they would choose
- Disability impact – if disabled or frail people choose mainstream services with less support for their disability, or are dependent upon less reliable support services (eg. accessible transport is not available or unreliable)
• BME/religious impact – the Asian women’s group which meets one day a week at Crownfield Road Day Centre is quite independent with no personal care or assisted transport needs. They have requested that they move together. The equality impact may be that this reduces the development of community cohesion for older people who may not necessarily meet or have contact with each other cultures to learn about and appreciate different culture.

The key positive impacts may include:

• More flexibility for all users to find (or the Council and voluntary sector to develop) a choice of services which meet the needs of more people
• An individually tailored support plan for each individual which draws on all the available resources within the community, instead of putting them into a one-size-fits-all service, resulting in tailored support to individual needs
• Age impact, for example:
  o provision of services for younger adults with dementia, so they don’t have to join older people’s services to have their dementia care needs addressed
  o more opportunity for people to join inter-generational activities for better social inclusion, if and when they choose
  o more opportunity for people to mix with peer groups of their own age, or undertake age-appropriate activities, instead of the approx. 30 year age span of the current service, if and when they choose (eg. reminiscence groups for people age 65 may be very different to reminiscence for people age 85)
• BME/religious impact
  o more flexibility to commission or support users to access culturally or religiously appropriate services (eg. support to attend mosque or church which cannot be provided in a day centre setting)
  o more support for BME/religious groups in the voluntary sector
• Sexual orientation – providing signposting and support for older people who would like information on LGTG groups and support. Also raising awareness and acceptance of LGTG issues.
• The proposals are designed to provide every user with person-centred planning which takes account of all equalities considerations as well as personal preferences (eg. Culturally segregated or integrated services) and personal interests and care needs. The person-centred planning culminates in a day activity plan for each user which reflects their individual choices and which is designed to best meet their individual needs. The impacts can be positive, ensuring individual needs and equalities considerations are addressed in a more systematic way. The desire to retain friendship groups can also be incorporated so that personalised day activity plans do not compromise existing friendship groups.
In relation to the current service users attending Crownfield Rd the service does not adequately promote disability equality as it is only providing services to 77 people, which is a minority of the older people assessed as needing support (and 32 less people than were using the service at the same time last year). The introduction of support brokerage across social work and day services and in the voluntary sector (taken forward under the Transformation Board) will have the capacity to provide person-centred planning and individual support plans to all 3,500 service users, and to signpost them to the hundreds of opportunities across the community. The more strategic focus on person-centred planning and brokerage and the use of less expensive community-based activities would achieve better value for money and still offer people a choice of high quality services, including those which provide for higher care needs including assisted transport, hoisting, and bathing, or which meet specific cultural, religious or language needs.

All residents will have support that meets the needs identified by individual assessment, and a choice of alternative provision. However we recognise that some people will be dissatisfied with their new provision even where it meets their needs, and for Crownfield Road users, some will be dissatisfied with the need to move from their current provision.

3.2 How significant is it in terms of its nature and the number of people likely to be affected?

There are 77 people registered to use Crownfield Road Day Centre, with attendance currently at 23 per day. All of these people are being provided with a reassessment of their needs, and will be provided with person-centred planning to find a choice of alternative provision which meets those needs.

28 people have significant physical disability or frailty. 6 of these are wheelchair users, and 1 needs access to assisted bathing.

15 of the users are members of the Rahaat Group. Of these, 6 are physically frail and 3 have dementia. Most of the Rahaat group travel independently to the day centre and require no personal care whilst there. As a group, they are relatively more independent than most users.

One third of the service users have dementia and are in need of specialist dementia support which is not provided at Crownfield Road Day Centre.

Three particular risk areas were identified as:

- The Rahaat group, who transferred into the service together from the voluntary sector, and who have expressed a wish to stay together. Most of these already use other services, and almost all have identified services
they wish to take up if Crownfield Road were to close. This is a result of
taster sessions set up to cater specifically for the Asian users and carers.

- Those with physical disability/frailty who are in need of a high level of
  support and personal care, including adapted facilities and equipment (eg.
  Hoists, baths or bariatric toilets). These users have been identified, and
  have also had taster sessions set up to try alternative services which
  provide this level of care, and more therapy/rehab/independent living skills
  services than Crownfield Road provides. There has been a gap in
  provision at Crownfield Road for these users, with a high proportion of
  Crownfield Road staff on restricted duties due to sickness and disability,
  and some safeguarding concerns for users as a result of the lack of
  capacity for manual handling. Some of these users have already moved
  on from Crownfield Road as a result of the taster sessions in more
  specialist day services.

- Those with dementia, who may prefer not to travel to the Morley Centre in
  Walthamstow and require specialist dementia provision in the south of the
  borough. Some of these users are already using alternative services in
  addition to Crownfield Road, such as the Barclay Mission or the
  Alzheimer’s Café.

3.3 Is the impact positive or negative (or is there a potential for both)?

The impacts can be summarised as having potential for positive and negative
impacts, although all of the potential negative impacts are being successfully
addressed on a case-by-case basis through person-centred planning.

3.4 On what aspects of the Equality Duties will this impact be?

Promoting an inclusive model of day care that supports the transformation
agenda and meets the needs of individuals more appropriately is linked to the
department’s equality commitment to reduce equality gaps in leisure and arts
activities for disabled and older people.

All equalities considerations will be considered in the planning and design of the
new or modernised services, and any additional commissioned services. All
services will be monitored to ensure that they are meeting equalities
requirements.

3.5 Could the impact constitute unlawful discrimination?

No. Everyone who has been assessed as needing support (users or carers) will
continue to receive a high standard of support tailored to all of their individual
needs. The key driver of Transformation (on which the proposals are based) is
the need to personalise services to better meet individual need including all
equalities considerations, and therefore the net impact of the proposals is very
positive for equalities.
3.6 What further information is required to gauge the probability and extent of the impact?

- Reassessment of all service users and carers at Crownfield Road is underway and will be completed before the proposed closure of the service would be implemented.
- Person-centred planning to identify the users choices and preferences and to develop individual day activity plans which address equalities issues as well as care needs is underway for all service users.
- 42 Taster sessions have already been provided in 17 alternative services, and some service users have already moved on to alternative provision through their own choice. The taster sessions will continue until all users have identified suitable alternative provision.
- Reviews of all individuals who have moved into new provision will be conducted by social workers to ensure that the new provision is meeting their needs.

3.7 Where and how can that information be obtained?

- All of the above information will continue to be gathered by the social workers and day service staff and project manager, and is so far supporting the conclusion that the choice and control over services being exercised by users is having very beneficial outcomes for service users.

4. Action Planning Questions

4.1 What action do we need to take to reduce negative impact?

- Reassessments of all affected service users (ongoing)
- Taster sessions in alternative services for users and carers, supported by day service staff (ongoing)
- Training of selected staff in person-centred planning (completed)
- Person-centred planning for all service users with the involvement of them and their carers, to identify their individual needs, interests and preferences, and to tailor a support plan to them as an individual (but also taking account of their friendship groups)
- Continuation of taster sessions, to support users and carers to try alternative services before they commit, and thus test their suitability for the individual’s needs and ease any transition
- Continued communications with staff, users and carers on the development of the proposals (ongoing)
- Commissioning of placements in alternative day services with suitable DDA compliant facilities, equipment and staff training to meet the needs of those with high care needs (ongoing)
• Continued separate consultation with the Rahaat group to ensure that the group needs and preferences are addressed as well as individually, and continued discussions with the several voluntary groups who have expressed interest in taking over facilitation of this group (ongoing)
• Development or commissioning of additional specialist dementia services in the south of the borough for those unable or unwilling to travel to the Billett Road (Walthamstow) services (ongoing)

4.2 If the action proposed will not fully mitigate adverse consequences for equality, or if the decision is to take no action, why is this, and can we justify it?

Not applicable. All equalities risks can be mitigated.

4.3 Can any further action be taken to promote equality of opportunity in relation to any of the equality strands?

No. All appropriate actions have been or will be taken.

4.4 Do we need to undertake any further consultation or research?

Detailed consultation has been undertaken with service users, including separate meetings with the Rahaat group with an interpreter. Consultation is ongoing. One-to-one person-centred planning is a more intensive process for understanding individuals, and therefore is achieving a better match of services to users, as reported by users and carers in individual feedback and follow-up consultation/review after transfer to alternative services.

5. Conclusions and Next Steps

5.1 The key areas, which were improved as a result of this assessment, were:

None. All equalities considerations were addressed in the design of the proposals.

6. Action Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action required:</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Time Scale</th>
<th>Comments/Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reassessments of all affected service users</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>Feb 2009 - Dec 2009</td>
<td>Social worker to be appointed subject to Cabinet decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establish timetable of taster sessions in alternative services</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Feb 2009</td>
<td>42 taster sessions held to date, and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Person-centred planning for all affected service users</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>From Feb 2009</td>
<td>Staff trained, PCP for users started April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commissioning of placements in alternative day services with suitable DDA compliant facilities, equipment and staff training to meet the needs of those with high care needs</td>
<td>Commissioning Unit</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>Individual placements have been commissioned as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Separate consultation meetings with the Rahaat group to ensure that the group needs and preferences are addressed as well as individually, and if appropriate, commissioning of Rahaat support from the voluntary sector</td>
<td>Head of Provision &amp; Independence</td>
<td>From August 2008,</td>
<td>Meetings held August/September 2008 and June 2009. Discussions also underway with several Asian providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Development or commissioning of additional specialist dementia services in the south of the borough for those unable or unwilling to travel to the Billett Road (Walthamstow) services.</td>
<td>Commissioning Unit/Head of Provision &amp; Independence</td>
<td>From June 2009</td>
<td>Some alternative provision identified. Discussions ongoing with providers about potential to expand provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Feasibility of Alternatives Considered – Keeping Crownfield Road Day Centre Open

In light of the view of some existing Crownfield Road service users and relatives wanting the centre to remain open, options for keeping the centre open have been considered. A summary of the options and conclusions is below, with cost estimates overleaf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Current Costs – the “Do Nothing” Option**  | Current costs unavoidably exceed the budget, due to: ▪ increases in staffing costs due to single status ▪ increases in transport costs imposed by Fleet Services ▪ the continuation of the Door-to-Door meals service following an initial pilot scheme ▪ the take-up of direct payments by service users leaving Crownfield Road to take up alternative services and activities                                  | • This option does not implement the personalisation agenda or contribute to the national indicator on self-directed support.  
• It does not deliver a service to everyone assessed as needing day services  
• It will result in a higher overspend                                                                 |
| **Option 1 – Closure of Crownfield Road and Reprovision via Direct Payments/Individual Budgets** | This option frees up the Crownfield Road budget (excluding the cost of direct payments or individual budgets for alternative provision for all existing users of Crownfield Road Day Centre).                                                                 | • This option will fully implement the personalisation agenda in respect of day services for all older people with an assessed need for day services  
• This option will achieve a saving  
**This is the recommended option**                                                                                               |
| **Option 2 – Reduced Crownfield Rd Capacity** | This option reduces the number of staff to cater for a capacity of 20 service users rather than the current 40. Capacity is defined by the number of staff available to support service users. Staffing is the primary non-fixed cost, as other costs such as building and transport are largely fixed. Therefore the additional costs of the “do nothing” option also apply, and offset the staffing cost savings. | As for the “do nothing” option                                                                                                               |
| **Option 3 – Reduced Capacity and Reduced Service Days** | This option reduces the number of staff, as above, and also reduces the service to a four day week instead of five. Again the staffing costs are the main source of savings, though the unit cost increases due to poorer value from the high building and transport costs. | As for the “do nothing” option                                                                                                               |
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**Crownfield Road Day Centre – Alternative Options Cost Estimates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Element</th>
<th>09/10 Projected Cost (Do Nothing Option)</th>
<th>Option 1 (Closure of Crownfield Road)</th>
<th>Option 2 (Reduced Staffing)</th>
<th>Option 3 (Reduced Staffing and Opening Days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td>505,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>418,363</td>
<td>339,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Allowances (car/travel, clothing/laundry)</strong></td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>2,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td>174,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174,700</td>
<td>166,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisions (including meals)</strong></td>
<td>49,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49,400</td>
<td>39,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office supplies</strong></td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities &amp; Events</strong></td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income (meals charges &amp; telecomms)</strong></td>
<td>-6,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6,900</td>
<td>-5,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Payments/Individual Budgets for Crownfield Road users</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Savings (or Cost) from Crownfield Budget</strong></td>
<td>831,500</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>744,245</td>
<td>668,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Budget</strong></td>
<td>700,600</td>
<td>700,600</td>
<td>700,600</td>
<td>700,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crownfield Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>131,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>-470,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,645</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,211</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance per day</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Cost Compared to London average of £31.00</strong></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Budgets for Morley/Other users</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dementia Resource Centre Development Costs</strong></td>
<td>120,600</td>
<td>120,600</td>
<td>120,600</td>
<td>120,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Total Financial Impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>£352,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£250,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£264,245</strong></td>
<td><strong>£252,811</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on estimated average £40 per person per day

**Controllable budget = 2009/10 operating budget of £822,700 minus fixed corporate recharges**
Appendix 5
Consultation Report

1. Methodology

1.1 “Personalising Day Opportunities” consultation papers were sent to 450 service users (and their carers) and 166 organisations, to all affected staff and other stakeholders including referring agencies such as NELFT.

1.2 Formal staff consultation papers were also sent to the unions and to all affected staff in the Morley Centre, Dementia Support Service and Crownfield Road Day Centre.

1.3 Consultation meetings were held as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date &amp; Time</th>
<th>Purpose of Meeting</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Service Users and Carers</td>
<td>Monday 29th June, 2-4pm</td>
<td>Consultation meeting/workshop on personalised Asian day activities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisations providing day activities to older or disabled people</td>
<td>Tuesday 30th June, 2-4pm</td>
<td>Workshop on preparing for personal budgets (fee structures, user contracts, promotion, accommodation &amp; transport)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Users &amp; Carers</td>
<td>Wednesday 1st July, 2-4pm</td>
<td>Consultation meeting/workshop on personalised services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday 1st July, 7pm</td>
<td>Consultation meeting/workshop on personalised services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; Unions</td>
<td>Wednesday 24th June, 1pm</td>
<td>Union meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday 25th June, 10-11am</td>
<td>Consultation meeting – presentation of proposals</td>
<td>32 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday 25th June, 2-3pm</td>
<td>Consultation meeting – presentation of proposals</td>
<td>2 Union reps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday 2nd July, 10-12am</td>
<td>Workshop on developing a person-centred planning toolkit, staff skills development</td>
<td>24 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday 2nd July, 2-4pm</td>
<td>Workshop on developing a person-centred planning toolkit, staff skills development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday 22nd July, 2pm</td>
<td>Union meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday 27th July, 2pm</td>
<td>Union meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 Taster sessions were also held for service users and their carers to try alternative activities and services in the community. At the end of June, 42 different taster sessions had been hosted by 17 organisations, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>No. of Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Housing Assn</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Resource Centre</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subco</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor bowls</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alzheimers Cafe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Morris Day Centre</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Swimming for over 65s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament Assembly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclay Mission</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abba Resource Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Christian Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Action – Reaching Out</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS (learning for adults)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebelands</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest Albany Crt/Gainsford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franky and Bennys (restaurant)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham Resource Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total to date:</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Service User and Carer Consultation

2.1 Consultation meetings have been held in all of the affected services, with service users and carers/relatives.

2.2 Consultation was also undertaken through feedback from the 42 taster sessions (so far).

2.3 The consultation feedback demonstrates:

- A very high level of interest from service users and carers in trying new things.
- A new freedom amongst users and carers to say what they don't like and what they would prefer to do or try (compared to previous reluctance to complain, from fear of losing their service)
- A higher than previously thought variety of opportunities for older people in the community, including support services such as assisted transport, so that all existing service users can be catered for in the community in a way which meets needs better than at present.
- Improved health and wellbeing and general satisfaction levels for older people and carers, both with the person-centred planning process and with the range of choices available to them.
- There is naturally some concern from Crownfield Road Day Centre users and their carers over the potential for closure of Crownfield Road and fears over coping with change
- ideas for supporting Crownfield Road Day Centre users and carers through the transition – for example, with specific taster sessions in other services, moving of friendship groups together, and with carers assessments and additional carers support.
- A high level of interest in direct payments for independent, individual or small group activity, with some innovative ideas (eg. Pooling of direct payments by one friendship group to take a short break to the coast together).
- Consensus that a directory of community activities and services is a high priority, to signpost people to what’s on in Waltham Forest which is accessible to disabled and older people.

3 Staff and Union Consultation

3.1 Consultation meetings have been held in all affected services with staff and unions.

3.2 Formal Crownfield Road Day Centre staff meetings with HR support have been held for those staff whose posts are affected by the proposals. One-to-one HR surgeries have also been held.

3.3 Draft staff consultation papers were circulated to unions for comment in advance, and unions were invited to all staff meetings and to meetings with HR and senior management.

3.4 Redeployment opportunities for affected staff at Crownfield Road have been identified in the Dementia Resource Centre, learning disabilities day services and the residential care homes, as well as other services across Adult Social Care and the wider Council.

3.5 A formal response to consultation was received from Unison (attached in addendum 2).

3.6 No individual staff responses were received, however a lot of positive contributions were made in staff workshops on the development of the Dementia Resource Centre, and the skills required of staff to deliver transformed services including support brokerage.

4 Scrutiny Committee

4.1 The Health, Adults and Older Persons Scrutiny Sub-Committee considered this proposal at its meeting on 5th November 2008 (see Appendix 6 for minutes). Recommendations made by the Sub-Committee have been incorporated into the proposals.

5 Consultation with Service Providers
5.1 Letters and briefing papers were sent to 166 organisations in or adjacent to Waltham Forest who provide services and activities to older and disabled people.

5.2 23 of these organizations have been visited to discuss their current and future services and activities, capacity, costs, and needs catered for, and to assess the accessibility of their venues.

5.3 17 of these organizations have so far participated in offering taster sessions to our service users, some offering several sessions in their own venues or community activities (eg. Bowling greens, computer suites, restaurants).

5.4 A workshop with providers was held to explore the implications of transformation, including:
   - Setting fee structures, terms and conditions, customer charters, and marketing services to individuals with personal budgets
   - Developing a menu of varied activities and services to provide choice and meet future demand
   - Sharing resources such as accessible transport and venues

5.5 Discussions with providers so far demonstrate that there is more than sufficient capacity (including real vacancies) within the private and voluntary sector to reprovide for all of the existing Crownfield Road users, including services for those with the highest care needs (eg. Hoists, manual changing, assisted transport or challenging behaviour).

5.6 Community transport are preparing to deliver more personalized services and to work with providers. Many traditional providers are already switched on to the personalization agenda and are offering a variety of outreach activities in addition to centre-based placements.

6 Feedback

6.1 Notes from the consultation workshops are attached in addendum 1.

6.2 Four formal responses were received – one letter from Unison, two from Mr Alfred Norris, a service user at Crownfield Road, and one from Ms Susan Pond, neighbour to Crownfield Road Day Centre. The responses are attached in addendum 2. No formal responses were received from staff.

6.2 Feedback forms were completed by service users at the end of each taster session. A summary of taster session feedback (including photos) is included in appendix 1).
Addendum 1

Consultation Workshop Notes

Mon 29th June – Asian service users and carers

3 service users attended, plus 1 carer

The following points were made by participants:

1. 1 person did not find the chairs and table comfortable at one of their taster sessions
2. 2 said they like Subco
3. Would like more information on what might be available
4. There are insufficient staff on duty at Crownfield Road, so not enough care provided
5. Taster sessions can be too far to travel to
6. Like the idea of having flexibility to use money to pursue chosen activities
7. How can Direct Payments be used for day activities?

Tuesday 30th June – providers of day activities

Presentations were made on the Transformation agenda, changes taking place on how organisations are funded and future contractual arrangements, Direct Payments/Individual Budgets, Person Centre Planning leading to Support Planning.

The following points were shared by people participating in the workshops:

- Can private residential care access day activities (to meet needs of their residents, whether privately or local authority funded?)
- We would like to provide day activities in our private residential care home.
- How do we set up Terms and Conditions?
- How will the system work if people have an Individual Budget?
- How do we charge, and what? (Unit costs?) We will need a balance sheet, yet we are not for profit organisations. Cost recovery
- What monitoring will take place if the service users take their money? What checks and balances will be in place? Concerned about quality control. Risk assessments, legal issues.
- In future there will be contracts with service users, not the local authority.
- Staff roles will change
- How will LBWF support us to change/make transition?
- How to make our services more attractive than our competitors?
- New administrative burden?
- What will be the role of the Support broker?
- How will residential homes charge for day activities?
- There’s scope for developing and creating new partnerships
- Information sharing around groups/activities/services
Challenging existing barriers around accommodation – want to share, same with transport
- How many accessible buildings in the Borough? Is an audit exercise needed?
- Create consortiums with partners?
- We need training on social enterprise/business sector
- Insurance needed on some activities?
- London Voluntary Sector Council could help? Funding available?
- shortage of dementia services in south of Borough
- Transport: Charity Commission requirement
- Boundaries
- S19 permit
- Charging
- Best way to build in more capacity?
- Coping with changes in dependency levels – we will need to do this
- How do we set up transport?
- Activities which are likely to be appropriate: exercise, cooking, reminiscence
- Culturally appropriate
- Will need funding to set up pilots
- We need to support individuals and groups
- Could try buy 9 sessions, get 1 free

**Wed 1st July, Carers and Service users**

2 carers attended, plus 1 staff from Quaid/Giblar

The following questions were raised by the carers:

- How will the system work for someone with dementia?
- What happens if a service isn’t available for 52 weeks a year?
- Can you mix and match activities, ie 3 different activities each week?
- What if I don’t want to deal with Direct Payment/Individual Budget?
- What exactly does Person Centred Planning involve?

**Thursday 2nd July – staff**

24 staff members attended.

**Workshop 1: Ideas for activities which service users would benefit from:**

- Acupuncture
- Beading
- Bingo
- Board games
- Book clubs, library, poetry groups
- Bowling, skittles
- Bring and Buy sale
Café trips, get togethers
Card making
Cards
Carers training and advice
Celebrations
Cinema and film afternoons, linking up with others
Contacts with HIV and premature baby units
Cooking
Couples activities, reminiscence,
Crosswords, word games, Sudoku
Cultural groups
Darts
Dominoes
Drama group
Drop ins for service users and carers
Eating well (and for people with dementia) nutrition
Enablement/Advocacy
Encourage community to come to centre, ie fetes etc
End of life support
Family work, sexual health promotion
Fashion show
Festivals
Fishing
Flower arranging
Garden centre trips
Gardening, plant therapy – garden shed (potting shed), raised flower beds, growing herbs
Hairdressing
Henna painting
Holistic therapies – Aromatherapy, beauty, massage, healing
Home brewing
Imperial War Museum
Individual self expression (one to one)
Information sessions – financial, benefits, bereavement,
Inter generational work
IT, using computers, online shopping
Knitting, sewing, quilting
London Farm, Leyton
Lunch clubs
Music therapy – live music
Nail parlours
Needlework
Opportunities to carry out hobbies and goals outside centre
Painting and Artwork
Pantomimes
Pet therapy
Pottery
Quizzes
Rehabilitation
Retreat days
Seaside trips
Sensory awareness and stimulation for people in later stages of dementia
Shopping trips, “Me” days
Shuv-halfpenny
Snooker/pool
Specialist days for people over 65
Spiritual opportunities
Support couples relationships
Support relationships in community
Table tennis
Tai Chi and other exercise
Tea dancing, line dancing
Theatre visits
Walking/rambling
Wellbeing days
Wood carving

Workshop 2: Skills needed to enable Person Centred Planning and Support Brokerage (to be used in job description development):

Able to challenge behaviour appropriately and sensitively
Able to cope with the unexpected
Able to prioritise workload
Able to recruit skilled people
Able to remain calm in a challenging situation
Able to skill shower
Adaptable
Advocacy
Assertive
Assessment
Basic First Aid
Brokerage
Committed and enthusiastic
Counselling skills (and access to Counselling)
Decisive
Empathy
Encouraging
Flexibility
Flexible working hours
Good communication
Good Coping mechanisms
Good organisation
Imagination
Innovation – to be able to think outside the box
IT skills
Languages other than English
Leadership
Mediational skills
Musical talent
Non-judgemental approach
Observation and monitoring, listening
Person Centred approach
Positive ageing attitude
Proactive
Recognising people’s needs, abilities, individualities and possibilities
Researching
Sense of humour
Signposting
Support carers
Tact
Team player
Understanding of basic health and safety and food hygiene
Understanding of dementia and its impact on individuals and their families
Willingness to undertake training and self development
Date: Tue
14/7/09

2X A WEEK

Dear Syd,

I now like Crest so much I'll be very grateful if you can do everything possible to arrange my attendance at Gaskill Centre (aka: Crest) for 2 x times a week. Please tell the Council that when Crowfield closes down (maybe) Crest could EXPAND to being open 2 x times a week (or more).

Thanking you in advance,

Yours sincerely,

Alfred "Fluffy" Norris
(Greef)
Wed 16/7/09

Dear Mrs Syima Ali,
Please do your utmost to arrange for me to attend Gainsford Court, Crest, Cathall Day Centre for 2 x 2 weeks because Groomfield is closing in September??? I realize that at the moment they are only open one (a Thursday) day but can't Crest extend its open hours one more day? I will be pleased to attend 2 x every week INSTEAD of Groomfield.

Today we had a really lovely day at Crest. We had a roast and coffee breakfast and a lovely TURKEY midday meal.

P.S.O.
There was a shop in the afternoon and I bought 2 Hankies and a tea-towel. Also we had 2 Refflers and I won a tin of Papaya Fruit. We also had a game of "bowling" with a Red Team and a Blue Team and my Red Team won a mini trophy! Also Ruby will be leaving so we had pass the mini parcels to intermittent music. Everyone got a prize, even Maureen and Jim.

Yours sincerely,

Alfred "Fluffy" Norris

[Signature]
20/7/07

FAD Catherine Beadle

Dearest Bhavan Ali,

I have heard a rumour that you intend closing Brown Field Day Centre and the adjoining building as a concerned resident, I will tell me your reasons for this action. What is to become of these elderly people, where are they to go, as you have already closed so many centres. I too am a pensioner a widow aged 83 yrs. at the moment I am fairly lucky to be able to look after myself, but should the time come when I need to go to a centre, none are available.
as the entrance to the centre is in my road, each day I see the houses bring the people to the centres, at least one day a week they are looked after properly and feel special. What (if at all) do you intend to do with the empty buildings, what will it be? You will have to go public, and we shall be against you all the way; we fought a war, sacrificed our young men, and now we are past our sell by date. We are to be thrown on the rubbish heap. I look forward to receiving your reply.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Councillor Liz Phillips  
Democratic Services  
Waltham Forest Town Hall  
Forest Road  
Walthamstow E17 4JF

Dear Councillor Phillips,

Re: Proposed Closure of Crownfield Day Centre

I have just received a telephone call from a member of staff at Waltham Forest Council requesting a time that she and a colleague could visit my Mother’s home to discuss alternative day care as Crownfield Day Centre will eventually close. I told her that as far as I was aware a decision had not been made and that it was my understanding that a decision would be made in September. She said that the day time care should be arranged now before it was too late. It sounds to me like this decision has been made and I would like your comments on this.

My understanding is that the proposed closure is based on a unit cost per “service user” of £127.29 per day for Waltham Forest versus £31.00 average for London and I would need to see raw data to believe this.

I refer to the Cabinet Committee Meeting dated 24th February 2009 where a paper was put forward entitled Reproofion of Day Services for Older People and Closure of Crownfield Day Centre. Point 5, Alternatives Considered, paragraph 5.2 states:

*The cost of day services at Crownfield Rd does not represent best value, being five times above the London average of day care provision. The cost of the service will significantly increase in 2009 with increased costs of transport, meals and single status staff, for which no budget has yet been identified.*

Firstly, I would like to know if this is a ‘true’ like for like’ comparison and need a breakdown of the figures of £127.29 and £31.00. I would also be interested to know what other London Boroughs were used for this comparison. There is attached to Appendix 3 a schedule showing the 08/09 Budget for Crownfield Day Centre, would you please clarify how the figure of £127.29 was reached?

Secondly, I cannot understand why a budget was not identified for the increased costs of transport, meals and staffing. These costs should have been identified at budget time and contingencies made, why weren’t they?

I note that the meals contract was due for retender/reprovision before the end of 2008/09 and that there was a risk of further meal cost increases. Was this service retendered? If it was, what is the cost of the new contract? Did the tender documents include a clause for companies to bring to the table initiatives to reduce costs?
I refer to the Health, Adults and Older People’s Services Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee dated 5th November 2008 and share the concerns of Sheena Scott Dunbar at the speed at which this re-provision is advancing and other points she raised.

I refer to her point regarding accessible venues, voluntary organisations that will need resources to upgrade their buildings if the Council will be relying on them to provide day time activities. Who will pay for this?

Mirri Konigsberg stated, in the above mentioned meeting of 5th November, that the Crownfield Day Centre is limited as to the number of people it reaches. What is the reason for this?

I would like your comments on all the points raised above by 21 July.

I look forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely,

Susan Pond

Addendum

Email from Dave Knight, Unison

Dear Catherine,

We have now had the opportunity to speak with our members in both services and as we cannot be at the workshops tomorrow due to prior commitments I am writing to you to raise questions and issues arising from the consultation paper.

1. Our members received the consultation paper on the day of the meeting which meant they did not really have the chance to digest the report enough to ask questions when invited to do so at the end of the meeting.
2. UNISON requires the proposed new job descriptions that are part of the new structure. There are concerns relating to how the new jobs are planned to be more generic so that traditional outreach tasks are mixed in with traditional day car and support tasks.
3. The job descriptions will need to be agreed and evaluated before the consultation period ends and we only have the 25 day consultation period to do that in.
4. It is UNISON's view that the 25 day consultation should begin when we have all the necessary documentation to properly deal with the proposal.
5. In addition to the job descriptions we also need to have a list of all the staff affected, their current job title, grade and workplace. We do have a lot of that information but we cannot link it to the staff by name. We also want the names so that we can check which of the affected staff are UNISON members.
6. We also require management proposals regarding how we move from the old structure to the new structure. Are there staff who will be directly assimilated to posts in the new structure? Will there be ring fences? If so how will they be constituted?
7. The proposal aims to close down Crownfield Road, so the staff there are having their posts deleted. Are staff in Dementia Support and the Morley Centre therefore able to assimilate to the new structure?
8. The PO2 Co-coordinator post may be available for assimilation. Will that be the case?
9. Is it planned to directly assimilate to the Dementia Advisor PO1 post?
10. One of our members is assigned to the Morley Centre from Dementia Support. She has been at the Morley Centre for 3 years. Will she be treated as a Morley Centre worker for the purposes of this exercise?
11. The entry on your list of posts for the Morley Centre Domestics implies that there is one staff doing 40 hours per week. This is not the case. There are two workers, both doing 20 hours. One is from an agency; the other is a permanent member of staff. The “To Be” chart shows one 36
hour post. How is it intended to deal with this?

12. The Crownfield Road Care Officers are all listed as Scale 3 - they should be recorded as Scale 4.

13. As you know, UNISON is opposed to the closure plan. We believe that this is a service that is much loved by the service users and their carers and we will be looking to try and persuade councilors to prevent the closure.

14. As I pointed out to you when we met last week, the "Personalising Day Services for Older and Disabled People" consultation document does contain some potential misquotes and gives a potentially false impression of what service users are saying.

Please give my apologies to tomorrow's meeting. It is a shame that these meeting dates cannot be arranged with the union so that we could attend more. However, we will still need a trade union / management meeting as soon as we can arrange one.

Yours sincerely

Dave Knight

Branch Secretary

UNISON in Waltham Forest

020 8496 4703

Council response overleaf.
Day Services Reprovision Consultation

Response to Questions from Unison

1. Will any posts from Crownfield be transferred to the Morley Centre?

We will not be transferring any existing Crownfield posts, though we are proposing the creation of additional posts at the Morley Centre, which will be ringfenced with other vacancies for affected staff. As the Morley Centre and Crownfield Road Day Centre posts have not yet been through the single status process we do not want to create a two-tier service by transferring posts with different terms and conditions.

2. Will Crownfield staff be offered posts in the Morley centre and if so how many and how will this be managed?

and

3. Will staff be eligible for new posts in the brokerage and support service (ringfence arrangements)?

We have agreed that all vacancies within the Morley Centre, the new brokerage and support service, the Dementia Support Service, the residential care homes (after the redeployment of Walton House staff, should Cabinet agree that proposal) and the Learning Disability day services will be ringfenced for the affected staff at Crownfield Road (and possibly one post within the Dementia Support Service, who do some floating day activity support already).

The redeployment process will be managed in accordance with the Managing Change policy, as for the Efficiency Review. If the job description is broadly similar and there is no competition for the post, assimilation will apply. If there is competition for the vacancies, skills matching and competitive interviews will apply. If job descriptions are not broadly similar, we will advertise the posts internally and hold competitive interviews. We can offer some training to support staff to transfer to a new role where they demonstrate capacity to meet the requirements of the role within a reasonable period with learning and development support.

Training will be offered to all of the new staff within the Brokerage and Support Service, using a person-centred planning toolkit which is yet to be selected.
4 We would like a breakdown of the £817,500 savings at Crownfield.

£817,500 is the current budget for Crownfield Road. There is some underspend against the staffing budget, but there is an overspend on transport and meals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crownfield Road Day Centre Budget 2008/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Allowances (car/travel, clothing/laundry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Costs (insurance, maintenance, cleaning, refuse collection, equipment, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions (including meals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities &amp; Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recharges (contribution to overheads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (meals charges &amp; telecomms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 When will we see the job descriptions for posts in the brokerage and support team and have the grades been confirmed?

Job descriptions for the new brokerage service are being drafted, but will not be evaluated prior to the Cabinet decision. A very helpful website which gives detailed information on what brokerage involves can be found at [www.nationalbrokeragenetwork.org.uk](http://www.nationalbrokeragenetwork.org.uk). We would be looking to offer brokerage staff this or similar training.

The Brokerage and Support Service will also offer additional services including floating day activity provision (ie. Delivery of day activities in residential care settings) as well as advice to community and voluntary organisations and management of a database of community activities, in partnership with Culture and Leisure (who have an existing activity database which we can build on).

6 What training will be offered to Crownfield staff?

Staff undergoing competitive interviews will be offered interview training prior to the redeployment process. Following the redeployment process we will assess training needs for all redeployed staff. This could be basic skills training, training in specific job competencies (eg. Dementia awareness) as required in the person specification, or team training in new
skills such as brokerage. The training required will depend upon the individual’s skills and the requirements of their post.

7 How have the services at Crown field been promoted over the last year?

The Day Centre is a referral-only service because users must have had a community care assessment and meet the Fair Access to Care criteria. The centre takes referrals from all assessment and care management teams, mental health, learning disabilities and NHS services. The referral rate has been steady over the last year, although the proportion of referrals with dementia has increased.

8 Will you be meeting with staff again?

We are providing one-to-one HR advice upon request. We haven’t scheduled any further team meetings at this stage, although we will maintain communication with staff after the close of formal consultation by circulating a consultation report with management responses, and a summary of recommendations to Cabinet and the rationale for these. Following the Cabinet decision in January we will be writing to all staff to advise the outcome, and next steps.

9 How many existing service users from Crownfield will be offered places at the Morley Centre?

All service users at Crownfield with dementia (a total of 46 registered people) will be offered places at the Morley Centre, and we are proposing to create additional staff posts at the Morley Centre to create the additional capacity in this service.

10 What will happen to those who are not offered places?

We have contacted more than 130 organisations in and around Waltham Forest who may have capacity to provide day activities to frail older people, including traditional day centres, voluntary organisations, residential homes with day services, and community groups.

11 What is the proposed capacity of the Morley Centre?
It is proposed to double the current capacity of the Morley Centre from 15 people per day to 30 people per day. The service was originally designed with this capacity, but has reduced its capacity as staff levels have been reduced.

End.
Present:
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Madge Bergman (MB) — Representative of the former Waltham Forest PCT PPI Forum – appearing as guest.

Neil Collins (NC) — Representative of the former North East London Foundation Trust PPI Forum & Waltham Forest PCT PPI Forum – appearing as guest.

Sheena Scott-Dunbar (SSD) — Age Concern Waltham Forest

Officers in Attendance:

Mimi Konigsberg (MK) — Executive Director – Adult & Community Services
Sandra Howard (SH) — Head of Adult Social Care and Health
Catherine Searle (CS) — Interim Head of Provision and Independence
Sylv Sheehan (SSh) — Project Manager
Harry Clibbens (HC) — Head of Mental Health & Community PCT Commissioning
Paul Rogers (PR) — Interim Head of Scrutiny
Mark Yeadon (MY) — Consultation Manager, Community Engagement
Farhana Zia (FZ) — Scrutiny Officer
7. **OLDER PEOPLE’S DAY SERVICES RE-PROVISION PROJECT / PUTTING PEOPLE FIRST**

Catherine Searle, Interim Head of Provision and Independence presented this report.

She explained that the government Transforming Social Care and Putting People First agendas were the main drivers for this proposed re-provision. Consultation with older people shows they want support to remain independent for as long as possible and want services which are flexible, which offer choice and are personalised.

Hence, a package of proposals has been put together on how people can access services and the facilities available.

The Council intends to create a Brokerage and Support Service, modernise and expand the Morley Centre for older people with dementia, provide day activities for younger adults with dementia, expand the Dementia Support Services to provide one to one outreach support and pilot a scheme to promote Direct Payments and Individual budgets for day activities.

As a result of the above, there is a proposal that the Crownfield Road Day Centre should close.

These are a broad range of proposals as we want to provide to a majority of users and not just a minority.

**Sheena Scott**

Dunbar

I have deep reservations about these proposals.

i. There is not enough information about the condition of buildings that voluntary organisations occupy and I fear these are not fully DDA compliant.

ii. Why isn't the Brokerage and Support Service independent of the Council?

iii. I think there is a greater need for advocacy because frail elderly people will find it difficult to navigate the Direct payments and Individual Budgets schemes.

**Cllr Sweden**

Sheena, could you please explain to members what Individual Budgets are?
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Sheena Scott
Dunbar
Older people will get a budget in order to purchase the facility or activity that they are interested in. The Brokerage and Support service is there to aid this process. However I believe this should be independent of the council. It does not make sense that the Council should be making funding decisions for this proposed service plus providing the service.

I have no problem with the direction of travel put forward by this report but I am concerned that voluntary organisations/groups, who have no experience with dealing with older people with dementia will be relied upon to provide daytime activities. They do not have any training in this field nor are aware of the procedures that need to be followed.
I am alarmed by the speed at which this re-provision is advancing.

Sandra Howard
In terms of Brokerage, there are two types that we will need to consider:

i. Those people have severe needs will require a ‘in house’ service where staff have the expertise and knowledge to support them.

ii. An independent brokerage service, signposted with the voluntary organisations.

Catherine Searle
Under the proposals the Brokerage Service will start small but this can evolve into something bigger and possibly be independent of the Council.
With regard to Direct Payments and Individual Budgets this has been modelled on the Learning Disability model which has a very effective Brokerage service and we hope to enjoy the same success.

Sylv Sheehan
With respect to accessibility of voluntary organisation buildings, we have written to potential providers (50-60 letters asking for expressions of interest), asking them if they have hoisting equipment, wheelchair access etc.

Sheena Scott
Dunbar
I think the Brokerage Support should be independent even for the frailest people. It is a conflict of interest but I appreciate that you’ve had open consultation with older people.

Regarding accessible venues, voluntary organisations will need resources to upgrade the fabric of their buildings, especially if the Council will be relying on them to provide day time activities.
Neil Collins: I wanted to support Sheena in respect to her point about advocacy. Advocacy services in this borough are limited. For example, those with mental health or learning disabilities are supported by a joint advocacy service with the London Borough of Redbridge. We need to get moving on this.

The report makes little mention of carers. If I understood correctly ‘carers plan’ assessments are lamentable. Carers are worried about Personalisation and Direct Payments because they feel more responsibility will be shifted on them. I think this re-provision is rushed and would hope the consultation will be extended beyond the 27th November 2008.

Catherine Searle: Have Waltham Forest Carers Association been consulted with?

Neil Collins: We are acutely aware that Day services provide a respite for carers and we have involved carers in this process.

Sandra Howard: We are committed to carers and their welfare.

Neil Collins: But you are cutting a post and the sub-committee needs to be made aware that posts are being cut. How are carers to be supported? I would like to see the consultation period to be longer.

Catherine Searle: Transport is a contentious issue and we are liaising with Community transport. A lot of work is going on and we will make the re-provision a success.

Cllr Braham: Two things worry me. At 3.7.1 the maths is wrong. You seem to be about £1,000 out and at 3.8.2, this sub-committee would insist on consultation but is TUPE included?

Catherine Searle: I accept we’ve made an error and our finances are £1,000 out. In respect to 3.8.2 this is a legal comment. We have been consulting with staff and we do not envisage any TUPE implications.
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Sheena Scott-Dunbar

When did consultation start with staff?

Catherine Searle

Discussions started in early August, carers, relatives, staff at the Crownfield Road Day Centre, at the Morley Centre have all been consulted.
We have met with the Waltham Forest Carers Association and Age Concern. We aim to redeploy staff, as vacancies have been frozen under the Efficiency Review.

Cllr Braham

Although the closure of Crownfield is upsetting for me, what consultation has taken place, with who and when?

Catherine Searle

We have met on at least two occasions with staff and carers at Crownfield Day Centre.

Mimi Konigsberg

The consultation is still open until the 27th November and there is still time to go. We will look at everyone’s responses and we will be doing a report analysing the results.

Catherine Searle

Page 56/57 reports on some of the feedback we have had but this is not complete.

Cllr Braham

What about TUPE?

Catherine Searle

We have had a meeting with staff and will re-deploy them to ring-fenced vacancies either at the Morley Centre, residential care homes, learning disability or the new service that will be created by this proposal. I am confident that we will find places for all affected staff.

Cllr Braham

How are you to keep together friendship and staff groups?

Catherine Searle

We have assured staff and users that we will do our utmost to keep groups together. For example, the Rahaat Group have already stated that they wish to remain a group and we shall make sure this continues.

Cllr Sweden

Personally I am uneasy about the proposed closure of Crownfield Day Centre but I fully support the Independence agenda. Day Services are essential and we mustn’t get committed to institutions. Whilst most will find their way around the Direct payment system and the rump of directly provided day services, I’d like you to make absolutely certain that the alternative facilities will be fit for purpose – residents and carers can ‘crumble’ from the anxiety of change.

In respect to the timetable on page 13, I have some reservation for older people who fall on the ‘high end of need’ spectrum. It would be a pity if we keep these people at home because they are severely disabled or confused and there is no capacity or venue for them to go to.

I would suggest that your report to Cabinet must reassure them that provision will be made for those people who are high end of need.

Cllr Safdar

In addition you will need to make clear that voluntary sector staff will need training, if they are to be relied upon to provide day services.
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Neil Collins  The Equalities Impact Assessment appended at 3 (page 31) states you have 98 current users who are frail, so the issue is not only about premises but also planning. The University of the third age is not equipped to deal with very frail people.

Cllr Sweden  The issues that have been highlighted by this discussion are as follows;

i. More detail needs to be made available about the suitability of accommodation.
ii. Consider the independence of the Brokerage Service.
iii. Training and support to the third sector with regard to those when high end of need and how the voluntary sector will fulfil statutory requirements.
iv. The availability of independent advocacy.
v. More detailed report to go to Cabinet on how changes will affect carers and what is proposed to support them.
vi. Transport issues - i.e. reliability of existing services.
vii. Cohorts of friendship and staff groups to be kept together.
viii. Expansion of day services in the future

We recommend the above would be achieved before Cabinet agrees to close current facilities. In addition to the above, we remind Cabinet of the commitment to re-provide all existing Day Care services users.

Mimi Konigsberg  This report set out to consult widely and I am heartened by your endorsement of the direction of travel we are taking. Presently the Crownfield Day centre is limited as to the number of people it reaches. We are saying that we can do a number of things, from staff training, auditing of voluntary sector venues, auditing of users and carer needs, so that we can empower people to live independently.

Cllr Sweden  Many thanks to Mimi for her valuable input to whom we wish our best.

The meeting started closed at 9.30 p.m.
Appendix 7 – Day Service Attendance Rates

Crownfield Road attendance April 06 - June 09

The graph shows the attendance rates at Crownfield Road from April 2006 to June 2009. The data is represented as follows:

- **Capacity**: The maximum number of participants the service can accommodate.
- **Registered**: The average number of registered participants.
- **Actual Attendance**: The actual number of participants.

The graph includes a line for each of these categories, with the actual attendance line highlighted in yellow. The average registered attendance is shown as 31, and the average actual attendance is shown as 23.5.
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EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAFF

Older People’s Day Service Reprovision Proposals

Date of Assessment: 27.07.09
Directorate: Adults and Community Care
Head of Service: Sandra Howard

Names and Roles of the people carrying out the EIA:
Catherine Searle, Interim Head of Provision & Independence

| Why is the Equality Impact Assessment being done? | Proposals to change the way day services are provided to deliver the Transformation and Putting People First agendas, including proposed closure of Crownfield Road Day Centre and redeployment of staff. |

1. Introduction and Background

1.1 Proposals have been outlined to modernise day services in accordance with the Putting People First agenda and the Transformation agenda (under the direction of the Transformation Board).

1.2 The proposals are to support older people to access more choice of mainstream community services and activities, and to redirect resources to support brokerage and personal budgets rather than tied up in expensive, building-based day services.

1.3 The proposals affect 21 staff of the Crownfield Road Day Centre which is proposed for closure.

1.4 Informal and formal consultation has been undertaken with staff and unions over a period of ten months, via meetings, letters, consultation papers, workshops, questionnaires and informal discussion.

1.5 Redeployment opportunities have been identified in the Morley Centre/Dementia Support Service, five older people’s residential care homes, Learning Disabilities day and residential/respite services, and home care. In addition any other suitable posts within the Council will also be considered.
1.6 It is very likely that suitable alternative employment will be available for most if not all staff, however in the event that individuals are unsuccessful in being placed in suitable alternative employment then the Council’s Redundancy Scheme will apply.

2. Profile of Crownfield Road Day Centre Staff

2.1.1 Age equality: Of the 21 staff of Crownfield Road Day Centre, 16 are aged 18-64 and 5 are aged 65+.

2.1.2 Disability equality: Of the 21 staff of Crownfield Road Day Centre, 5 have a disability.

2.1.3 Gender equality: 16 staff (76%) are female and 5 (24%) male.

2.1.4 Race equality:

- 5 staff (24%) are White British
- 16 staff (76%) are Black or Minority Ethnic background, made up of:
  - 2 (10%) are Black or Black British – African
  - 4 (19%) are Black or Black British – Caribbean
  - 3 (14%) are Asian or Asian British – Pakistani
  - 2 (10%) are Asian or Asian British – Bangladeshi
  - 4 (19%) are Asian or Asian British – Other
  - 1 (5%) is Other Ethnic Group

2.1.5 Religion/Beliefs: not recorded

2.1.6 Sexual Orientation: not recorded.

3. Questions this assessment addresses

3.1 What kind of equality impact could there be?

The possible key negative impacts include:

- Age impact – Crownfield Road Day Centre has an ageing workforce, with an average age of 56, and with 7 staff (33%) over retirement age, who could be disproportionately impacted if suitable redeployment opportunities could not be found.
- Disability impact – 5 staff have a disability under the DDA legislation. There is a risk of negative impact to disabled staff if their disability needs cannot be accommodated in the available redeployment opportunities,
however this is unlikely if staff’s disability needs are being accommodated in the current service.

- BME impact – there is a high number (17 staff, or 76% of the team) who are from black or minority ethnic backgrounds. There is some risk of negative impact in the event that suitable redeployment opportunities could not be found for all staff, although this is considered low risk and low impact.

The key positive impacts may include:

Moving BME, and particularly Asian staff to other services, and particularly residential care homes, where there is a shortage of Asian staff to support the increasing numbers of Asian residents, and in particular for those residents who speak little or no English and require staff fluent in Asian languages. This will apply in particular to the Rahaat staff who transferred into the Council’s employment from the voluntary sector.

3.2 How significant is it in terms of its nature and the number of people likely to be affected?

21 staff are affected by the proposals, all of whom will be subject to the Council’s redeployment procedures if the proposals are agreed. Redeployment (and any redundancy) will be managed through the Council’s HR policy and procedures, and therefore the impact will be low.

3.3 Is the impact positive or negative (or is there a potential for both)?

The impacts can be summarised as having potential for positive and negative impacts, although the potential negative impacts can be mitigated against, and there are distinct positive impacts.

3.4 On what aspects of the Equality Duties will this impact be?

All of the equalities duties will be addressed through the redeployment procedure.

3.5 Could the impact constitute unlawful discrimination?

No. Everyone will be treated equally in accordance with the Council’s HR policy and procedures.

3.6 What further information is required to gauge the probability and extent of the impact?
• Job matching exercise as soon as the decision has been made, to match staff to redeployment opportunities, and determine any potential redundancies
• Further one-to-one HR advice to individuals affected by the proposals, once the decision has been made and redeployment opportunities identified

3.7 Where and how can that information be obtained?

• The above information will be gathered and managed by HR, with senior management, staff and union involvement, after the Cabinet’s decision on the proposals.

4. Action Planning Questions

4.1 What action do we need to take to reduce negative impact?

The redeployment process will follow the Council’s Managing Change policy and procedure, and address any individual equalities impacts individually, should they arise, in consultation with HR and unions.

Equalities considerations will be monitored by senior management and HR through the redeployment process to ensure that:
- Skills matching procedures do not discriminate against staff, particularly on the grounds of ethnicity or age
- Staff with a disability have their disability requirements fairly taken into account in seeking suitable redeployment opportunities

4.2 If the action proposed will not fully mitigate adverse consequences for equality, or if the decision is to take no action, why is this, and can we justify it?

Not applicable. All equalities risks can be mitigated.

4.3 Can any further action be taken to promote equality of opportunity in relation to any of the equality strands?

No. All appropriate actions have been or will be taken.

4.4 Do we need to undertake any further consultation or research?

No. Extensive consultation including one-to-one HR surgeries has been conducted.

5. Conclusions and Next Steps
5.1 The key areas, which were improved as a result of this assessment, were:

None. All equalities considerations are addressed in the HR policy and procedures.

6. Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action required:</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Time Scale</th>
<th>Comments/Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Redeployment Process to include:</td>
<td>Saddaf Mian, Senior HR Advisor; Lolita Llamas, Service Manager</td>
<td>Week starting 16 Sep 2009</td>
<td>As far as possible, all staff to be redeployed to suitable alternative employment which takes account of any disability needs. All redeployees to have fair and equal treatment in redeployment process in accordance with HR policy &amp; procedure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

1.1 At Cabinet in November 2008, Cabinet agreed in principle that children’s health staff, employed by the National Health Service, be accepted as secondees to work in the Council under Children’s Trust arrangements, and Cabinet noted that the Children and Young People’s Board will oversee the implementation of the proposal, via the workforce development project board, as detailed in Appendix 4 to the report.

1.2 This report sets out the detail behind the proposed approach to establishing Children’s Trust Arrangements in Waltham Forest. In recognition of the progress already made towards integration (specifically in Specialist Children’s Services and Children Centres), this report seeks agreement that existing partnership arrangements be extended to form a Children’s Trust including School Nursing, Health Visiting, and Therapies staff. These arrangements will be formalised under a Section 75 Health Act agreement that will replace the existing Partnership Agreement for Specialist Children’s Services. The preferred means by which staff are designated to provision of services under this Agreement will be by way of a ‘making available’ protocol rather than as secondees as previously agreed.
2 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 For Cabinet Decision

2.1.1 Cabinet is requested to agree:

(a) the establishment of the Children's Trust under the terms to be set out in a proposed Section 75 agreement;

(b) the proposed management structure of the Children's Trust;

(c) the proposal that the post of Head of Nursing for Children's Services ONEL CS (Havering PCT) become jointly managed by ONEL CS (Havering PCT) and London Borough of Waltham Forest.

3 REASON FOR DECISION

3.1 The proposal to integrate services in Waltham Forest into a Children's Trust is premised on 2 key initiatives:

- “Every Child Matters” and the clear Government guidance for local authorities and their ‘relevant partners’ to work together to improve children’s well being, through the establishment of Children's Trusts to bring together all services for children and young people in an area, underpinned by the Children Act 2004 duty to cooperate, and to focus on improving outcomes for all children and young people. Children’s Trust Arrangements are designed to address the fragmentation of responsibility for children’s services. They are intended to build upon, bring together and formalise the joint working that is already taking place in the borough.
- The clear expectation, following the publication of ‘Commissioning a Patient Led NHS’ and more recently, the London-wide PCT Fitness for Purposes Review, is that PCTs will carry out the role of commissioning solely.

3.2 Therefore, PCTs are determining the future delivery arrangements for directly provided community health services, including those that fall within the remit of the children's trust arrangements.

3.3 A Waltham Forest PCT Board and PEC workshop was held in January 2008 to examine the options for meeting NHS London requirements whilst improving service delivery, with options assessed against criteria developed by Birmingham University Health Services Management Centre. The Board workshop gave strong support for Children’s Services to be managed in the future in a single Borough based Children's Trust under the leadership of the Children’s Directorate of the London Borough of Waltham Forest (LBWF).

3.4 In NHS Waltham Forest PCT (WF PCT), following consultation with staff side representatives and others, the preferred option and Board recommendation was that staff be employed by Outer North East London Community Services (Havering PCT) (ONEL CS (Havering PCT)), but be dedicated to LBWF to work to jointly
agreed outcomes. Following Legal Advice provided to ONEL CS (Havering PCT) and to LBWF, it is recommended that the arrangements by which ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff be dedicated to LBWF be defined through a “Making Available Protocol”.

3.5 In accordance with the WF PCT Board recommendation, the business transfer of Provider Services to ONEL CS (Havering PCT) was affected on 01/04/2009.

3.6 Given these changes, LBWF see entering joint working arrangements through a Children’s Trust as critical to ensure local Children’s Services are “anchored” within the Borough.

3.7 In recognition of the progress already made towards integration (specifically in Specialist Children’s Services and Children Centres), this report seeks agreement that existing partnership arrangements be extended to form a Children’s Trust including School Nursing, Health Visiting, and Therapies staff. These arrangements will be formalised under a Section 75 Health Act agreement that will replace the existing Partnership Agreement for Specialist Children’s Services.

4 PROPOSAL

4.1 The Statutory Guidance in “Every Child Matters” defined four component parts of a Trust. In 2008, LBWF assessed its position against these components as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Delivered by</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated governance</td>
<td>The Children and Young People Board</td>
<td>In place but not fully effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Strategy</td>
<td>the Children and Young people plan</td>
<td>In place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated processes</td>
<td>CAF and lead professional, information sharing</td>
<td>In place but opportunities to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated front-line delivery</td>
<td>Our area-based integrated services, specifically Children Centres and Specialist Children Services</td>
<td>In place but opportunities to do more in Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 In light of the above, the proposed extension of existing partnership agreements in Waltham Forest into a Children’s Trust incorporates the following key components:

- Arrangements formalised in a Section 75 Agreement, the key thrusts of which will be:
  - Enhanced Governance Arrangements;
  - Overall Direction of the Children’s Trust provided by the Executive Director of Children and Young People Service.
  - LBWF and ONEL CS (Havering PCT) will supply management staff to fill jointly managed posts in a joint management structure;
ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff will be dedicated to work alongside LBWF colleagues, as defined in a “Making Available Protocol”.

4.2.1 Governance

- Small Children and Young People Executive Group (CYPEG) of 10 -12 members to lead and direct the partnership to deliver improved outcomes for children and young people;
- Partnership network of 20 – 30 member representing all relevant interests (including adult services);
- Young people’s panel to meet 3 times a year with the chair of the executive.
- Children’s Health Clinical Improvement Group (CIG) reporting to ONEL CS (Havering PCT) responsible for Clinical Governance to provide reports to CYPEG quarterly within parameters of agreed Quality Framework.

4.2.2 Direction of the Partnership

- The Executive Director of Children and Young People Service will chair the CYPEG, with the following main responsibilities:
  - overall management of the Service
  - management of the Budget
  - make recommendation for the allocation of Partnership Resources
  - management of the delivery of the targets set by the Partners

4.2.3 Supply of staff to facilitate the Partnership, and Workforce Arrangements

- LBWF as Host Partner will dedicate the post of Executive Director Children and Young People Services posts to the Partnership;
- LBWF and ONEL CS (Havering PCT) dedicate named senior manager posts to the Partnership (see Appendices for structure chart);
- The Partners shall make staff available to the Partnership;
- Accountability for all staff will rest with the LBWF except where statute or statutory guidance requires the employing authority to retain particular responsibilities;
- Professional accountability will be to the professional heads of the partners;
- Human Resource policies and procedures will be those applicable to the employing Partner;
- ONEL CS (Havering PCT) will be responsible for recruitment and replacement of existing staff made available to LBWF, and LBWF will be responsible for recruitment of any posts that become vacant within their establishment. For senior management posts, consideration can be given to appoint on either party’s terms and conditions;
- Staff will be performance managed according to the policies and procedures of the relevant Partner.

5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

5.1 Children’s Trust Arrangements could be established in line with the models set out below.
5.2 There is no single template for Children’s Trust Arrangements. There are three main implementation models:

- Establishing a single entity through Section 75 Health Act flexibilities. The organisation would employ staff and have a commissioning and managing function. Very few authorities have chosen this route given the complexity of establishing and maintaining such formal arrangements.
- Establishing a single entity for children’s provision, using Section 75 agreements for pooling budgets. Again, with separate legislation for education, social care and health, many authorities have found these arrangements to be complex to establish.
- Formalising and extending existing partnership arrangements as Children’s Trust Arrangements.

5.3 ONEL CS (Havering PCT) and LBWF are pursuing the third option, based on extending and enhancing current partnership arrangements within a shared management structure, as described below.

6 CONSULTATION

6.1 We have consulted with management on the proposal that the post of Head of Nursing for Children’s Services ONEL CS (Havering PCT) become jointly managed by ONEL CS (Havering PCT) and London Borough of Waltham Forest, and taken views into account.

6.2 Communication with staff regarding the changes is planned.

6.3 Any changes that arise for service users as a result of entering into this Agreement will require consideration of the need for comprehensive consultation and engagement, with those service users. The main implication for LBWF staff will be the ability - and expectation - that they will work more closely with Health colleagues. Any significant changes for staff will be consulted upon in accordance with the Council’s usual procedures.

7 IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Financial

The proposal is cost neutral.

7.2 Legal

7.2.1 The establishment of Children’s Trusts are underpinned by the Children Act 2004, which establishes the duty to co-operate, to focus on improving outcomes for all children and young people.

7.2.2 The legal framework around the proposal is provided for under Section 75 of the Health Act 2006. The proposed agreement is currently being drafted by legal advisors to ONEL CS (Havering PCT). Legal Services are instructed to review and
negotiate the terms of this agreement on behalf of LBWF. External legal advice for this purpose will be obtained, if required.

7.2.3 The proposed agreement comes within Rule 7 (Exceptions to Competitive Tendering) in Part 8 of the Council’s Constitution, (Rule 7.1.2 as effective competition is prevented by statute in that only ONEL CS (Havering PCT) can be the other party to the agreement).

7.2.4 Cabinet is requested to delegate the decision to finalise and agree the terms of the Section 75 Agreement to the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People Services, in consultation with the Executive Director for the Children and Young People Services and the Director of Governance and Law.

7.3 Human Resources

7.3.1 The main Human Resources impact is on ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff who will be “Made Available” to LBWF through a “Making Available” Protocol.

7.3.2 The main implication for LBWF staff will be the ability – and expectation – that they will work more closely with Health colleagues, and be provided with the ability to do so through the terms of the Section 75 Agreement and through a Subject Specific Information Sharing Agreement (SSISA) to enable them to more readily share relevant information.

7.3.3 The current proposal is that ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff will be “made available” to LBWF, but it is anticipated that the outcome of consultation with ONEL CS (Havering PCT) and LBWF staff communication may lead to closer integration being pursued over time (which may include the Secondment of ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff).

7.4 Health Impact Assessment

More effective joint working between Health and LBWF staff should enhance Public Health.

7.5 Equality Impact Assessment (see appendix 5)

A key driver for the establishment of the Children’s is to ensure the quality of services delivered is not diluted, by “anchoring” local services in Waltham Forest for staff and for local children and young people, including those in the designated equalities groups. As such, by ensuring these services are anchored within the borough, and further integrated, it is considered that service levels will be maintained and improved, with a positive impact on all client groups.

7.6 Climate Change Assessment (see appendix 6)

The proposal relates to the further integration of services in a shared management structure. There are no plans currently to relocate staff or refurbish buildings.
As such, the Climate Change Impact is seen as minimal. We anticipate reduced travel for clients as a single assessment should replace several. Care should be taken to ensure any potential increases in staff travel are carefully managed.

8 CONCLUSION

The extension of existing Partnership Arrangements in Waltham Forest to form a Children’s Trust is seen as being a major factor to allow LBWF to meet Statutory obligations, and to ensure the best possible outcomes are achieved for Children and Young People and their families.

Background Information

This report has been cleared after discussion with the Portfolio Member

Signed Date 1 September 2009

Portfolio Member for Children & Young People
APPENDIX 1 – SCHEDULE OF AFFECTED SERVICES

For ONEL CS (Havering PCT) Waltham Forest Locality:

Health visiting, school nursing, safeguarding, specialist children’s services, and therapy services, Child Health Information

For LBWF:

*Education for communities*

Children Centres, extended services, youth support, education support, 14-19, youth offending, music service, Suntrap, and special educational needs.

*Children’s Services*

Social work services comprising first response and assessment services, looked after children services, child protection, community safeguarding and intervention, placements and resources, specialist children services.
Waltham Forest Children’s Trust

APPENDIX 2 – PROPOSED MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

CHILDRENS SERVICES: Proposed Management Structure

LBWF Executive Director Children and Young People Services

ONEL CS (Havering PCT) BOARD

LBWF Deputy Director Children Services

ONEL CS (Havering PCT) WF Div Borough Director

LBWF Head of Education for Communities

Joint Appointment

Accountability

Accountability

Joint Appointment

Group Manager Specialist Children’s Services LBWF / ONEL CS (Havering PCT)

Head of Therapies ONEL CS

Head of Nursing for Children’s Services ONEL CS (Havering PCT)

Specialist Children Services

Clinical Supervision for therapies staff

General Therapies WXHUT Children Therapies

Clinical Supervision for therapies staff

Health Visiting Teams School Nurses
## APPENDIX 3 – FUNCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN THE CHILDREN’s TRUST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Director Children and Young People Services</th>
<th>ONEL CS (havering PCT)</th>
<th>LBWF</th>
<th>Shared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall management of Service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment – Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment – ONEL CS Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment – LBWF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management – ONEL CS staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management – LBWF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Supervision</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Accountability – ONEL CS Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Accountability – LBWF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Training – ONEL CS staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Training – LBWF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes of Conduct – ONEL CS Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes of Conduct – LBWF Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Policies and Procedures – ONEL CS Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Policies and Procedures – LBWF Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Support – ONEL CS Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Support – LBWF Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms and Conditions – ONEL CS staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms and Conditions – LBWF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks associated with employment – ONEL CS staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks associated with employment – LBWF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Health Training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Training</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4 – SCHEDULED COMMUNICATIONS AND CONSULTATION

Planned and Completed Communications and Consultations are detailed below

Communications

Shared

- Children and Young People’s Executive Group - July 15th 2009
- Local Strategic Partnership - tbc
- Staff Communications - w/c 24/8/09
- Stakeholder Communications - Post go-live
- Public Communications - Post go-live

ONEL CS

- ONEL CS Directors Meeting - July 13th 2009
- ONEL CS Board - July 20th 2009
- NHS WF Contract Meeting - August 8th 2009

LBWF

- Joint EfC CF SLT - July 21st 2009
- Cabinet - September 15th 2009
Appendix 4: Consultation (ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff)

The following lays out the Consultation timeline for ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Consultation Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17th July 2009</td>
<td>Consultation Letter issued to Staff Side Chair for comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st July 2009</td>
<td><strong>formal start of 6 week consultation period</strong> Issue Consultation Letter and “Making Available” Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/c 20th July 2009 to w/e 2nd October 2009</td>
<td>6 week Consultation period (excluding August holiday period) 3 x &quot;open forums&quot; (lunchtimes, different locations) (see below for dates and locations), 1 to 1’s Any questions please send to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th September 2009</td>
<td>Partnership Meeting Union Meeting for ONEL CS (Havering PCT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th October 2009 to 12th October 2009</td>
<td>Compile and issue responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th October 2009</td>
<td>Planned Go-Live. May be deferred if further consultation required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Equalities Impact Assessment

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Policy/Service/Function</th>
<th>Waltham Forest Children’s Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Assessment</td>
<td>August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Children and young people services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Service</td>
<td>Chris Kiernan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names and Roles of the people carrying out the EIA</td>
<td>Charles Mortleman – Project Manager, Integrated Children Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is the Equality Impact Assessment being done?</td>
<td>Cabinet Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Introductions and Background

1.1 The report to Cabinet of 15th September 2009, entitled “Waltham Forest Children’s Trust”, sets out the proposed approach to establishing Children’s Trust Arrangements in Waltham Forest. In recognition of the progress already made towards integration (specifically in Specialist Children’s Services and Children Centres), the report seeks agreement that existing partnership arrangements be extended to form a Children’s Trust including School Nursing, Health Visiting, and Therapies staff. These arrangements will be formalised under a Section 75 Health Act agreement that will replace the existing Partnership Agreement for Specialist Children’s Services.

1.2 The proposals will have an impact for both Universal and Targeted Services.

1.3 Following the publication of ‘Commissioning a Patient Led NHS” and more recently, the London-wide PCT Fitness for Purposes Review, there is an expectation that PCTs will carry out the role of commissioning solely. To enable this, in NHS Waltham Forest PCT (WF PCT), PCT Provider Services staff have been transferred to be employed by Outer North East London Community Services (Havering PCT), but it is proposed that they be dedicated to LBWF to work to jointly agreed outcomes. Following Legal Advice, it is recommended that the arrangements by which ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff be dedicated to LBWF be defined through a “Making Available Protocol”, thereby forming the “Children’s Trust”.

1.4 A key driver for the establishment of the Children’s Trust, therefore, is to ensure the quality of services delivered is not diluted, by “anchoring” local services in Waltham Forest for staff and for local children and young people, including those in the designated equalities groups. As such, by ensuring these services are anchored within the borough, and further integrated, it is considered that service levels will be maintained and improved, with a positive impact on all client groups.

2. Profile of groups affected as customers and/or staff

- Age Equality
- Disability equality
Customers and staff falling in all the above groups, as well as those outside these groups, will be affected equally.

3. Questions this assessment addresses

3.1 What kind of equality impact may there be?

The purpose of the Children’s Trust is to establish a long term partnering between the Parties to anchor local services in Waltham Forest and to improve the well-being of local children and young persons through the provision of Services, which are intended to:

- ensure more effective co-ordination of Functions;
- simplify access to health, social and educational care services, which shall be provided in a seamless manner;
- maximise the flexibility of health, social and educational care services to respond to individual need;
- ensure the effective safeguarding of local children and young people;
- improve the working and integrated planning of health, social and educational care services;
- ensure gaps in health, social and educational care services provision are avoided;
- reduce duplication and bureaucracy;
- ensure public funds are used effectively and efficiently;
- respond to the Children’s Trust Agenda

These benefits will apply to groups within and outside the specified Equalities groups equally.

3.2 How significant is it in terms of its nature and the number of people likely to be affected?

A significant number of service users will be positively impacted by the changes, but the changes are considered to be equally positive for those within and outside the specified Equalities groups.

3.3 Is the impact positive or negative (or is there a potential for both)?

The impact is considered to be positive for groups within and outside the specified Equalities groups equally.

3.4 On what aspects of the Equality Duties will this impact be?

All

3.5 Could the impact constitute unlawful discrimination?
3.6 What further information is required to gauge the probability and extent of the impact?

None

3.7 Where and how can that information be obtained?

N/a

4. Action Planning Questions

4.1 What action do we need to take to reduce negative impact?

N/a

4.2 If the action proposed will not fully mitigate adverse consequences for equality, or if the decision is to take no action, why is this, and can we justify it?

N/a

4.3 Can any further action be taken to promote equality of opportunity in relation to any of the equality strands?

N/a

4.4 Do we need to undertake any further consultation or research?

N/a

5. Conclusions and Next Steps

The impact is considered to be positive for groups within and outside the specified Equalities groups equally.

6. Action Plan

n/a
## Appendix 6: Climate Change Impact Assessment

### Matrix to Assess Climate Change Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim is to reduce Carbon Emissions (CO2) by 80% by 2050</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Mitigation measure</th>
<th>Opportunity to promote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong> Water Use and Flooding</td>
<td>No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy</strong> Energy efficiency and energy saving in buildings, including opportunities for installation of renewable energy generation</td>
<td>No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air</strong> Air quality, pollution</td>
<td>No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste</strong> – reducing, reusing and recycling waste</td>
<td>No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land</strong> Use of brown-field and green-field sites</td>
<td>No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bio-diversity</strong> Effects on bio-diversity including green space, trees, rivers and streams</td>
<td>No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waltham Forest Children’s Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Slightly reduced travelling for Service Users as assessments and meetings will be shared avoiding multiple journeys.</th>
<th>Possibly slightly increased travel for staff (eg to joint Service meetings at other locations within the Borough)</th>
<th>Ensure meetings are held in locations requiring least travel and only when necessary.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to deliver service. Discouraging car use and encouraging walking, cycling and use of public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Buildings | No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage | | |
| Adaptable buildings to heat or flooding. Use of green roofs, rainwater harvesting etc. | | | |

Commentary on any differences in financial costings for climate change mitigation / adaptation measures including energy efficiency and potential external grant sources

N/a

Potential “whole life costing” savings ie: increased installation costs will achieve running cost savings over lifetime; including reduced use of resources eg: water saving devices

N/a

Explanation of Proposal chosen in context of results matrix assessment, including what mitigating steps can and have been taken

The proposal relates to the further integration of services in a shared management structure. There are no plans currently to relocate staff or refurbish buildings.

As such, the Climate Change Impact is seen as minimal. We anticipate reduced travel for clients as a single assessment should replace several. Care should be taken to ensure any potential increases in staff travel are carefully managed (as above).
SUMMARY

1.1 At Cabinet in November 2008, Cabinet agreed in principle that children’s health staff, employed by the National Health Service, be accepted as secondees to work in the Council under Children’s Trust arrangements, and Cabinet noted that the Children and Young People’s Board will oversee the implementation of the proposal, via the workforce development project board, as detailed in Appendix 4 to the report.

1.2 This report sets out the detail behind the proposed approach to establishing Children’s Trust Arrangements in Waltham Forest. In recognition of the progress already made towards integration (specifically in Specialist Children’s Services and Children Centres), this report seeks agreement that existing partnership arrangements be extended to form a Children’s Trust including School Nursing, Health Visiting, and Therapies staff. These arrangements will be formalised under a Section 75 Health Act agreement that will replace the existing Partnership Agreement for Specialist Children’s Services. The preferred means by which staff are designated to provision of services under this Agreement will be by way of a ‘making available’ protocol rather than as secondees as previously agreed.
2 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 For Cabinet Decision

2.1.1 Cabinet is requested to agree:

(a) the establishment of the Children’s Trust under the terms to be set out in a proposed Section 75 agreement;

(b) the proposed management structure of the Children’s Trust;

(c) the proposal that the post of Head of Nursing for Children’s Services ONEL CS (Havering PCT) become jointly managed by ONEL CS (Havering PCT) and London Borough of Waltham Forest.

3 REASON FOR DECISION

3.1 The proposal to integrate services in Waltham Forest into a Children’s Trust is premised on 2 key initiatives:

- “Every Child Matters” and the clear Government guidance for local authorities and their ‘relevant partners’ to work together to improve children’s well being, through the establishment of Children’s Trusts to bring together all services for children and young people in an area, underpinned by the Children Act 2004 duty to cooperate, and to focus on improving outcomes for all children and young people. Children’s Trust Arrangements are designed to address the fragmentation of responsibility for children’s services. They are intended to build upon, bring together and formalise the joint working that is already taking place in the borough.

- The clear expectation, following the publication of ‘Commissioning a Patient Led NHS” and more recently, the London-wide PCT Fitness for Purposes Review, is that PCTs will carry out the role of commissioning solely.

3.2 Therefore, PCTs are determining the future delivery arrangements for directly provided community health services, including those that fall within the remit of the children's trust arrangements.

3.3 A Waltham Forest PCT Board and PEC workshop was held in January 2008 to examine the options for meeting NHS London requirements whilst improving service delivery, with options assessed against criteria developed by Birmingham University Health Services Management Centre. The Board workshop gave strong support for Children’s Services to be managed in the future in a single Borough based Children’s Trust under the leadership of the Children’s Directorate of the London Borough of Waltham Forest (LBWF).

3.4 In NHS Waltham Forest PCT (WF PCT), following consultation with staff side representatives and others, the preferred option and Board recommendation was that staff be employed by Outer North East London Community Services (Havering PCT) (ONEL CS (Havering PCT)), but be dedicated to LBWF to work to jointly
agreed outcomes. Following Legal Advice provided to ONEL CS (Havering PCT) and to LBWF, it is recommended that the arrangements by which ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff be dedicated to LBWF be defined through a “Making Available Protocol”.

3.5 In accordance with the WF PCT Board recommendation, the business transfer of Provider Services to ONEL CS (Havering PCT) was affected on 01/04/2009.

3.6 Given these changes, LBWF see entering joint working arrangements through a Children’s Trust as critical to ensure local Children’s Services are “anchored” within the Borough.

3.7 In recognition of the progress already made towards integration (specifically in Specialist Children’s Services and Children Centres), this report seeks agreement that existing partnership arrangements be extended to form a Children’s Trust including School Nursing, Health Visiting, and Therapies staff. These arrangements will be formalised under a Section 75 Health Act agreement that will replace the existing Partnership Agreement for Specialist Children’s Services.

4 PROPOSAL

4.1 The Statutory Guidance in “Every Child Matters” defined four component parts of a Trust. In 2008, LBWF assessed its position against these components as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Delivered by</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated governance</td>
<td>The Children and Young People Board</td>
<td>In place but not fully effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Strategy</td>
<td>the Children and Young people plan</td>
<td>In place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated processes</td>
<td>CAF and lead professional, information sharing</td>
<td>In place but opportunities to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated front-line delivery</td>
<td>Our area-based integrated services, specifically Children Centres and Specialist Children Services</td>
<td>In place but opportunities to do more in Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 In light of the above, the proposed extension of existing partnership agreements in Waltham Forest into a Children’s Trust incorporates the following key components:

- Arrangements formalised in a Section 75 Agreement, the key thrusts of which will be:
  - Enhanced Governance Arrangements;
  - Overall Direction of the Children’s Trust provided by the Executive Director of Children and Young People Service.
  - LBWF and ONEL CS (Havering PCT) will supply management staff to fill jointly managed posts in a joint management structure;
ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff will be dedicated to work alongside LBWF colleagues, as defined in a "Making Available Protocol".

4.2.1 Governance

- Small Children and Young People Executive Group (CYPEG) of 10 -12 members to lead and direct the partnership to deliver improved outcomes for children and young people;
- Partnership network of 20 – 30 member representing all relevant interests (including adult services);
- Young people’s panel to meet 3 times a year with the chair of the executive.
- Children’s Health Clinical Improvement Group (CIG) reporting to ONEL CS (Havering PCT) responsible for Clinical Governance to provide reports to CYPEG quarterly within parameters of agreed Quality Framework.

4.2.2 Direction of the Partnership

- The Executive Director of Children and Young People Service will chair the CYPEG, with the following main responsibilities:
  - overall management of the Service
  - management of the Budget
  - make recommendation for the allocation of Partnership Resources
  - management of the delivery of the targets set by the Partners

4.2.3 Supply of staff to facilitate the Partnership, and Workforce Arrangements

- LBWF as Host Partner will dedicate the post of Executive Director Children and Young People Services posts to the Partnership;
- LBWF and ONEL CS (Havering PCT) dedicate named senior manager posts to the Partnership (see Appendices for structure chart);
- The Partners shall make staff available to the Partnership;
- Accountability for all staff will rest with the LBWF except where statute or statutory guidance requires the employing authority to retain particular responsibilities;
- Professional accountability will be to the professional heads of the partners;
- Human Resource policies and procedures will be those applicable to the employing Partner;
- ONEL CS (Havering PCT) will be responsible for recruitment and replacement of existing staff made available to LBWF, and LBWF will be responsible for recruitment of any posts that become vacant within their establishment. For senior management posts, consideration can be given to appoint on either party’s terms and conditions;
- Staff will be performance managed according to the policies and procedures of the relevant Partner.

5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

5.1 Children’s Trust Arrangements could be established in line with the models set out below.
5.2 There is no single template for Children’s Trust Arrangements. There are three main implementation models:
- Establishing a single entity through Section 75 Health Act flexibilities. The organisation would employ staff and have a commissioning and managing function. Very few authorities have chosen this route given the complexity of establishing and maintaining such formal arrangements.
- Establishing a single entity for children’s provision, using Section 75 agreements for pooling budgets. Again, with separate legislation for education, social care and health, many authorities have found these arrangements to be complex to establish.
- Formalising and extending existing partnership arrangements as Children’s Trust Arrangements.

5.3 ONEL CS (Havering PCT) and LBWF are pursuing the third option, based on extending and enhancing current partnership arrangements within a shared management structure, as described below.

6 CONSULTATION

6.1 We have consulted with management on the proposal that the post of Head of Nursing for Children’s Services ONEL CS (Havering PCT) become jointly managed by ONEL CS (Havering PCT) and London Borough of Waltham Forest, and taken views into account.

6.2 Communication with staff regarding the changes is planned.

6.3 Any changes that arise for service users as a result of entering into this Agreement will require consideration of the need for comprehensive consultation and engagement, with those service users. The main implication for LBWF staff will be the ability - and expectation - that they will work more closely with Health colleagues. Any significant changes for staff will be consulted upon in accordance with the Council’s usual procedures.

7 IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Financial

The proposal is cost neutral?? Is this the full FI???

7.2 Legal

7.2.1 The establishment of Children’s Trusts are underpinned by the Children Act 2004, which establishes the duty to co-operate, to focus on improving outcomes for all children and young people.

7.2.2 The legal framework around the proposal is provided for under Section 75 of the Health Act 2006. The proposed agreement is currently being drafted by legal advisors to ONEL CS (Havering PCT). Legal Services are instructed to review and
negotiate the terms of this agreement on behalf of LBWF. External legal advice for this purpose will be obtained, if required.

7.2.3 The proposed agreement comes within Rule 7 (Exceptions to Competitive Tendering) in Part 8 of the Council’s Constitution, (Rule 7.1.2 as effective competition is prevented by statute in that only ONEL CS (Havering PCT) can be the other party to the agreement).

7.2.4 Cabinet is requested to delegate the decision to finalise and agree the terms of the Section 75 Agreement to the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People Services, in consultation with the Executive Director for the Children and Young People Services and the Director of Governance and Law.

7.3 Human Resources

7.3.1 The main Human Resources impact is on ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff who will be “Made Available” to LBWF through a “Making Available” Protocol.

7.3.2 The main implication for LBWF staff will be the ability – and expectation – that they will work more closely with Health colleagues, and be provided with the ability to do so through the terms of the Section 75 Agreement and through a Subject Specific Information Sharing Agreement (SSISA) to enable them to more readily share relevant information.

7.3.3 The current proposal is that ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff will be “made available” to LBWF, but it is anticipated that the outcome of consultation with ONEL CS (Havering PCT) and LBWF staff communication may lead to closer integration being pursued over time (which may include the Secondment of ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff).

7.4 Health Impact Assessment

More effective joint working between Health and LBWF staff should enhance Public Health.

7.5 Equality Impact Assessment (see appendix 5)

A key driver for the establishment of the Children’s is to ensure the quality of services delivered is not diluted, by “anchoring” local services in Waltham Forest for staff and for local children and young people, including those in the designated equalities groups. As such, by ensuring these services are anchored within the borough, and further integrated, it is considered that service levels will be maintained and improved, with a positive impact on all client groups.

7.6 Climate Change Assessment (see appendix 6)

The proposal relates to the further integration of services in a shared management structure. There are no plans currently to relocate staff or refurbish buildings.
As such, the Climate Change Impact is seen as minimal. We anticipate reduced travel for clients as a single assessment should replace several. Care should be taken to ensure any potential increases in staff travel are carefully managed.

8 CONCLUSION

The extension of existing Partnership Arrangements in Waltham Forest to form a Children’s Trust is seen as being a major factor to allow LBWF to meet Statutory obligations, and to ensure the best possible outcomes are achieved for Children and Young People and their families.

Background Information

This report has been cleared after discussion with the Portfolio Member

Signed .............................................. Date ...........................................

Portfolio Member for ..............................................
APPENDIX 1 – SCHEDULE OF AFFECTED SERVICES

For ONEL CS (Havering PCT) Waltham Forest Locality:

Health visiting, school nursing, safeguarding, specialist children’s services, and therapy services, Child Health Information

For LBWF:

*Education for communities*

Children Centres, extended services, youth support, education support, 14-19, youth offending, music service, Suntrap, and special educational needs.

*Children’s Services*

Social work services comprising first response and assessment services, looked after children services, child protection, community safeguarding and intervention, placements and resources, specialist children services.
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APPENDIX 2 – PROPOSED MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

ONEL CS (Havering PCT) WF Div

Head of Therapies ONEL CS

Specialist Children’s Services LBWF, ONEL CS (Havering PCT)

Group Manager Specialist Children’s Services LBWF, ONEL CS (Havering PCT)

LBWF Deputy Director Children Services

ACCOUNTABILITY

Joint Appointment

ONEL CS (Havering PCT) WF Div Board Director

LBWF Executive Director Children and Young People Services

ACCOUNTABILITY

Joint Appointment

CHILDRENS SERVICES:
Proposed Management Structure

LBWF Head of Education for Communities

Head of Nursing for Children’s Services ONEL CS (Havering PCT)

Health Visiting Teams

School Nurses

Clinical Supervision for Therapies Staff

Clinical Supervision for Therapies Staff

General Therapies WXHUT

Health Visiting Teams

School Nurses
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APPENDIX 3 – FUNCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN THE CHILDREN’s TRUST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive Director Children and Young People Services</th>
<th>ONEL CS (havering PCT)</th>
<th>LBWF</th>
<th>Shared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall management of Service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment – Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment – ONEL CS Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment – LBWF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management – ONEL CS staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management – LBWF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Accountability – ONEL CS Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Accountability – LBWF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Training – ONEL CS staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Training – LBWF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes of Conduct – ONEL CS Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes of Conduct – LBWF Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Policies and Procedures – ONEL CS Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Policies and Procedures – LBWF Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Support – ONEL CS Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Support – LBWF Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms and Conditions – ONEL CS staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms and Conditions – LBWF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks associated with employment – ONEL CS staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks associated with employment – LBWF staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Health Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tbc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4 – SCHEDULED COMMUNICATIONS AND CONSULTATION

Planned and Completed Communications and Consultations are detailed below

Communications

Shared

- Children and Young People’s Executive Group - July 15th 2009
- Local Strategic Partnership - tbc
- Staff Communications - w/c 24/8/09
- Stakeholder Communications - Post go-live
- Public Communications - Post go-live

ONEL CS

- ONEL CS Directors Meeting - July 13th 2009
- ONEL CS Board - July 20th 2009
- NHS WF Contract Meeting - August 8th 2009

LBWF

- Joint EfC CF SLT - July 21st 2009
- Cabinet - September 15th 2009
Appendix 4: Consultation (ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff)

The following lays out the Consultation timeline for ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Consultation Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17th July 2009</td>
<td>Consultation Letter issued to Staff Side Chair for comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st July 2009</td>
<td><strong>formal start of 6 week consultation period</strong> Issue Consultation Letter and “Making Available” Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/c 20th July 2009 to w/e 2nd October 2009</td>
<td>6 week Consultation period (excluding August holiday period) 3 x &quot;open forums&quot; (lunchtimes, different locations) (see below for dates and locations), 1 to 1’s  Any questions please send to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th September 2009</td>
<td>Partnership Meeting Union Meeting for ONEL CS (Havering PCT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th October 2009 to 12th October 2009</td>
<td>Compile and issue responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th October 2009</td>
<td>Planned Go-Live. May be deferred if further consultation required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 5: Equalities Impact Assessment

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Policy/Service/Function</th>
<th>Waltham Forest Children’s Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Assessment</td>
<td>August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Children and young people services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Service</td>
<td>Chris Kiernan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names and Roles of the people carrying out the EIA</td>
<td>Charles Mortleman – Project Manager, Integrated Children Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is the Equality Impact Assessment being done?</td>
<td>Cabinet Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Introduction and Background

1.1 The report to Cabinet of 15th September 2009, entitled “Waltham Forest Children’s Trust”, sets out the proposed approach to establishing Children’s Trust Arrangements in Waltham Forest. In recognition of the progress already made towards integration (specifically in Specialist Children’s Services and Children Centres), the report seeks agreement that existing partnership arrangements be extended to form a Children’s Trust including School Nursing, Health Visiting, and Therapies staff. These arrangements will be formalised under a Section 75 Health Act agreement that will replace the existing Partnership Agreement for Specialist Children’s Services.

1.2 The proposals will have an impact for both Universal and Targeted Services.

1.3 Following the publication of ‘Commissioning a Patient Led NHS’ and more recently, the London-wide PCT Fitness for Purposes Review, there is an expectation that PCTs will carry out the role of commissioning solely. To enable this, in NHS Waltham Forest PCT (WF PCT), PCT Provider Services staff have been transferred to be employed by Outer North East London Community Services (Havering PCT), but it is proposed that they be dedicated to LBWF to work to jointly agreed outcomes. Following Legal Advice, it is recommended that the arrangements by which ONEL CS (Havering PCT) staff be dedicated to LBWF be defined through a “Making Available Protocol”, thereby forming the “Children’s Trust”.

1.4 A key driver for the establishment of the Children’s Trust, therefore, is to ensure the quality of services delivered is not diluted, by “anchoring” local services in Waltham Forest for staff and for local children and young people, including those in the designated equalities groups. As such, by ensuring these services are anchored within the borough, and further integrated, it is considered that service levels will be maintained and improved, with a positive impact on all client groups.

2. Profile of groups affected as customers and/or staff

- Age Equality
- Disability equality
3. Questions this assessment addresses

3.1 What kind of equality impact may there be?

The purpose of the Children’s Trust is to establish a long term partnering between the Parties to anchor local services in Waltham Forest and to improve the well-being of local children and young persons through the provision of Services, which are intended to:

- ensure more effective co-ordination of Functions;
- simplify access to health, social and educational care services, which shall be provided in a seamless manner;
- maximise the flexibility of health, social and educational care services to respond to individual need;
- ensure the effective safeguarding of local children and young people;
- improve the working and integrated planning of health, social and educational care services;
- ensure gaps in health, social and educational care services provision are avoided;
- reduce duplication and bureaucracy;
- ensure public funds are used effectively and efficiently;
- respond to the Children’s Trust Agenda

These benefits will apply to groups within and outside the specified Equalities groups equally.

3.2 How significant is it in terms of its nature and the number of people likely to be affected?

A significant number of service users will be positively impacted by the changes, but the changes are considered to be equally positive for those within and outside the specified Equalities groups.

3.3 Is the impact positive or negative (or is there a potential for both)?

The impact is considered to be positive for groups within and outside the specified Equalities groups equally.

3.4 On what aspects of the Equality Duties will this impact be?

All

3.5 Could the impact constitute unlawful discrimination?
No

3.6 What further information is required to gauge the probability and extent of the impact?

None

3.7 Where and how can that information be obtained?

N/a

4. Action Planning Questions

4.1 What action do we need to take to reduce negative impact?

N/a

4.2 If the action proposed will not fully mitigate adverse consequences for equality, or if the decision is to take no action, why is this, and can we justify it?

N/a

4.3 Can any further action be taken to promote equality of opportunity in relation to any of the equality strands?

N/a

4.4 Do we need to undertake any further consultation or research?

N/a

5. Conclusions and Next Steps

The impact is considered to be positive for groups within and outside the specified Equalities groups equally.

6. Action Plan

n/a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Time Scale</th>
<th>Comments/Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 6: Climate Change Impact Assessment

### Matrix to Assess Climate Change Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim is to reduce Carbon Emissions (CO2) by 80% by 2050</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Mitigation measure</th>
<th>Opportunity to promote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Use and Flooding</td>
<td>No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency and energy saving in buildings, including opportunities for installation of renewable energy generation</td>
<td>No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality, pollution</td>
<td>No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste</strong> – reducing, reusing and recycling waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of brown-field and green-field sites</td>
<td>No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bio-diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on bio-diversity including green space, trees, rivers and streams</td>
<td>No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td>Slightly reduced travelling for Service Users as assessments and meetings will be shared avoiding multiple journeys.</td>
<td>Possibly slightly increased travel for staff (e.g. to joint Service meetings at other locations within the Borough)</td>
<td>Ensure meetings are held in locations requiring least travel and only when necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to deliver service. Discouraging car use and encouraging walking, cycling and use of public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Buildings</strong></th>
<th>No impact – staff numbers remain constant and no change in locations / buildings usage</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability of buildings to heat or flooding. Use of green roofs, rainwater harvesting etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary on any differences in financial costings for climate change mitigation / adaptation measures including energy efficiency and potential external grant sources**

N/a

**Potential “whole life costing” savings ie: increased installation costs will achieve running cost savings over lifetime; including reduced use of resources eg: water saving devices**

N/a

**Explanation of Proposal chosen in context of results matrix assessment, including what mitigating steps can and have been taken**

The proposal relates to the further integration of services in a shared management structure. There are no plans currently to relocate staff or refurbish buildings.

As such, the Climate Change Impact is seen as minimal. We anticipate reduced travel for clients as a single assessment should replace several. Care should be taken to ensure any potential increases in staff travel are carefully managed (as above).
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The North London Waste Plan is a joint waste development plan document being drawn up by Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest (the seven boroughs). The Issues and Options stage was consulted on in early 2008 and the preferred options report is now ready for ratification by each borough before going to public consultation in October. The preferred options report sets out a preferred approach on site allocation and establishes a policy and monitoring framework for the Plan. The Mayor has allocated to each borough an amount of waste, known as the apportionment, for which boroughs have to make site provision. The preferred approach is to meet the apportionment by safeguarding and where appropriate intensifying existing waste management sites, by re-orientating existing transfer stations into waste
management sites and by identifying a small number of additional sites that may be used if the existing sites prove unsuitable.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

2.1. **For Cabinet Decision**

2.1.1. Cabinet is requested to;

(a) Agree the preferred option report of the North London Waste Plan for the purpose of consultation

(b) Authorise the Assistant Director of Development in conjunction with Cabinet Member for Investment and Enterprise to agree any consequent changes to the North London Waste Plan and Memorandum of Understanding; and

(c) Agree the supplemental Memorandum of Understanding.

3. **REASON FOR DECISION**

3.1. Approving the Preferred Options Report will signify Council’s endorsement of its current content and will allow Waltham Forest and the other North London Waste Plan Boroughs to proceed with the subsequent public consultation phase, which is planned to commence in October 2009.

3.2. Cabinet’s approval in this regard is significant. After consultation on the preferred options, this report will be amended, with the aim of eventual adoption as a joint Development Plan Document (DPD). This DPD is important for Waltham Forest as it will provide the strategic planning framework to manage North London’s waste up until 2021.

3.3. Approving the supplemental Memorandum of Understanding will give protection to all boroughs so they are able to control costs as well as to the lead borough of Camden so that it can enter into additional contracts and expect to be paid back by the other boroughs.

4. **PROPOSAL**

4.1. **What is the North London Waste Plan?**

The London Boroughs of Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest (the seven boroughs) are co-operating as planning authorities in drawing up the North London Waste Plan. This is a joint waste development plan document (DPD) which when adopted will form part of each borough’s Local Development Framework. The North London Waste Plan like other DPDs needs to be in conformity with
relevant national planning policy, the London Plan, borough’s sustainable community strategies and the borough’s Core Strategy.

4.2 Progress to date

4.2.1 In November 2007 Cabinet approved the first stage of the North London Waste Plan for consultation (The North London Waste Plan Issues and Options Report). In January - March 2008 there was public consultation across the seven boroughs on the issues and options report. There was publicity on the Plan and a public workshop was held in each borough as well as a number of follow up meetings. The consultation responses have fed into the preparation of the preferred options report and a report on the consultation responses is available on the North London Waste Plan website.

4.3 Preferred Options Report

4.3.1 The preferred options report of the North London Waste Plan has three main aspects. Firstly it sets out how much land for waste the Plan must make provision for. Secondly it identifies the sites where waste facilities could be sited. Thirdly it sets out a policy and monitoring framework to enable land use decisions relating to waste to be made by Waltham Forest.

4.3.2 The preferred options report provides a sequential policy approach for development of waste facilities in North London. First developers must consider the existing waste management sites (schedule A of the preferred options report, attached at Appendix B) for redevelopment or possible intensification.

4.3.2 If these are not suitable, developers should consider the re-orientation of existing transfer station sites (schedule B of the preferred options report, attached at Appendix B) into waste management facilities.

4.3.3 If both of these are unsuitable developers can turn to potential new waste sites (schedule C of the preferred options report, attached at Appendix B). Only in exceptional circumstances can non-allocated sites be put forward for waste development.

4.3.4 The preferred options for new waste facilities are shown in the below table (as identified in Schedule C of the Preferred Options Report which is attached to this Cabinet Report at Appendix B). These sites were chosen as the highest scoring sites following scoring against
agreed criteria. They represent the most suitable sites for waste management use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>Site on Edgware Rd and Geron Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Martinbridge IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>Friern Barnet STW (Pinkham Way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>WF</td>
<td>Rigg Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>Victory Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>Network Rail land at Aerodrome Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Makanji House, Kynoch Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Building premises, Kynoch Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Nobel Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>Marsh Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.5 These ten additional sites total 25.65 hectares. The land area in Schedule C is sufficient to meet North London’s waste needs (as apportioned by the London Plan), the site requirements of the North London Waste Authority and provide some flexibility in terms of site availability.

4.3.6 For further information on how land requirements were calculated or how sites were identified, please refer to the summary document at Appendix A, or the full Preferred Options Report at Appendix B.

4.4 Implications for Waltham Forest

4.4.1 It should be borne in mind that although the current image of waste facilities is often negative, modern waste facilities have the potential to be designed to high environmental standards and can generate significant numbers of jobs.

4.4.2 Waltham Forest has sites identified in Schedules A, B and C. In Schedule A (existing waste management sites) we have three sites identified, in Schedule B (existing waste transfer sites) we have three sites identified, and in Schedule C (opportunity sites) we have one large site identified as a preferred option – Rigg Approach. Please refer to Appendix A for maps of each site.

4.4.3 Rigg Approach is currently designated as strategic employment land and houses a number of industrial operators. Initial viability assessment undertaken as part of the preparation of the preferred options report has identified some operators may be interested in operating waste facilities on their site in the future.
4.4.4 It is anticipated that development proposals for this site would most likely involve a modern, high tech waste facility that is self contained and green. Such facilities provide key opportunities for sustainable jobs within the Borough.

4.4.5 Rigg Approach is located within an existing industrial estate, where a waste facility would have the potential to integrate well with surrounding uses. Any impacts that may result from a waste facility in this location would be required to be mitigated. This would ensure there are no negative effects on surrounding businesses or people.

4.4.6 Consultation of this site as a preferred option will help Waltham Forest clarify the community’s opinion about whether this would be an appropriate waste facility. If following consultation it is identified that this site would be unlikely to come forward for waste use, there is the potential it will be removed from the plan. If it is identified as an acceptable site, it will be included in the Plan submitted to a Government Inspector for approval. If subsequently approved following public enquiry, development of this site as a waste facility will still be subject to the sequential tests of the plan.

4.5 Relationship to Local Development Framework (LDF)

4.5.1 If approved, the North London Waste Plan will become a Development Plan Document (DPD) within the LDF. The LDF Core Strategy, which is currently moving towards Preferred Options consultation, will also address waste management from a higher strategic level.

4.5.2 The policy within the Core Strategy will provide a broad strategic direction for waste management in the borough, requiring development to incorporate the principles of “reduce, reuse, recycle” in design and construction as well as make a commitment to carrying forward the North London Waste Plan. The Core Strategy will not allocate land for waste management but will instead refer to the North London Waste Plan.

4.5.3 The North London Waste Plan will therefore play an important role in ensuring Waltham Forest and the other North London boroughs have sufficient land to meet their waste management requirements through to 2021.
5. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

5.1. The plan itself considers a number of alternatives for allocation of new waste management sites and has identified 10 sites as preferred options. These sites were tested against robust criteria that identified them as the best options when considered against other alternatives.

5.2. Each of the seven boroughs is presenting the Plan to their respective Cabinets in September 2009. A synchronised approach in obtaining the approval of the relevant Cabinets is therefore needed in order to meet the set project timelines. Further, the failure to obtain the approval of any one of the boroughs of this stage of the Plan would jeopardise the existing Memorandum of Understanding in place and could also adversely impact upon the strategic objectives of the North London Joint Waste Strategy and the North London Waste Authority in guiding the management of North London’s waste up to 2021.

6. CONSULTATION

6.1. In November 2007 Cabinet approved the first stage of the Plan for consultation (The North London Waste Plan Issues and Options Report). Consultations have been carried out in accordance with the commitments made in the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement. In January - March 2008 there was public consultation across the seven boroughs on the issues and options report. There was publicity on the Plan and a public workshop was held in each borough as well as a number of follow up meetings. The consultation responses have fed into the work drawing up the preferred options report and a report on the consultation responses is available on the North London Waste Plan website.

6.2 The next round of consultation on the preferred options, scheduled for October – November 2009 will involve:

- public consultation sessions in each of the seven boroughs, advertised in local newspapers
- follow-up meetings with various community groups and local organisations. These can be requested by any such group and the opportunity advertised to all groups and individuals on our mailing lists and via the publicity produced
- interactive questionnaire on the project website
- copies of the report made available in council offices and libraries.
6.3 **Next stages**

6.3.1 After the preferred option consultation, work will then begin on preparing the plan for submission. The submission will need to be ratified by boroughs in September 2010. In November 2010, there will be a six week period for people to make representations on the submission version of the plan. It is intended to formally submit the plan to government in March 2011 and this starts the process leading up to an examination scheduled for June 2011. The Inspector's report is expected in September 2011 and the plan can then be adopted by councils by the end of December 2011.

7. **IMPLICATIONS**

7.1. **Financial**

7.1.1 The seven boroughs have signed up to a Memorandum of Understanding on the North London Waste Plan which included provision to sharing on an equal basis the cost of preparing the plan. Camden is the lead borough for the contract and employs the full time programme manager. Costs are payable for work by the consultants, to employ the programme manager, for publicity work and for the examination in public of the plan. Total project cost between January 2007 and April 2012 is estimated at £1.21m. Each borough is responsible for one seventh of the costs, equivalent to £173,047 per borough. Costs per borough in 2009/10 are projected at £32,998. Costs are projected to rise in 2010/11 to over £40,000 per borough because the cost of the examination falls largely within that financial year. Costs for the NLWP are comparable with other joint waste plans being carried out across England.

7.1.2 The Local Development Framework (LDF) budget has been enhanced this year by an additional £33k of corporate funding that will be used specifically to support the expected costs in 2009/10. It will be necessary to put in a growth bid to support the LDF programme in subsequent years.

7.1.3 The NLWP Programme Manager makes budget monitoring reports to the Planning Officers Group every three months highlighting any variations in expenditure. The revised budget is effectively capped and no additional funds can be spent without borough agreement.
7.2. Legal


7.2.2 Part 6 of the 2004 Regulations sets out details on preparing DPD’s, prescribed information that should accompany the DPD, details of who should be consulted, the manner of public participation and the process for the adoption of the DPD.

7.2.3 Under the Provisions of Section 1 of the Local Authorities (Goods and Services) Act 1970 all the boroughs have agreed a Memorandum of Understanding about how they will co-operate and provide services and payment to each other on the North London Waste Plan. In Waltham Forest this was agreed by Council on 27 February 2007. There is a need for a supplemental Memorandum of Understanding to clarify the mechanism for agreeing additional items of expenditure. This is to give protection to all boroughs that they can control costs and to the lead borough so that it can enter into additional contracts and expect to be paid back by the other boroughs.

7.2.4 The supplemental Memorandum of Agreement was agreed by boroughs in June 2008. There was an amendment to it agreed by the boroughs in July 2009. The background is this: the supplemental MoU was drafted by a lawyer at Camden. Following discussions at Planning Officers Group, Heads of Planning and Planning Members Group, the supplemental Memorandum of Agreement was sent round to boroughs for comments from their legal teams on 14 May 2008. Boroughs agreed that they would progress the supplemental MoU through their councils at the same time as the preferred options report for the Plan. Due to a number of factors this has been delayed and it is only now that a preferred option report is ready to go to councils for ratification. In July 2009 approval was received from Planning Officers Group, Heads of Planning and Planning Members Group for a small change to the approval mechanism for agreeing additional expenditure. This replaced "Heads of Planning and Planning Members Group" as the groups to approve additional expenditure with "Heads of Planning in
conjunction with their Planning Members Group representative.

7.3. **Human Resources**

7.3.1 There are no significant implications for the Council’s Human Resource policy resulting from the approval of this decision.

7.4. **Health Impact Assessment**

7.4.1. There are no significant implications on health impacts resulting from the approval of this decision. However, the emphasis on reorienting existing waste transfer sites to more efficient and better designed waste management facilities will likely lead to indirect positive health impacts through reduced odours and noise and an overall improvement in visual amenity in areas adjoining new waste facilities.

7.5 **Equality Impact Assessment**

7.5.1 Two equality impact assessments have taken place on the plan to date. In each case any identified negative impacts were taken on board and the plan was amended to ensure it was as inclusive as possible and promoted social benefits where possible.

7.5.2 In both equality impact assessments the following target groups were identified: women; black and ethnic minority people; young people and children; older people; disabled people; lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgendered; and different faith groups.

7.5.3 There was a screening assessment of the Equalities Impact Assessment of the Issues and Options Report of the North London Waste Plan. The results showed that the majority of issues and options contained within the Waste Plan would have indiscriminate mixed impacts upon all target groups and would not lead to an adverse discriminatory impact upon specific target groups. Only one high level negative impact was identified in association with one issue and option. This is in relation to sustainable transport and may potentially result in a discriminating adverse impact upon Black and Minority Ethnic groups, older people and certain faith groups. This option was not taken forward as the preferred option for this issue, and so a stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment was not required.
7.5.4 There was a further screening assessment of the Equalities Impact Assessment of the proposed policies in the preferred options report (please see full report attached at Appendix C). The results show that the majority of the proposed policies for the North London Waste Plan will have indiscriminate mixed impacts upon all target groups and will not lead to an adverse discriminatory impact upon specific target groups. Recommendations were made for modifications to the proposed policies to remove the effects of low negative impacts and offer general enhancement of the policies and these have been taken on board as the policies have been revised during the process.

7.5.5 The preferred options report also considered the potential negative impacts arising from the use of waste facilities such as traffic, air quality and noise. The ability to prevent and or mitigate these impacts was factored into the selection criteria used to identify new sites. That is if the use of a site was likely have a negative impact which could not be mitigated through design, then the site was removed from the list.

7.5.6 In support of this, the North London Waste Plan policies require waste management facilities to identify negative impacts at the time of application and propose how they will be mitigated. This will then be considered by Development Management when deciding an application.

7.5.7 At the issues and options consultation, boroughs assisted in identifying groups representing key parts of the community. An offer was made to visit local groups and as a result a number of targeted meetings were held in addition to the public workshops.

7.5.8 The preferred options consultation is an additional opportunity to engage with the community and promote equality. The process will be designed to be as inclusive as possible. Moreover it is intended to repeat the offer to visit local groups and hold further targeted meetings during the preferred options consultation.

7.6 Climate Change Impact Assessment

7.6.1 The overarching principle of the North London Waste Plan (NLWP) is to manage the waste of North London in a sustainable way. A sustainability appraisal has been made a key component of the preferred options report and has informed the report as it has developed. This involved testing the Plan against an agreed set of
economic, social and environmental criteria throughout the preparation process.

7.6.2. In line with this objective, the Preferred Options policies of the NLWP require development to consider how it will mitigate any negative impacts that may arise from a new waste facility on that site; for example noise, dust, litter, odours and other emissions. Additionally applications for waste facilities will need to provide a sustainable design and construction statement that details how the development proposes to combat climate change and promote energy and resource efficiency; for example the incorporation of green roofs, energy efficiency and/or water efficiency measures. The delivery of these policies will occur through the development application process. During this process the NLWP policies as well as policies from the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF), will be applied to development proposals and considered when deciding an application.

7.6.3. Additionally all waste facilities that are capable of directly producing energy or a fuel must demonstrate how they can facilitate a decentralised energy system on the site, unless this is shown to be unviable.

7.6.4. A key positive impact the NLWP will have on climate change is in relation to the sustainable management of waste. In particular this plan will promote policies that encourage the culture of “reduce, reuse, recycle” and ultimately will seek to minimise use of landfill. These policies will also be reinforced and supported through the Core Strategy which forms part of the LDF.

7.7 Habitats Assessment

7.7.1 A Habitats Directive Assessment screening exercise has been undertaken on the emerging policies in the North London Waste Plan. Epping Forest Special Area for Conservation and Lee Valley Special Protection Area were considered to be particularly vulnerable to potential adverse impacts as a result of some of the policies contained within the Plan. Recommendations were made on the re-writing of these policies and these have been taken on board in the development of the policies.

7.7.2 A stage 2 assessment under the Habitats Directive of the waste sites identified in the plan is being carried out.
8. CONCLUSION

8.1 The report seeks Cabinet to approve the attached North London Waste Plan preferred option report for consultation and to authorise the Director of Environment in conjunction with Lead Member for Environment to agree any consequent changes. Additionally, this report requests Cabinet to agree the supplemental Memorandum of Understanding. Cabinet’s approval of the Report will facilitate progress to be made towards the adoption of a waste management DPD that will provide the policy framework to sustainably manage North London’s waste up until 2021.

Approval by the Chief Officer (required for posting on the Bulletin Board)

This draft report is cleared for publication on the Cabinet Bulletin Board.

Subject to:
(a) Any comments of Portfolio-holders via the Bulletin Board;
(b) Clearance by the relevant Portfolio-holder prior to inclusion on the Cabinet agenda; and
(c) My comments as set out below (e.g. identifying data not yet available);
I consider the report suitable for the Cabinet agenda.

Comments: None

Signed: Date: 21 August 2009

Executive Director of Environment and Regeneration

Approval by the Portfolio-Holder (before inclusion on the Cabinet agenda)

I have cleared this report for inclusion on the Cabinet agenda.

Signed: Date: 27 August 2009

Portfolio Member for Enterprise and Investment
Appendix A – Summary of North London Waste Plan Preferred Options and Maps of Waltham Forest Sites

Background

Policy Context
The Mayor in the London Plan has set a target for London to become 85% self-sufficient in the management of waste by 2020. The London Plan allocates to each borough an apportionment of waste that it needs to make site provision for. If all boroughs meet their apportionment the 85% self-sufficiency target will be achieved. The seven North London Boroughs have decided to aggregate their apportionment and find site solutions over the seven boroughs. The apportionment covers municipal solid waste and commercial and industrial waste. The North London Waste Plan also needs to consider provision for construction, demolitions and excavation waste and hazardous waste.

The North London Waste Plan needs to identify sufficient land for facilities to deal with the apportionment of waste to the boroughs and to establish a planning policy framework for the consideration of waste related planning applications.

Progress to date
Work on the North London Waste Plan commenced in 2007. Consultants Mouchel are employed to carry out the main planning work and CAG Consultants have responsibility for the consultation work. The programme manager supervises and co-ordinates Plan activity. A Planning Officer Group from across the seven boroughs meets on a regular basis to progress the work. At key stages of the plan process the Heads of Planning from each borough meet as does a Planning Members Group, composed of cabinet members with responsibility for planning.

In November 2007 Cabinet approved the first stage of the Plan for consultation (The North London Waste Plan Issues and Options Report). In January - March 2008 there was public consultation across the seven boroughs on the issues and options report. There was publicity on the Plan and a public workshop was held in each borough as well as a number of follow up meetings. The consultation responses have fed into the work drawing up the preferred options report and a report on the consultation responses is available on the North London Waste Plan website.

Relationship to the North London Waste Authority and North London Joint Waste Strategy
The North London Waste Authority is responsible for the processing, treatment and disposal of municipal wastes from the seven boroughs. The seven boroughs together with the North London Waste Authority have drawn up the North London Joint Waste Strategy. The Joint Waste Strategy was updated in June 2008 to include a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Strategy and the updated Strategy was also subject to public consultation.
The Strategy will also form the basis for the new services and facilities required by the North London Waste Authority. The Authority currently has contracts in place to manage a number of major waste facilities across North London, however, these contracts are due to end in 2014 and the North London Waste Authority is in the process of developing new contracts, which will include new facilities, to manage and dispose of its waste from 2014 and beyond. Contract award for this is expected to take place in 2010. The Authority has recently published its outline business case which the North London Waste Plan has to take into account.

The adopted Joint Waste Strategy is separate from the North London Waste Plan and serves a different purpose. The Joint Waste Strategy spells out a vision and actions to guide the future management of the waste specifically collected by the seven boroughs. The Strategy is being prepared by the boroughs in their roles as collection & disposal authorities whereas the Waste Plan is being prepared in their role as planning authorities. The Waste Plan has to consider all types of waste (municipal, commercial and industrial, construction, demolition and excavation and hazardous) whereas the Joint Waste Strategy only deals with municipal waste. The Waste Plan has to balance the needs for waste facilities with other needs and aspirations in North London.

The Waste Plan has to take into account the future requirements of the North London Waste Authority and at key stages there has been close collaboration between the Waste Plan and the Authority as a major stakeholder in the process. The developer of any new or expanded waste facility will have to apply for planning permission from the relevant borough and the application will be assessed in the light of that borough’s planning documents and the North London Waste Plan.

**Preferred options report**

**Summary of report**

The preferred options report of the North London Waste Plan has three main aspects. Firstly it sets out how much land for waste the Plan must make provision for. Secondly its selects a number of sites where waste facilities could be sited and thirdly it sets out a policy and monitoring framework to enable land use decisions to be made.

The overall approach of the preferred options report can therefore be summarised as

1. Safeguarding and where appropriate intensification of existing waste management sites (as identified in Schedule A of the Preferred Options Report, attached at Appendix B). Waltham Forest has three existing waste management sites within the borough.

2. The re-orientation of existing waste transfer stations when no longer required, into waste management facilities (as identified in Schedule B of the Preferred Options Report, attached at Appendix B). Waltham Forest has three existing waste transfer sites within the borough.
3. Identification of ten additional sites to enable the boroughs to meet the Mayor’s apportionment, the meet the needs of the North London Waste Authority and to allow for a level of flexibility (as identified in Schedule C of the Preferred Options Report, attached at Appendix B)

**Amount of land for waste**

The Waste Plan is required to help meet the Mayor’s target for London to become 85% self-sufficient in the management of waste by 2020. This means London will be largely dealing with its own waste instead of sending it to landfill in the counties around London. To ensure that London achieves self-sufficiency, each borough has been asked to identify sites deal with a proportion of London’s total waste that has been allocated to each borough in what is known as the apportionment. The seven boroughs are pooling their apportionments.

To meet the apportionment the North London boroughs need to identify land sufficient to deal with nearly 2.4 million tonnes per annum by 2021. The existing waste management facilities, assuming they operate at 75% of their licensed capacity, deal with nearly 1.4 million tonnes per annum. We need to find land sufficient to deal with this gap of 1 million tonnes per annum. Using information in the London Plan to convert this tonnage into land, the land requirement is between 25.4 to 28.4 hectares.

There are 24 waste transfer stations in North London. If facilities that are less than 0.25 hectares in size are disregarded, there are 16 waste transfer stations that can reasonably be re-orientated into waste management facilities. This provides 14.3 hectares of land towards meeting the apportionment. This brings down the gap that we need to find to between 11.1 and 14.1 hectares.

In their Outline Business Case the North London Waste Authority sets out how they are seeking three large sites in the west, central and eastern parts of the area to provide facilities for Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT), Anaerobic Digestion and Materials Recovery Facilities (MRF). Together these requirements equate to roughly 18 hectares. They also are seeking sites for Household Waste Recycling Centres in Barnet and North East Enfield. This equates to an additional 2 hectares. The North London Waste Authority site requirements total around 20 hectares.

**Identification of sites**

Sites have been assessed and scored using a range of criteria including potential for energy generation, proximity to main roads, rail and waterways, proximity to open land, proximity to residents, and access to the site. Only the highest scoring sites have been identified within this plan as they represent the most suitable sites for waste management use according to the environmental, social and economic criteria against which the sites were assessed.

The preferred options report sets out a sequential policy approach for developers of waste facilities in North London. First they must consider the existing waste management sites (schedule A of the preferred options report) for redevelopment or possible intensification. If these are not suitable,
developers should consider the re-orientation of existing transfer station sites (schedule B of the preferred options report) into waste management facilities. If both of these are unsuitable developers can turn to potential new waste sites (schedule C of the preferred options report). Only in exceptional circumstances can non-allocated sites be put forward for waste development.

The preferred options for new waste sites (as identified in schedule C of the preferred options report) includes four large sites suitable for the North London Waste Authority and other operators. It also includes six small sites suitable for Household Waste Recycling Centres and other small operators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>Site on Edgware Rd and Geron Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Martinbridge IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>Friern Barnet STW (Pinkham Way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>WF</td>
<td>Rigg Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>Victory Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>Network Rail land at Aerodrome Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Makanji House, Kynoch Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Building premises, Kynoch Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Nobel Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>Marsh Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These ten additional sites total 25.65 hectares. The land area in Schedule C therefore is sufficient to meet apportionment, the site requirements of the North London Waste Authority and provide some flexibility in terms of site availability. Within the list are two sites which have been assessed as suitable and which the North London Waste Authority are actively pursuing as part of their outline business case. Their preferred site in the east of the area is not in the list because that site has been identified in Enfield’s emerging core strategy as a mixed use site and is therefore not available. However two other large sites have been identified that would be suitable.

Policy and monitoring framework
The preferred options report now contains planning policies as a result of comments received at the issues and options stage. There are seven policies proposed dealing with a range of waste specific issues. The policies set out the proposed sequential approach for development, the safeguarding of existing waste management sites and how applications on non-allocated sites will be dealt with. Another policy sets out how new waste management facilities should meet requirements with regard to design, traffic assessments, visual impact and environmental impacts. In addition there are policies relating to re-processing and re-manufacturing and about opportunities for decentralised energy and ensuring that construction and demolition waste is dealt with on site.

Any planning application for waste facilities will be dealt with by the borough in which the application is made. The application will be assessed against the London Plan, that borough’s local development framework and the North London Waste Plan.
Monitoring of the North London Waste Plan will be crucial. This requires that data and information are collected and reviewed by the boroughs on an annual basis in order that trends can be examined and problems identified and managed through the Plan review process. Key indicators are proposed to be reported each year as figures for the combined authorities. These will include total waste arising and total waste management capacity given planning consent in the previous year (on safeguarded sites and on new sites). Such information will be compared with the predicted waste arisings and the apportionment to ensure that there is not an over or under provision of waste management sites in North London.

Please see overleaf for maps of waste sites within Waltham Forest.
Existing Waste Management Sites:

As identified in Schedule A of the Preferred Options Report

1. Map Showing Site Locations
2. Baseforce Metals, Staffa Road, Leyton E10 7QZ
3. BD&G Parts for Rover, Argall Avenue, Leyton, E10 7FB *
4. London Borough of Waltham Forest, Gateway Road, Leyton E10 5BY
5. London Borough of Waltham Forest, Kings Road, Chingford E4 7HP (near Pimp Hall)
6. London Borough of Waltham Forest, South Access Road, Walthamstow E17 8AX

*This site has waste management licences according to most recent information from the Environment Agency; however it is believed that the site may no longer be operating as waste management facilities.
1. Map Showing Site Locations
2. Baseforce Metals, Staffa Road, Leyton E10 7QZ
3. BD&G Parts for Rover, Argall Avenue, Leyton, E10 7FB *
5. London Borough of Waltham Forest, Kings Road, Chingford E4 7HP (near Pimp Hall)
6. London Borough of Waltham Forest, South Access Road, Walthamstow E17 8AX
Existing Waste Transfer Sites:

As identified in Schedule B of the Preferred Options Report

1. Map Showing Site Locations
2. Bywaters, Gateway Road, Leyton E10 7BY
3. Dem'cy Contractors Ltd, Staffa Road, Leyton E10 7QZ
4. GBN Services Ltd, Church Road, Leyton E10 7JN
1. Map Showing Site Locations
3. Dem'cy Contractors Ltd, Staffa Road, Leyton E10 7QZ
4. GBN Services Ltd, Church Road, Leyton E10 7JN
Potential New Waste Management Site:

As identified in Schedule C of the Preferred Options Report

1. Map Showing Site Location
2. Multiple Owners, Rigg Approach, Leyton E10 7QN
1. Map Showing Site Location
2. Multiple Owners, Rigg Approach, Leyton E10 7QN
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Foreword

What to do with the waste that is generated in North London raises a lot of big issues for our Boroughs, such as:

- how to stop waste being generated in the first place?
- how to promote more reuse and recycling?
- how to get best value out of what is left?

We face big challenges in how we manage and treat our waste as we begin to treat it more as a resource than a nuisance.

As a group of boroughs we are determined to make the best decisions for our area. That is why we are collaborating on the North London Waste Plan to find sites that are suitable for waste facilities that are fit for the 21st century. We want to see waste facilities that are well designed, good neighbours, fit for purpose and that create opportunities for jobs, for new types of green industries and for decentralised heat and energy systems that can help in the fight against climate change.

Now we want you to tell us if this Preferred Options report, which sets out proposed policies and options on sites, is heading in the right direction. We will listen to your views and make changes before we prepare a final version next year. When we submit this final version, there will be another opportunity to give your views. These views will then be passed onto the Inspector who will hold a public examination of the Plan.

Finally, we would very much like to thank all those people who took the trouble to comment on the previous Issues and Options report.

Cllr Terry Neville  Cabinet Member for Environment and Street Scene, Enfield Council and Chairman North London Waste Plan Planning Members Group

Cllr Melvin Cohen  Cabinet Member for Planning & Environmental Protection, Barnet Council

Cllr Chris Knight  Executive Member for Environment, Camden Council

Cllr Alan Laing  Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Hackney Council

Cllr Nilgun Canver  Cabinet Member for Enforcement and Safer Communities, Haringey Council

Cllr Lucy Watt  Executive Member for Communities, Skills and Business, Islington Council

Cllr Terry Wheeler  Portfolio Holder for Enterprise and Investment, Waltham Forest Council
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Executive Summary

The North London Waste Plan

1 The North London Waste Plan (the Plan) is being produced jointly by seven North London Boroughs: Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest. The Plan will provide a planning framework identifying sites suitable for waste facilities to meet north London’s needs and will aim to ensure that the benefits of these facilities are maximised and the negative aspects minimised. The Plan will be part of each borough’s Local Development Framework and is being drawn up in conformity with national planning policy and the Mayor of London’s planning strategy. The Plan complements, but is different in scope, to the Joint Waste Strategy drawn up by the seven boroughs and the North London Waste Authority. This stage of the Plan identifies preferred site options for waste facilities in North London and introduces policies with which developers must comply. Prior to its adoption, there will be a public examination of the Plan in 2011.

2 The Plan covers the following waste types: municipal; commercial and industrial; construction, demolition and excavation; and hazardous.

Our approach to dealing with our share of London’s waste

3 The Mayor of London has set an overall target for London to become 85% self-sufficient in the management of waste by 2020. This means London will be dealing with its own waste instead of sending it to landfill in the counties around London. To ensure that London achieves self-sufficiency, each borough has been asked to deal with a proportion of London’s total waste (the apportionment).

4 North London boroughs have pooled their individual apportionments and will identify sufficient sites to meet this pooled apportionment and include extra sites to allow a level of flexibility as some existing sites may not be suitable for anything other than their existing use.

Intensification and Re-Orientation of existing sites

5 In line with the London Plan, our approach in the first instance is to direct developers of new waste facilities to existing sites, which should be re-developed and intensified where possible and practicable. North London has 25 existing waste management sites.

6 North London also has 24 waste transfer stations which, through re-orientation, will provide a proportion of the additional land that is required to meet the apportionment; however, we still need to identify new sites for waste management facilities as there is not enough land currently in waste use to meet the identified land requirement.

7 Only if developers can demonstrate that the existing waste management and transfer sites are not suitable, or available, for the proposed facility will they be allowed to consider the schedule of new sites or any other site. Ten sites have been identified as potential new waste sites, which are the subject of this public
consultation. Each proposed facility will be subject to the specific borough’s planning application and approval processes. Existing waste management sites and waste transfer stations are known as ‘safeguarded’ sites – that is they are already in waste use and are generally presumed to be suitable for re-orientation or intensification. However, any proposals for re-orientation or intensification will still require planning permission and be subject to specific borough’s planning application and approval processes.

Site Identification

8 Following on from the Issues and Options consultation, potential new sites have been assessed and scored using a range of criteria including potential for energy generation, proximity to main roads, rail and waterways, proximity to open land, proximity to residents, and access to the site. Only the highest scoring sites have been identified within this Plan as they represent the most suitable sites for waste management use according to the environmental, sustainability, social and economic criteria against which the sites were assessed.

Joint Waste Strategy and the North London Waste Authority

9 The North London Waste Authority is responsible for the processing, treatment and disposal of municipal wastes from the seven boroughs. The North London Joint Waste Strategy was updated in June 2008 to include a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Strategy and the updated Strategy was also subject to public consultation. The adopted Joint Waste Strategy is separate from the North London Waste Plan and serves a different purpose. It spells out the vision and strategy that will guide the management of the waste specifically collected by the seven boroughs up to 2020 but does not identify sites for waste management use.

10 The Joint Waste Strategy will also form the basis for the new services and facilities required by the North London Waste Authority. The Authority’s current contracts to manage a number of major waste facilities across North London are due to end in 2014 and the North London Waste Authority is in the process of developing new contracts, which will include new facilities, to manage and dispose of its waste from 2014. Contract award for this is expected to take place in 2010. Developers of any new facilities required for the delivery of the contract, will need to comply with the North London Waste Plan and other borough planning documents to get planning permission for any new facilities. The needs of the North London Waste Authority have been taken into account in drawing up the Preferred Options report.

Monitoring of the Plan

11 Monitoring of the North London Waste Plan will be crucial. This requires that data and information are collected and reviewed by the boroughs on an annual basis in order that trends can be examined and problems identified and managed through the Plan review process.

12 Key indicators are proposed to be reported each year as figures for the combined authorities. These will include total waste arising and total waste management capacity given planning consent in the previous year (on safeguarded sites and on
new sites). Such information will be compared with the predicted waste arisings and the apportionment to ensure that there is suitable provision of waste management sites in North London.

Development Management

13 Developers proposing waste management facilities within North London must apply for planning permission from the borough in which the intended development site lies. Each borough has its own local development management policies which the application must be in compliance with. In addition to this, the North London Waste Plan has developed five complementary policies. Developers and planning applicants should ensure that their proposals are in compliance with both the local policies and the policies contained in the North London Waste Plan.

14 The policies within the North London Waste Plan, and within borough planning documents, will ensure that any new waste management facilities will meet planning requirements with regard to design, traffic assessments, visual impact, environmental impact and also have regard to alternative transport and combined heat and power opportunities.
1 Introduction

1.1 The North London Waste Plan Preferred Options

1.1.1 This report represents the second stage in a process that will produce an adopted Waste Plan for the seven north London boroughs of Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest.

![Figure 1.1: North London boroughs](image)

1.1.2 The seven boroughs are working together to produce the North London Waste Plan as a Waste Development Plan Document which identifies a range of suitable sites and supporting policies for the future management of all of north London's waste up to 2021. Table 1-1 shows the timetable for development and adoption of the North London Waste Plan.
Table 1-1: Timetable for North London Waste Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Stage of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January-March 2008</td>
<td>Issues and Options Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October- November 2009</td>
<td>Preferred Options Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>Publication of Submission Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>Submission of Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>Adoption of Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.3 The North London Waste Plan identifies sites sufficient to deal with the apportionment of waste that the Mayor has allocated to each borough. The Plan includes sites identified as having potential for waste management use and a set of policies to guide potential developers. The North London Waste Plan covers all types of waste as described below:

1. **Municipal Solid Waste** – (MSW). This is defined as any waste collected by or on behalf of a local authority. For most local authorities the vast majority of this waste is from the households of their residents. Some is from local businesses and other organisations such as schools and the local authority’s own waste;

2. **Commercial and Industrial Waste** – (C&I). These are defined as wastes from trade and business premises and from industrial installations;

3. **Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste** – (CDE). These comprise waste building materials, packaging and rubble, from all construction activities;

4. **Hazardous Waste** – Waste which, because of its characteristics, poses a present or potential hazard to human health or the environment;

1.2 Opportunities from Waste

1.2.1 Waste should be seen as a resource and waste management should be seen as an opportunity for the future, something which local residents and businesses can benefit from. With future waste management technologies comes the opportunity for innovation, job creation, education and awareness raising and very real benefits in energy generation and alternative fuels. Waste management technologies can be linked into reprocessing and remanufacture of materials and can be co-located with other industrial processes where heat and power generated by one process can be used to drive another process.

1.2.2 Waste management facilities may include reuse and recycling centres, bulking and storage of recyclables, composting, mechanical biological treatment, anaerobic digestion, thermal treatment, reprocessing of recyclable waste into new materials for industry and other advanced waste treatment technologies.
1.2.3 As an example of such opportunities from waste is the on-going development at Dagenham Dock Sustainable Infrastructure Park, which has a vision to create a “best practice example of modern sustainable industrial development covering issues such as recycling operations, energy efficiency, ‘green links’ between businesses, transportation and waste minimisation on a site that can offer substantial new employment opportunities and a dramatically improved appearance”\(^1\). This demonstrates that a central focus on resource and waste management can drive regeneration and that waste need not be seen as a ‘bad neighbour’ but can provide opportunities for sustainable development in an integrated manner.

1.3 How should the North London Waste Plan be used?

1.3.1 The North London Waste Plan should be used by potential developers to find appropriate sites for their waste management facilities. It should also be viewed and used in conjunction with the relevant borough’s local development framework as well as the London Plan\(^2\).

1.3.2 Under the Mayor of London Order (2008)\(^3\) certain types of waste development need to be referred to the Mayor. The Mayor has powers either to return the application to the borough as planning authority for decision, or to direct the borough to refuse an application or to act as a local planning authority and take over the consideration of the planning application instead of the borough. The relevant waste categories where the Mayor can exercise these powers are

- Waste development with a capacity of more than 50,000 tonnes per annum of waste or 5,000 tonnes per annum of hazardous waste or occupying more than 1 hectare
- Waste development which does not accord with one or more provisions of the local development plan and either; occupies more than 0.5 hectares; or has capacity for more than 20,000 tonnes per annum of waste or 2,000 tonnes per annum of hazardous waste.

1.3.3 Notwithstanding the above, the borough in which a proposed facility is to be located will generally make the decision on any planning application. Developers should consider the following documents when developing a planning application for a new waste facility:


\(^3\) The Town and County Planning (Mayor of London) Order (2008), from http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2008/uksi_20080580_en_1
1.3.4 There may also be further plans and strategies associated with the area within which the potential facility is located, such as:

- Supplementary Planning Guidance
- Development Management/Control Policies
- Site Specific Proposals/Site Allocations

1.4 Local Development Frameworks

1.4.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, London boroughs are required to replace their existing land use plans (called Unitary Development Plans) with Local Development Frameworks. Local Development Frameworks will comprise a number of spatial planning documents and must contain both specific policies for waste and sites identified for waste use. These planning documents must be in general conformity with the London Plan, which is the Mayor of London’s spatial development strategy for the capital, in addition to national planning policy. Ultimately, these plans will be independently tested through a public examination. This process will examine the various plans and ensure that they meet all of the key tests for a sound Plan. Only then can they be adopted by the boroughs.

1.4.2 Each of the seven north London boroughs is preparing a number of other strategies and plans which, along with the North London Waste Plan, will form their Local Development Framework. Table 1-2 lists the Development Plan Documents being prepared by the individual boroughs, at July 2009.

*Table 1-2: Development Plan Documents for each north London borough (at October 2009)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Stage of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>Core Strategy</td>
<td>Preferred Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mill Hill Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colindale Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>Core Strategy</td>
<td>Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Policies</td>
<td>Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Allocations</td>
<td>Preferred Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Stage of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Core Strategy</td>
<td>Publication (Nov 09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design Guide (supplementary planning document)</td>
<td>No timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Standard (supplementary planning document)</td>
<td>No timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sites Schedule</td>
<td>No timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North East Enfield Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Preferred Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Leeside Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Issues and Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enfield Town Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Issues and Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Circular Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Preferred Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>Core Strategy</td>
<td>Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Control Policies</td>
<td>Evidence gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Specific Allocations</td>
<td>Evidence gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dalston Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Preferred Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hackney Central Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Preferred Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hackney Wick and Fish Island Action Area Plan</td>
<td>Preferred Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manor House Action Area Plan</td>
<td>Issues and Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>Core Strategy</td>
<td>Preferred Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Leeside Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Issues and Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Allocations</td>
<td>Initial scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Management</td>
<td>Initial scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>Core Strategy</td>
<td>Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Management</td>
<td>Issues and Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Allocations</td>
<td>Issues and Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finsbury Park Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Preferred Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Fringe/South Islington Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Issues and Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>Core Strategy</td>
<td>Preferred Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Management</td>
<td>Issues and Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Specific Proposals</td>
<td>Issues and Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Olympic Fringe Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Issues and Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackhorse Road Area Action Plan</td>
<td>Issues and Options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 North London Waste Authority

1.5.1 The North London Waste Plan is required to inform and be informed by the local Municipal Waste Management Strategy. This is prepared by the North London Waste Authority who is responsible for the processing, treatment and disposal of municipal wastes from the seven boroughs. The North London Joint Waste Strategy
was updated in June 2008\(^4\) to include a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Strategy and the updated Strategy was also subject to public consultation. The adopted Joint Waste Strategy is separate from the North London Waste Plan and serves a different purpose. It spells out the vision and approach that will guide the management of the waste specifically collected by the seven boroughs up to 2020. This Strategy therefore helps guide the decisions that the north London boroughs make as waste service providers to their residents and businesses. It does not cover all of the waste streams produced and managed in north London, nor does it identify sites for the management of waste.

1.5.2 The Strategy also forms the basis for the new services and facilities required by the North London Waste Authority. The Authority currently has contracts in place to manage a number of major waste facilities across north London, including the incineration plant at Edmonton, the Hornsey Street transfer station in Islington and the Hendon Rail transfer station in Barnet. However, these contracts are due to end in 2014 and the North London Waste Authority is in the process of developing new contracts, which will include new facilities, to manage and dispose of its waste from 2014 and beyond. The North London Waste Authority submitted their Outline Business Case for the new contracts to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs in October 2008 and contract award is expected to take place in 2010.

1.5.3 The North London Waste Authority reference case in the Joint Waste Strategy and in the Outline Business case says that the Authority will need the following facilities to deal with waste and recycling up to 2042 and to meet recycling targets:

- 600,000 tonnes Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) for the production of solid recovered fuel (SRF) for use in Combined Heat and Power plants (CHP). Fuel use is to be procured separately and new facilities in north London are not likely to be required.
- 150,000 tonnes Anaerobic Digestion (AD) for food waste
- 150,000 tonnes Materials Reclamation Facility (MRF) for recyclates
- Facilities for bulking waste
- Facilities for green waste
- Additional Household Waste Recycling Centres

\(^4\) NLWA JMWMMS available from [http://www.nlondon-waste.gov.uk/resources/the_north_london_joint_waste_strategy](http://www.nlondon-waste.gov.uk/resources/the_north_london_joint_waste_strategy)
1.5.4 The reference case is a programme that demonstrates how the Authority can achieve their recycling and other targets. It does not mean that the new services after 2014 in the new contract will necessarily be exactly like this as the procurement of the new facilities will be a competitive process. However, the Authority is looking for sites in the west, central and eastern parts of North London to locate these new facilities.

1.5.5 North London Waste Authority have indicated that they are also seeking sites for additional Household Waste Recycling Centres, specifically in Enfield (one site) and Barnet (up to three sites), to improve the geographical coverage of these recycling services to the local populations.

1.6 How are we currently tackling waste minimisation?

1.6.1 The North London Waste Plan is not directly concerned with waste minimisation although it is of great importance to the seven boroughs and the residents of north London and therefore the Plan seeks to influence waste minimisation activities where possible.

1.6.2 The North London Waste Plan supports the management of waste according to the waste hierarchy as identified in the Waste Strategy for England and the London Plan (Figure 1.2). The boroughs will work towards waste minimisation and resource efficiency by encouraging reuse and recycling through the services they deliver and through the planning system. They will seek to influence on-site re-use/recycling in new developments and the incorporation of the principles of the hierarchy in new developments to encourage potential occupiers to reduce, reuse and recycle wastes.

1.6.3 It is important that waste is prevented wherever possible to ensure that there is less waste to manage. Each of the seven boroughs is already dealing with wider waste issues such as encouraging waste minimisation and increasing recycling in accordance with the waste hierarchy. The waste hierarchy states that we should firstly try to reduce and re-use waste, then recycle waste into useful materials and if this is not possible recover energy from waste before considering the disposal of waste as a last resort. All boroughs operate household waste recycling collections, reuse and recycling centres and offer information on waste minimisation such as home composting or re-usable nappies.

---

1.6.4 The North London Waste Authority and the seven boroughs have also developed a Joint Waste Strategy which includes a series of actions for reducing the amount of waste which is collected by the boroughs. A Waste Prevention Plan has also been produced by the North London Waste Authority which essentially focuses on changing our patterns of consumption, encouraging us to consider the implications of waste produced by the products we purchase and also encouraging repairing and reuse of items rather than disposal. The wider issue of tackling the producers of waste, such as retail and industry, and minimising waste which is not under the boroughs’ control is dependant on the Government. The north London boroughs and the North London Waste Authority will continue to lobby the Government to place more responsibility on the producers of the waste.

---

1.6.5 The North London Waste Plan is based on the assumption that effective waste and resource management can make a positive and lasting contribution to the sustainable development of London and the combating of climate change.

1.7 How will the plan be monitored?

1.7.1 Monitoring of the plan will be crucial. If the north London boroughs are to contribute their fair share of London’s total waste management needs (ie the apportionment), it is vital that they ensure that the land allocated to meet this need, and the policy framework to support their sustainable development, is working as required. This requires that data and information are collected and reviewed by the boroughs on an annual basis in order that trends can be examined and problems identified and managed through the Plan review process.

1.7.2 The boroughs are already reporting annually on the capacity of new waste management facilities and the amount of municipal waste arising and managed by management type. Once the Plan is adopted, key performance indicators are proposed to be reported each year in the Annual Monitoring Report. This will enable the north London boroughs to compare trends in waste production with those forecast in the London Plan and to monitor the take up of waste sites identified in the Plan. This will then enable the boroughs to consider whether the allocation of sites is sufficient and whether the plan needs reviewing. The proposed indicators that will be reported for each authority and the authorities combined include:

- Quantity of each type of waste produced
- Total capacity (in tonnes) of new waste management facilities given planning permission in the previous year, by process (e.g. recycling, composting, anaerobic digestion etc) and against annual forecast of quantity of waste produced
- Capacity (in tonnes) of new waste management facilities on existing sites (including re-developed transfer sites), on new sites allocated within the North London Waste Plan, and on non-allocated sites
- The quantity of municipal waste generated per household;
- Re-use, recycling and composting figures for municipal waste.
- The quantity of municipal waste landfilled;
- Comparison of municipal and commercial & industrial waste that is managed compared to the apportionment targets set out in The London Plan;
- Tonnage of Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste produced and disposed of in the boroughs;
- Tonnage of hazardous waste produced and disposed of in the boroughs
• Other indicators that may be decided to measure performance against policies

1.8 Previous consultation responses
1.8.1 In January and February 2008 we asked for your views on the key issues which the North London Waste Plan needs to address, as set out in the North London Waste Plan Issues and Options report\(^7\). A wide range of responses were received via the various public workshops and meetings held across the seven boroughs, via the project website (http://www.nlwp.net) and in writing. Throughout this Preferred Options report, we make reference to how, broadly speaking, we have taken account of these responses. A fuller description of the outcomes of the previous consultation can be found in the Issues and Options Consultation Summary of Responses (April 2008) and in the Report on Consultation\(^8\).

1.9 We are seeking your views on this Preferred Options report
1.9.1 Having considered and consulted on the options open to us in planning for north London’s waste, this report sets out the seven boroughs’ preferred approach to planning for waste and identifying new waste sites. It also sets out a range of waste-specific planning policies to further guide future waste management development in north London.

1.9.2 Where choices have been made between competing options, the report describes these options and explains why the preferred option has been chosen. We are publishing the report for consultation, providing the opportunity for individuals and organisations to consider the options and approaches put forward.

1.10 When and where
1.10.1 Your views on this Preferred Options report are invited during a six-week period running from TBC. There will be a variety of ways of becoming involved in the process, including a series of public workshops, one in each of the seven boroughs. Details of these workshops are available on the project website (http://www.nlwp.net). In addition, if you are a member of a community group that has a particular interest in the issues, we would be happy to attend one of your meetings to discuss the issues with you. Just email us at events@nlwp.net or contact Archie Onslow on 020 7974 5916.

1.10.2 You can also send us your responses by completing the online questionnaire (http://www.nlwp.net/have_your_say/response_form.php). The questionnaire is also available at the back of this report. If you complete a paper copy of the


\(^8\) These reports are available to download from http://www.nlwp.net/documents/documents.html
questionnaire, these should be returned to Archie Onslow at Camden Town Hall,
Argyle Street, London WC1H 8EQ.

1.10.3 All responses must be received by TBC.

1.10.4 Additional copies of this report can be downloaded from the project website
(http://www.nlwp.net). Hard copies are available to view at:

- libraries in the seven North London boroughs; and

- the main planning offices of the seven boroughs:

  - London Borough of Barnet
    North London Business Park, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP

  - London Borough of Camden
    Camden Town Hall, 5th Floor Reception, Argyle Street, London, WC1H 8EQ

  - London Borough of Enfield
    Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield, EN1 3XY

  - London Borough of Hackney
    Hackney Planning Services, 263 Mare Street, London E8 3HT

  - London Borough of Haringey
    Civic Centre, High Road, Wood Green, London N22 8LE

  - London Borough of Islington
    Islington Contact Centre, 222 Upper Street, London N1 1XR

  - London Borough of Waltham Forest
    Waltham Forest Town Hall, Sycamore House, Forest Road, London E17 4JF

1.10.5 The information you supply will be used for the purpose for which you have provided
it. This data will be maintained in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 and
will not be passed on or sold to any other organisation without your prior approval
unless this is a legal requirement.
2 What are the aims and objectives of the Plan?

2.1 The Vision of the North London Waste Plan

The North London Waste Plan aims to help North London become more self-sufficient in managing the waste it produces. We will do this through the intensification of existing waste management facilities, the re-orientation of existing waste transfer stations into waste management facilities and the identification of a small number of additional sites for new waste facilities. In dealing with waste North London boroughs will seek to maximise the opportunities for green jobs and decentralised energy and ensure that well designed, high quality waste facilities are developed.

In delivering this vision, we need to define more specific aims and objectives for the Plan and we therefore asked, during the Issues and Options consultation, what the views on the proposed aims and objectives were.

2.2 What we asked about the aims and objectives

These aims and objectives were developed in conjunction with consultation with key stakeholders and the residents of north London. We asked you whether you agreed with the aims and objectives of the North London Waste Plan and whether you could suggest any additional aims and objectives.

2.3 What you told us about the aims and objectives

The majority of you were in favour of the aims and objectives of the Plan but some of you highlighted some areas where these could be added to or strengthened. The main issues were:

- ensuring there were sufficient reuse and recycling centres and other waste facilities in individual boroughs;
- having a more explicit emphasis on sustainability;
- more support for reuse and recycling;
- inclusion of transport considerations;
- inclusion of consideration of health impacts; and
- including waste reduction as an objective

Our preferred approach is to add objectives on waste minimisation, alternative transport and sustainable development because these complement the strategic approach of the plan.
2.4 The aims and objectives of the North London Waste Plan

The revised aims and objectives of the North London Waste Plan are therefore:

2.4.1 The Aims of the North London Waste Plan

1. To identify a range of suitable and viable sites to meet the North London boroughs’ future waste management needs and increased self-sufficiency for London\(^9\).

2. To set out a range of policies designed to support determination of planning applications for waste facilities as well as ensure a more general and sustainable approach to waste and resource management as impacted on by the land use planning system.

3. To maximise the contribution of the Plan to North London’s environment, economy and society. The Plan will both reflect and feed into North London’s wider needs to ensure an integrated approach to improving the quality of life across the area.

2.4.2 The Objectives of the North London Waste Plan

The Objectives of the Plan, which will assist in the delivery of the aims, are:

- Through policies and proposals, to ensure that north London’s waste is managed as far up the waste hierarchy as possible, to ensure environmental and economic benefits are maximised;

- Through appropriate safeguarding policies in boroughs’ Core Strategies to ensure no net loss of existing waste sites;

- To identify, through a rigorous methodology, a range of sites capable of managing, within north London, the amounts of waste (apportionment) as set out in the London Plan;

- Through rigorous and proportional Development Management policies, to ensure that all waste developments accord to high standards of design, build quality and operation;

- To integrate the North London Waste Plan with the key aims and objectives of the boroughs’ Community Strategies;

\(^9\) ‘Self-sufficiency’ - when wastes are dealt with in the administrative region where they are produced
• To integrate with the North London Joint Waste Strategy for municipal waste management;

• To promote sustainable development within the Plan area through the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations;

• To ensure adequate site provision for the range of facilities required for sufficient and sustainable waste management in north London.

• To ensure, as far as is practicable, that the Plan supports the minimisation of transport impacts through appropriate supporting policies and site assessment criteria that recognise the importance of both minimising road vehicle impacts and the positive use of alternative modes of transport such as rail and water in the selection of sites.
3 Sustainability Appraisal

The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal is to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations into the preparation of revisions of Regional Spatial Strategies and for new or revised Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents.

This process will ensure that planning decisions are made that accord with the principles defined in the Government’s UK Sustainable Development agenda\(^\text{10}\). The timing of the Sustainability Appraisal aims to ensure that sustainability considerations are taken into account early in the process of policy development.

Sustainability Appraisals must also, where appropriate, incorporate the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (2001/EC/42) (SEA Directive)\(^\text{11}\). The SEA Directive requires that a formal assessment is undertaken of plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment. This has been transposed into UK law through the SEA Regulations (July 2004)\(^\text{12}\). The purpose of the SEA Directive is “to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view to promoting sustainable development”.

3.1 Sustainability Appraisal Approach

The approach adopted for the Sustainability Appraisal was iterative and involved a high degree of interaction between those individuals responsible for the Sustainability Appraisal and those individuals responsible for development of the Plan. The Sustainability Appraisal approach and the format of this report follow guidance on Sustainability Appraisal for Development Plan Documents provided by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)\(^\text{13}\) formerly the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM). Figure 1.1, from the DCLG guidance, indicates the various stages involved in the incorporation of Sustainability Appraisal within the Development Plan Document approach and indicates where in this Sustainability Appraisal Report stages A, B and C have been addressed. The Policy Statement 12 (PPS12) Local Spatial Planning sets out the Government’s policy on


\(^{11}\) European Directive 2001/42/EC "on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment" (the Strategic Environmental Assessment or ‘SEA Directive’)


3.2 Scoping
The first stage in the Sustainability Appraisal process (Stage A of DCLG guidance) involves assembling information on the existing environmental, social and economic baseline to provide a starting point for appraising the effects of implementing the Plan. To provide a sound basis for analysis, the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report also identified relevant plans and programmes, key sustainability issues and problems and detailed a Sustainability Framework through which the appraisal could take place, this information was reported in the form of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report\(^4\). Views on the content of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, including the proposed approach to the Sustainability Appraisal, were taken into account through a formal period of consultation with statutory and non-statutory consultees in August 2007.

3.3 Issues and Options
The Issues and Options aims and objectives were tested for compatibility with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives through a compatibility matrix. During development of the draft issues and options for the Plan, the draft Sustainability Framework set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report was applied to each potential option (Stage B of DCLG guidance).

A Sustainability Commentary\(^5\) was produced in which the key findings were provided in association with each of the identified issues and options. The Sustainability Commentary was prepared to meet the requirements of DCLG guidance (para 3.39) “As each option is refined, a commentary on the key sustainability issues and problems arising must be prepared, with recommendations on how each of the options could be improved, e.g. through mitigation measures.”

3.4 Preferred Options
Preferred Options for the Plan were developed taking into account findings presented in the Sustainability Commentary as well as the results of consultation on the Draft Issues and Options and relevant “evidence base” material.


\(^5\) North London Waste Plan Issues and Options, Sustainability Appraisal, Sustainability Commentary, January 2008
The Preferred Options were tested for compatibility with the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and the results were then collated and were taken into account, as necessary, during further drafting and refinement of the options.

### 3.5 Assessment of Site Assessment Criteria
The Site Assessment Criteria (Appendix 5) were assessed using the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, and the results were incorporated into the Plan.

The majority of the Sustainability Appraisal objectives are addressed by the site selection criteria, where it was considered that the objectives were not being met mitigation was recommended and incorporated into the Plan.

### 3.6 Assessment of Policies
The policies contained within the Plan were assessed against sustainability objectives and mitigation recommendations have been addressed where appropriate in the NLWP. In some instances the mitigation will be addressed within individual Boroughs Core Strategies and this is noted with the Sustainability Appraisal Report.

### 3.7 Monitoring
The EC Directive 2001/42/EC requires the significant environmental effects of implementing the plan or programmes to be monitored “in order to identify unforeseen adverse effects and to be able to undertake remedial action” (Article 10(1)). Responsible Authorities must ensure when designing their monitoring arrangements that they comply with this provision. This guidance uses the term ‘SEA monitoring’ to cover the overall monitoring of environmental effects. The Sustainability Appraisal Report will include Draft monitoring recommendations and these will be updated following the consultation period.

### 3.8 Reporting
Outputs from the Sustainability Appraisal are presented in this Sustainability Appraisal Report which is designed to fulfil the requirements of EC Directive 2001/42/EC in respect of the Strategic Environmental Assessment “Environmental Report”. This report will be published alongside the North London Waste Plan Preferred Options and will be available to individuals and organisations involved in consultation on the Preferred Options.

### 3.9 Further Assessments of the North London Waste Plan

#### 3.9.1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) was undertaken to ensure that flood risk is considered as part of the spatial planning process. As required of Planning Policy Statement 25, we have used the findings of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment on regional and local flood risk issues in the assessment of sites suitable for waste management.

#### 3.9.2 Equalities Impact Assessment
The Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) was undertaken to ensure that the North London Waste Plan does not discriminate against specific target groups. The Equalities Impact Assessment of the Issues and Options identified the options that may have a negative impact on certain target
groups. Since the development of the Plan’s Policies, a further Assessment has been undertaken and suggested mitigation has been incorporated into the Plan and Sustainability Appraisal Report. We have taken this into account when developing the Preferred Options to ensure that no target group experiences a high level negative impact from the North London Waste Plan. This report will be published alongside the Preferred Options and will be available to individuals and organisations involved in consultation on the Preferred Options.

### 3.9.3 Habitats Regulations Assessment


In September 2007 Mouchel completed a screening exercise to determine the need for a Habitat Directive Assessment of the potential impacts of the North London Waste Plan’s Issues and Options upon any European designated site located within 10 km of the seven north London boroughs (Mouchel 2007). The report concluded that some of the Issues and Options had the potential to impact the Natura 2000 sites identified, and that Task 2 (Appropriate Assessment and ascertaining the effect on site integrity) was required. Since the completion of this screening, changes to the Plan have taken place, with the development of policies to support the Waste Development Plan Document.

This report presents the findings of a screening exercise which aims to determine whether any of the recently developed policies are likely to trigger the need for a full Habitats Directive Assessment, in compliance with the EC Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora), of the Plan.

Four of the policies are considered to have some potential to affect some of the Natura 2000 sites identified, either directly or indirectly. Epping Forest SAC and Lee Valley SPA and Ramsar sites were considered to be particularly vulnerable to potential adverse impacts as a result of some of the policies contained within the Plan.

The Plan policies have been updated to incorporate the recommendations from the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening. This report will be published alongside the Preferred Options and will be available to individuals and organisations involved in consultation on the Preferred Options.

The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Equalities Impact Assessment and Habitats Directive Screening Assessment can be found at http://www.nlwp.net/documents/documents.html.
4 Identifying future requirements for waste management

In order for the North London Waste Plan to be effective we need to identify and quantify the targets that Plan needs to achieve.

4.1 Should North London only plan to meet the apportionment or should we try to be self-sufficient?

4.1.1 The Mayor of London has set an overall target for London to become 85% self-sufficient in the management of waste by 2020. This means London will be dealing with its own waste instead of sending it to landfill in the counties around London. To ensure that London achieves self-sufficiency, each borough must manage a proportion of London’s total waste (the apportionment).

4.1.2 We asked you whether north London should just aim to meet its apportionment of waste from the Mayor or go further to become more self-sufficient.

4.1.3 What you told us: Whilst there was most support for north London being as self-sufficient as possible there was also support for meeting the apportionment and providing some contingency above that figure. There were also some opinions expressed against self-sufficiency as there was a worry that it would take the responsibility away from waste producers and potentially undermine waste minimisation efforts.

4.1.4 Our preferred option is to allocate enough land to meet the apportionment, the needs of the North London Waste Authority and provide a level of flexibility, using existing sites and some new sites.

4.1.4.1 Firstly to ensure that enough suitable land is identified and allocated to meet the capacity requirements of the combined North London boroughs’ apportionment. As indicated in Table 4-5 the estimated land requirement for meeting this need is an additional 28.4ha by 2021. Some of this total will be new land and some will come from existing transfer station land;

4.1.4.2 The analysis undertaken in support of the Plan suggests that there is currently a significant proportion of our land requirement already in waste use. In particular, 15.3ha of land currently in waste use is classed as transfer, where waste is bulked up for onward transfer to landfill. As north London becomes more self-sufficient and the cost of landfill rises, such use will no longer be required and this transfer capacity can be re-orientated, offering potential for new waste recycling and processing capacity. However, a number of existing transfer stations are small (in land area terms) and therefore likely to be difficult to re-orientate to waste treatment. Consequently, sites smaller than 0.25ha have been discounted which leaves 14.3ha of transfer land suitable for re-orientation.
4.1.4.3 The difference between the identified land requirement and the land area available in re-orientable transfer station sites will need to come from new land allocated for waste use. The Plan therefore needs to identify how much land allocate new sites for waste management use so that the apportionment and the needs of the North London Waste Authority can be met and also to allow for a level of flexibility. The reason for this is that, in planning for the long term, there is inevitably uncertainty about likely waste arisings and therefore facility needs. Waste Development Plan Documents are required to plan for 10 years (in line with PPS10), however borough Core Strategies are required to plan for 15 years (in line with PPS12), therefore the North London Waste Plan must plan for 10 years as a minimum, but with a view to the future. By allowing for some flexibility the Plan is adopting a pragmatic approach which will allow the ten-year plan requirements to be met while also having some capability to meet longer term needs. The effectiveness of this flexible approach will be monitored through the life of the Plan via the Annual Monitoring Report.

4.1.4.4 The Plan is required to consider the needs of the North London Waste Authority. The Authority has identified that to deliver its preferred waste treatment strategy three main sites are required with a total area of around 18ha and up to four small sites (for household waste recycling centres) with a total area of around 1.5ha. This means that the Authority requires around 19.5ha of land. The Plan calculation methodology has identified a total need of 28.4ha with 14.3ha available from existing transfer sites, which means that 14.1ha of new land is required. This does not match exactly with the Authority’s identified land requirements because most of the transfer land is in sites of less than 2ha which are not suitable for development as major waste management facilities for municipal waste. Therefore the Plan needs to identify some larger sites that are potentially suitable for the Authority. One of the reasons that the Authority is looking for more land than the Plan initially calculated is that the Authority is looking to a significantly longer time line than the Plan and is consequently considering a larger requirement for waste treatment. In order to deliver its long-term strategy in an effective manner, the Authority will need suitable land to be available at the start of its long-term residual waste treatment contract. Clearly the Plan must consider these longer term needs at the outset and identify sufficient land to meet the needs of the Authority for municipal waste as well as providing flexibility for developers for other waste types.

4.1.4.5 Therefore, in order to meet the apportionment and the needs of the North London Waste Disposal Authority while providing a flexible land use planning framework it will be necessary to identify a total of at least 22ha of land on new sites in the final adopted version of the Plan. The exact number of hectares identified in the final Plan will actually depend on the number and sizes of the specific sites identified and therefore it is not possible, at this stage, to say exactly how many hectares the Plan will allocate.

4.1.5 Alternative allocation options

In developing the Preferred Options the following alternatives were considered and ultimately rejected.

- To allocate enough land to ensure north London could be self-sufficient: this was rejected on the basis that meeting the apportionment allows London to meet its self-sufficiency targets. If all London boroughs meet their apportionment, then
London will achieve self-sufficiency levels. It is not necessary for north London to make provision for additional waste management infrastructure which might allow importation of waste.

- To allocate enough land to meet the apportionment; this was rejected on the basis that some flexibility is needed to allow for the fact that whilst new sites for managing waste are under construction, there will still need to be operational sites to transfer and manage waste.

4.1.6 In the rest of section 4 we set out the detail of how we have arrived at our preferred option. We start by looking at how much waste north London needs to manage in the future and how much we are already managing. We set out how we intend to deal with construction, demolition and excavation waste and with hazardous waste. We show how we have to identify sites to deal with the additional amounts we are not currently managing and how we went about identifying these sites.

4.2 How much and what types of waste will North London need to manage?

4.2.1 The London Plan provides self-sufficiency targets for 2010, 2015 and 2020 for the amount of municipal, commercial & industrial and construction, demolition & excavation waste to be managed in London. Table 4-1 shows that, by 2020, it is expected that London will manage 80% of municipal, 85% of commercial & industrial and 95% of construction, demolition & excavation wastes produced in London. These self-sufficiency targets will ensure that the majority of waste produced in London is no longer exported to areas outside of London to be treated or disposed of.

Table 4-1: Self-Sufficiency targets for London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste stream</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Solid Waste</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Industrial</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Demolition &amp; Excavation</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All wastes</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 To ensure that the self-sufficiency targets for London are achieved, the amount of waste required to be managed across London has been apportioned to boroughs on the basis of ‘suitability’ i.e. the amount of existing facilities, suitable land and supporting infrastructure, that exists in the borough to manage waste. The borough’s apportionment only considers municipal and commercial & industrial waste as

---

construction, demolition & excavation wastes are expected to be largely reused or recycled on the site in which they arise.

4.2.3 The borough level apportionment requires boroughs to identify sufficient land for facilities to manage their apportioned tonnages of municipal and commercial & industrial waste in their development plan documents. As the seven north London boroughs are developing a joint Waste Development Plan Document (this Plan) our individual borough apportionments have been pooled and we must collectively make provision for the pooled amount of waste to be managed within our area. The borough level apportionment for north London is shown in Table 4-2.

4.2.4 The London Plan provides an apportionment of waste only to the year 2020. Since the timetable for production of the North London Waste Plan currently anticipates adoption of the Plan in 2011 and Planning Policy Statement 10 requires all Development Plan Documents to plan for at least a 10 year period, it is necessary to calculate an apportionment for 2021. In the absence of guidance on forecasting the apportionment, the calculated apportionment is based on a continuing ambition for London to be 85% self-sufficient in 2021, coupled with maintaining the levels of self-sufficiency identified for north London at 2020.

4.2.5 The amount of municipal and commercial & industrial waste expected to be produced in north London is also shown in Table 4-2 and demonstrates that the apportionment targets for North London are less than the quantity of waste expected to be produced.

Table 4-2: Quantity of waste forecast to be produced in North London and Apportionment targets for target years (MSW and C&I only) (tonnes per annum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Arisings</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Solid Waste (London Plan figures)</td>
<td>1,108,145</td>
<td>1,234,247</td>
<td>1,373,475</td>
<td>1,403,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Industrial (London Plan figures)</td>
<td>1,661,852</td>
<td>1,839,420</td>
<td>2,062,119</td>
<td>2,103,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MSW and C&amp;I (London Plan figures)</td>
<td>2,769,997</td>
<td>3,073,667</td>
<td>3,435,594</td>
<td>3,506,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Apportionment</td>
<td>1,504,000</td>
<td>1,994,000</td>
<td>2,341,000</td>
<td>2,384,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apportionment as an equivalent percentage of total arisings</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that there may be a level of contingency in using the waste forecast data from the London Plan as it predicts the quantity of waste to increase 2% every year but more recent data suggest that municipal waste is growing at only 0.5% every year. As waste minimisation activities increase and landfill tax rises it is expected that the quantity of waste produced each year will stabilise and may reduce. However, the North London Waste Plan has been based on the published apportionment figures to ensure consistency with the London Plan.

4.3 Do we have enough facilities to manage this? If not what is the gap?

4.3.1 Not all waste facilities in north London are counted as managing waste as some are just used to bulk waste and transfer it to landfill. There is just less than 2 million tonnes of existing waste management capacity in north London (See Appendix 4 for lists of existing waste facilities). However, not all of the treatment capacity may be available; in-line with the London Plan the North London Waste Plan has adopted an effective capacity approach for existing waste treatment facilities. Existing waste treatment facilities are assumed to operate at 75% of their maximum throughput. As this is the figure that has been used in the calculation of the apportionment it is reasonable to use this figure in calculating future needs. The total effective existing capacity (excluding transfer facilities) is then compared with the apportionment to understand how much more capacity is required to meet the apportionment and self-sufficiency targets (Table 4-3). Around million tonnes of additional capacity will be required in 2021 to meet the apportionment whereas over 1.6 million tonnes additional capacity will be required for self-sufficiency for municipal and commercial and industrial waste only.

Table 4-3: North London Arisings waste management capacity requirements for target years (tonnes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Arisings</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total MSW and C&amp;I arisings (London Plan figures)</td>
<td>2,769,997</td>
<td>3,073,667</td>
<td>3,435,593</td>
<td>3,506,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Apportionment</td>
<td>1,504,000</td>
<td>1,994,000</td>
<td>2,341,000</td>
<td>2,384,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total existing capacity (75% basis)</td>
<td>1,373,624</td>
<td>1,373,624</td>
<td>1,373,624</td>
<td>1,373,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional capacity required to meet the apportionment targets</td>
<td>130,376</td>
<td>620,376</td>
<td>967,376</td>
<td>1,010710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional capacity required to become</td>
<td>980,873</td>
<td>1,238,993</td>
<td>1,546,630</td>
<td>1,606,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 From the London Plan (paragraph 4.71)

Waste is deemed to be managed in London if:
- It is used for energy recovery in London (e.g., through anaerobic digestion, pyrolysis/gasification or through incinerators), or
- It is compost or recyclate sorted or bulked in London material recycling facilities for reprocessing either in London or elsewhere.
4.4 What provision for new facilities do we need to make and what kinds of facilities could these be?

4.4.1 The London Plan suggests the types of facilities that will be required to manage London’s 5.7 million tonnes of municipal solid waste in 2020 based on an assumption of the predicted percentage of waste that needs to be managed by certain types of facility (Table 4-4). The table provides an assumption of the land take required by each type of facility, the smallest of which is 0.9 hectares. As technologies improve and become more efficient, the land take required will become smaller and therefore we believe there is a level of flexibility in the North London Waste Plan in using the London Plan figures.

Table 4-4: Throughput and land take of different types of facilities for London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility type</th>
<th>Throughput per facility (tonnes per year)</th>
<th>Land take per facility (ha)</th>
<th>Number of facilities</th>
<th>Total Land take (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials Recycling Facility (MRF)</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT)</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic digestion</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasification/pyrolysis</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>308</strong></td>
<td><strong>328</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Using the facility land takes in Table 4-4 together with the London Plan’s projections for types of technologies anticipated to treat municipal and commercial & industrial waste in 2020, it is possible to calculate an indicative number and type of facilities that would be required to meet north London’s waste infrastructure requirements for meeting the Apportionment and for self-sufficiency.

---

### Table 4-5: Land take required for North London Waste Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility type</th>
<th>Through put per facility (tonnes per year)</th>
<th>Land take per facility (ha)</th>
<th>Number of additional facilities required to meet apportionment in 2021</th>
<th>for self sufficiency in 2021 (MSW &amp; C&amp;I only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRF</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBT</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic digestion</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasification/pyrolysis</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total land take (ha)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3 Meeting the apportionment would require 28.4ha of land to be allocated across the seven North London boroughs to meet the targets for 2021 as shown in Table 4-5. To become 85% self-sufficient in the management of municipal and commercial waste in 2021, 44.5ha of land would need to be allocated. The figure of 85% has been used as it is assumed, in line with the London Plan, that the remaining 15% would be land filled outside of Greater London, on the basis that no more value that can be extracted from it. However, as identified as our preferred option (see 4.1.4), the aim of the North London Waste Plan is to meet the apportionment as, if all London boroughs meet their apportionment, London will achieve self sufficiency.

### 4.5 Construction, Demolition & Excavation wastes

4.5.1 Construction, demolition & excavation waste makes up over a third of London’s total waste. We asked you whether you thought we should make provision for construction, demolition & excavation wastes within the North London Waste Plan.

4.5.2 What you told us: The key messages received were that we should make an assumption on the amount of construction, demolition & excavation wastes produced in North London and make site provision for the management of that waste. There was also support for the assumption that most construction, demolition & excavation wastes are managed on site but that some provision should be made.

4.5.3 Our preferred option is to assume that construction, demolition and excavation wastes are largely managed on site and that North London Waste Plan and development control policies will ensure that developers must recycle or reuse such wastes on site. The rise in the landfill tax is a key driver in ensuring less of this waste goes to landfill. As an example, the Olympic Park is currently recycling/reusing over 96% of wastes on site. The small remainder is largely hazardous wastes that need to be disposed of in specialised facilities outside of London.
4.5.4 For the purposes of this Plan it is assumed that no specific additional land provision needs to be made for construction, demolition & excavation. However policy NLWP 5 will ensure that on-site recycling and re-use is maximised by developers. See Appendix 4 for more details on waste arisings.

4.5.5 Alternative options

- To make an assumption on the amount of construction, demolition & excavation waste being produced and make land provision for managing the waste; this was rejected on the basis that the data on such waste is out dated and related to the whole of London and it is therefore difficult to predict how much waste will need to be managed, in north London, if at all.

- To make no provision for construction, demolition & excavation waste at all; this was rejected on the basis that it would not conform with planning policy

4.6 Hazardous wastes

4.6.1 Hazardous waste is not a large waste stream but obviously a very sensitive one. We asked you whether you thought we should make provision for hazardous waste within the North London Waste Plan

4.6.2 What you told us: The key messages received were that we should make an assumption on the amount of hazardous waste produced in north London and make site provision for the management of that waste.

4.6.3 Our preferred option is to assume that hazardous wastes are largely managed on a regional basis and therefore make no specific land allocation for such facilities within north London at this stage. The management of hazardous waste is of real importance but is also a very specialised activity. However, it is not possible to plan for this waste stream at the sub-regional level, as emphasised by Policy 4A.29 within the London Plan. This states that the Mayor will work with the boroughs, Environment Agency and industry to ascertain regional capacity needs. It is worth noting that north London has existing hazardous waste facilities with a total capacity of 17,500 tonnes which will be safeguarded through the North London Waste Plan.

4.6.4 The Plan does recognise the importance of such facilities and applications for hazardous facilities will be determined in accordance with the policies contained in this Plan and local borough development plans. See Appendix 4 for further information on waste arisings.

4.6.5 Alternative options

- To make an assumption on the amount of hazardous waste being produced and make land provision for managing the waste; this was rejected on the basis that the data on such waste is limited and it is therefore difficult to predict how much waste will need to be managed at a sub-regional level.
• To assume hazardous wastes are managed elsewhere and make a small provision for what may need to be treated or disposed of; this was rejected on that basis that it is difficult to predict how much waste will need to be treated or disposed of.

4.7 The requirements of the North London Waste Authority

4.7.1 An important consideration in the development of the Plan is the needs of the North London Waste Authority in setting up new arrangements for dealing with municipal waste as part of their new waste contract. The North London Waste Authority have indicated in their Outline Business Case (as outlined in 1.5.3 above), their need for three large new sites in the west, centre and east of the area where they can site Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) plants, Anaerobic Digesters (AD) and Materials Reclamation Facilities (MRF). In addition the North London Waste Authority has identified a need for a number of smaller sites that could be used as Household Waste Recycling Centres in Enfield and Barnet. Their requirements total around 20 hectares.

4.7.2 North London Waste Authority currently has no sites that it can offer into its residual waste treatment contract procurement to assist in the delivery of its new waste management infrastructure. It currently makes use of an existing waste facility at Edmonton but the contract for this expires at the end of 2014 and cannot be extended. The Authority does not own the land at Edmonton and is therefore unable to develop alternative treatment facilities on the site. Therefore the Plan needs to identify sufficient land to meet the needs of the Authority (as outlined in 4.1.4.4 above). However, the Edmonton facility is expected to continue to operate throughout the life of the Plan and will provide capacity to treat waste arising in north London (other than municipal waste).

4.8 How much land do we need to find?

4.8.1 We are not therefore making separate provision for construction, demolition and excavation waste nor for hazardous waste. We are required to make provision for municipal solid waste and commercial & industrial waste. We have identified, through existing sites and new sites, enough land to meet the apportionment, to meet the needs of the North London Waste Authority plus a level of flexibility, to allow for the fact that some sites may not be available.

4.8.2 In order to meet the 28.4ha of land required for new waste treatment facilities (Table 4-5), we have allowed for 14.3ha to come from re-orientation of existing transfer stations and 14.1ha from new sites. However, we also need to take account of the needs of the North London Waste Authority and they have indicated that they require 19.5ha, which will have to come from new sites. Therefore the Preferred Options report is proposing 10 new sites, totalling 25.7ha as part of the consultation process. These sites have been evaluated using the criteria that have been reviewed by the Sustainability Appraisal and are considered to be the best sites with potential for waste management development.
All the sites to be consulted on in the Preferred Options stage of the North London Waste Plan are set out in the attached Schedules, as follow:

**Table 4-6: Schedule of all sites in the Preferred Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Existing Waste Treatment (safeguarded)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Transfer Station (safeguarded)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Proposed New (for consultation)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next sections set out how we went about finding the sites identified in the schedules.

**4.9 How did we find these sites?**

4.9.1 We asked you whether you thought the broad locations identified in the London Plan provided a good starting point for identifying new waste sites and whether there were any sites within the broad locations that were particularly suitable or unsuitable.

4.9.2 What you told us: Whilst some people thought the broad locations were a good starting point, others had objections against specific areas including Blackhorse Lane and the North London Business Park.

4.9.3 Our preferred option, for the development of this report, was to use a number of sources of information to establish a list of potential sites:

- National Land Use Database of Previously Developed Land (2006);
- Existing broad locations suggested in the London Plan;
- North London Waste Authority waste management sites long list;
- Existing licensed waste management facilities
- Sites suggested during public consultation.

**4.10 How did we consider existing waste sites?**

4.10.1 Existing waste sites are “safeguarded” under the London Plan and are therefore an important resource for the future. We used Environment Agency records to get details of existing waste sites. The London Plan makes a distinction between facilities that manage waste and facilities used to transfer waste from one place to another.

4.10.2 North London has:

- 25 licensed (or planned) waste management sites
7 reuse and recycling centres (RRC, also known as Household Waste Recycling Centres))

1 incinerator, and

24 Licensed transfer stations

4.10.3 All 57 sites are safeguarded within the Plan and can continue in waste management use. However, not all existing and transfer are considered suitable for intensification or re-orientation. See Appendix 4 for more details on existing facilities.

4.10.4 In the London Plan, existing sites are safeguarded for ‘intensification’ whereby they can continue in waste management use and potentially be re-developed to increase the amount of waste they currently treat. Transfer sites are safeguarded for ‘re-orientation’ whereby they can continue in waste management use but be redeveloped from waste transfer use to a waste treatment use which is higher up the waste hierarchy.

4.10.5 In considering how suitable safeguarded sites are for re-development it is important to note the basis on which the calculation of land requirement (ie new sites) has been carried out. Table 4-5 above reproduces the typical throughputs and landtakes for various waste management operations set out in the London Plan. This is clearly a snap shot view as facility sizes as throughputs and landtakes vary and Table 4-7 compares London Plan figures with the ranges of throughputs and landtakes for the various technologies that have been developed throughout the UK. This indicates that while the calculation based on the London Plan provides a robust approach to identifying the requirement for new sites, there is flexibility within the identified new sites requirement based on experience in the UK.

Table 4-7 – Comparison of London Plan and UK range of facility sizes and landtakess

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>London Plan</th>
<th>UK Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Throughput (ktpa)</td>
<td>Landtake (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRF</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBT</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasification/pyrolysis</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10.6 The calculation basis for the North London Waste Plan has been to assume that existing waste treatment facilities are operating at 75 of their licensed capacity (in-line with the methodology used to calculate apportionment in the London Plan). This
represents some flexibility within the North London Waste Plan and supports the assumption that existing safeguarded treatment sites can be intensified.

4.10.7 Waste transfer stations are safeguarded for re-orientation. This means that, during the life of the Plan, they can continue in waste management use as a transfer station or, as the market changes, be redeveloped for waste management uses that are higher up the waste hierarchy. The same flexibility principle applies to transfer sites as it does to existing sites and new sites.

4.10.8 As identified in 4.1.4.2 above, the existing transfer stations can sometimes be small and therefore not particularly suitable for re-orientation. The analysis of the range of landtakes for various types and scale of waste management technology (Table 4-6) indicates that sites of <0.25ha are unlikely to be suitable for re-orientation and this is the basis on which the calculations in the Plan have been made. However, it is possible that some waste treatment capacity could be implemented on small sites; for example it has been estimated that a 10,000tpa anaerobic digestion plant could be built on a site of 0.15ha\textsuperscript{20}. Therefore the approach used in the Plan includes an element of flexibility as any small transfer sites, not included in the >0.25ha calculation, that are re-orientated will be incorporated in the annual monitoring of the Plan.

4.10.9 It is important to note that just because a site is safeguarded it does not automatically mean that planning permission for any waste management related activity of the site will be granted. Re-development of any site will still be subject to the relevant borough’s development control processes and require permitting by the Environment Agency.

4.11 How did we consider potential new sites?
4.11.1 To meet the apportionment we need to identify some potential new sites. We used sources set out in 4.9.3 to find a list of new sites which we then assessed and scored against the criteria, which had been through a sustainability assessment as discussing in section 3, to determine which were the most suitable sites for waste use. The list of potential new sites was reduced by removing:

- safeguarded sites

- sites deemed unsuitable including North London Business Park and Blackhorse Lane

4.11.2 Sites were deemed unsuitable for various reasons including: sites designated for residential use, sites recently developed, sites recently adopted for new transport

interchange, and sites already having planning permission for non-waste use. It was decided that few, if any, of these types of sites would realistically come forward for waste use within the timeframe of the Plan. See Technical Report for the full long list of sites and reasons for removal from the list.

4.11.3 As part of the identification of sites, we have already started to consider the deliverability of sites – that is whether a site, which is potentially suitable for waste management use under the assessment criteria, is likely to become available for waste management use during the life of the Plan. Consequently we have written to the owners and operators of the 30 best sites that the assessment process identified and asked them for their opinions of site deliverability. To date the response rate has been low and this work will be continued through the course of the consultation process. However, where multiple landowners (for example in excess of 30 landowners for a given site) have been identified from Land Registry enquiries the sites have been discounted as it is unlikely that all the landowners will agree to the site coming forward.

4.12 What site assessment criteria did we use?

4.12.1 We needed to develop some criteria against which we could assess the potential new sites. We asked you whether you thought the site assessment criteria identified in Planning Policy Statement 10 and the London Plan should be used to identify new waste sites or whether they should be supplemented by local criteria.

4.12.2 What you told us: There was a mixed response on this with some people of the opinion that the criteria were sufficient whilst others thought that more locally specific criteria should be used. Other suggestions were to include positive criteria such as energy and employment opportunities.

4.12.3 Our preferred option is to use the site assessment criteria identified in Planning Policy Statement 10 and the London Plan as a basis and to add to this with locally specific criteria including protecting allotments and open space. We also used criteria based on the opportunities to be gained from waste management facilities such as decentralised energy and employment.

4.12.4 The site assessment criteria consisted of a three stage process:

4.12.4.1 **Showstoppers**
These included sites of national or international conservation interest, green belt, Metropolitan Open Land, allotments, flood zone 3b and listed buildings. Any sites that contained a ‘showstopper’ were removed from the list.

4.12.4.2 **Computer based criteria**
These included proximity to Nature Conservation, archaeological features, flood zones 3 and 2, historic land and buildings, Public Rights of Way and conservation areas where a higher score was given the further a site was from these areas.

Positive criteria were proximity to Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), railheads and navigable waterways/canals, areas of high unemployment and
decentralised energy opportunities. Each site was scored higher based on its proximity to the areas identified.

4.12.4.3 Site visit criteria
These included site configuration, existing uses/buildings on site, visual intrusion on surrounding area and potential for advantageous co-location of facilities with existing industrial, commercial or mixed use developments.

In addition proximity to residential areas, schools and hospitals, site access from trunk roads, routing of vehicles to site, eg. conflict with residential roads, and roads past schools were also considered at this stage. A higher score was given the further a site was from these areas and if access was considered suitable and did not conflict with residential areas.

4.12.5 The weighting of some specific criteria was undertaken to ensure that the most suitable sites to enable a positive contribution to the future of waste management in North London would come forward. Each of the scores under the weighted criteria were multiplied by 3 to ensure that the final score on these criteria was 3 times greater than for other criteria. The criteria weighted were:

- proximity to railheads and navigable waterways/canals,
- proximity to decentralised energy opportunities,
- proximity (ie sites not near) to residential areas, schools and hospitals and
- routing of vehicles to site e.g. conflict with residential roads, roads past schools.

4.12.6 Alternative options

- to use only the criteria in the London Plan and PPS10; this was rejected because of the need to identify locally specific criteria and take account of the public feedback.

4.13 Should we specify which technologies are suitable for each site?
4.13.1 A range of new waste facility types are required to enable north London to deal with more of its own waste. The different facilities use different technologies although larger sites offer opportunities for co-location of technologies. We asked you whether the Plan should specify which technologies are appropriate on each site identified or whether sites should be allocated for general waste use.

4.13.2 What you told us: You thought the best approach would be to specify certain technologies for some sites but that other sites would be suitable for a range of technologies.

4.13.3 Our preferred option is to allocate sites for general waste use as this will maximise flexibility within the market and allow for innovative, efficient technologies to be developed. By specifying waste technologies for specific sites, there is a risk that we
could lock in provision for technologies that become less efficient relative to emerging technologies. Waste management technologies can be of any size to suit the site and type of waste to be managed and therefore it is not appropriate to designate certain technologies to certain sites. A secondary consideration is that if a few sites were allocated for specific technologies there is a risk that the commercial value of these sites could be distorted which would restrict their ability to be developed.

4.13.4 By specifying certain sites for certain technologies there may also be a perception that planning permission will be granted for that technology on that site. This is clearly not the intention of the North London Waste Plan. For example, if a site had been identified for mechanical biological treatment it could potentially preclude the development of co-located facilities such as energy recovery as this would not fall within the designation of mechanical biological treatment. Equally the impacts of technologies vary widely both in terms of scale of operation and in terms of technology employed, which means that a technology designation on a site would still require the detailed assessments identified in 4.12.5, meaning that the technology designation (on the site) was of little practical benefit.

4.13.5 Much of the concern about technologies is related to their impacts. The impacts of all waste facilities will need to be managed through the planning process, through policy NLWP 3 in this Plan and through other policies in the boroughs’ planning documents. This may include the requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment or a Traffic Impact Assessment. The policies contained within the North London Waste Plan require prospective developers to have regard to the environment, amenity and residents of the area in which the site is located and within north London. Applications for waste facilities will also be subject to Environmental Permitting control by the Environment Agency.

4.13.6 Alternative options

- Allocate specific technology types to specific sites; this was rejected as it would stifle the market for development of the sites and would not account for advances in technologies in the future;

- Allocate sites that are suitable for a given range of specified technologies; this was rejected as this option offers limited flexibility in the development of sites and would not account for advances in technologies in the future

- Specify certain technology types for some sites but not others; this was rejected on the basis that it would potentially stifle the market with regard to development of certain sites and could affect the market value of sites.

4.14 How should we determine the number, size and distribution of sites?

4.14.1 Decisions regarding the number, size and distribution of sites have important economic, social and environmental implications. We asked you what you thought the best approach was for determining the number, size and distribution of new
waste facilities and whether we should adopt a centralised, a de-centralised or a hybrid approach to facilities.

4.14.2 What you told us: The majority of you thought that a range of larger and smaller sites would be the best option with sub-regional clusters of larger sites and a larger number of smaller sites.

4.14.3 Our preferred option is to allocate a range of larger and smaller sites (the hybrid approach). This includes larger sites, benefiting from the advantages of co-location of facilities with smaller sites supplying waste to them or providing opportunities for smaller scale facilities providing a more localised service.

4.14.4 The preferred option can meet the site requirements of the North London Waste Authority who, as explained in 4.7.1 are after three large sites and a number of smaller sites. The large sites will allow facilities to be co-located and share infrastructure such as weighbridges, thus making better use of available land. In terms of specific sites identified in Schedule C, two of the sites that the North London Waste Authority are considering as part of their Outline Business Case have come out well in our assessment and are identified in the list in Schedule C. The third site they are considering is not deliverable as it is identified in the emerging Enfield Core Strategy as a strategic site for mixed development. Instead we have identified two further large new sites that could meet the needs of the North London Waste Authority or other waste developers.

4.14.5 In addition the North London Waste Authority has identified a need for a number of smaller sites that could be used as Household Waste Recycling Centres in Enfield and Barnet. An additional number of smaller sites in these areas are identified in Schedule C.

4.14.6 Identifying a mix of sites gives the best approach as it meets the needs of the North London Waste Authority for both large and small sites and provides some flexibility in terms of provision of sites for private developers.

4.14.7 The use of existing sites means that it is difficult to enable an equal geographic spread of sites across all seven north London boroughs. In addition, the criteria used to assess whether sites were suitable for waste management (section 4.11) considered a range of environmental, social and transport issues which meant that the most suitable sites were mainly in industrial areas, away from open land and green spaces. Generally speaking industrial areas are not equally spread across all seven boroughs and therefore an equal geographic spread of suitable sites was not possible.
4.14.8 In April 2009 the Mayor published “A new plan for London – Proposals for the Mayor’s London Plan”\textsuperscript{21}, which identified a “move towards fewer larger waste sites – protecting existing waste sites and work collaboratively with boroughs to identify strategic sites with waste management potential to capitalise on economic opportunities”. The impact of this generally supports the hybrid approach with a mix of larger and smaller sites providing a range of sites for differing waste management technologies. Additionally the Annual Monitoring Report will provide a mechanism for the Plan to monitor the development of waste management facilities and ensure that development policies are implemented correctly.

4.14.9 Alternative options

- Allocate a smaller number of large sites: While this option could go some of the way to meeting the requirements of the North London Waste Authority it would not meet their need for smaller sites as well. This option was also rejected because it would add to the distance that waste would travel and because it could lead to a concentration of facilities in particular areas.

- Allocate a larger number of smaller sites: Identification of further small sites would not meet the needs of the North London Waste Authority and there would be no benefits from co-location. This was also rejected as we believe it will stifle the market for innovative new waste management solutions for north London by restricting the scale of individual developments.

4.15 Sustainable transport

4.15.1 While waste will continue to be predominantly carried by road, there are possibilities within north London to use rail and water transport. We asked you what you thought was the most suitable method relating to the sustainable transport of waste.

4.15.2 What you told us: The majority of you thought that we should prioritise sites offering a range of transport alternatives including rail, road and water.

4.15.3 Our preferred option is to prioritise sites which have access to alternative transport. We have done this by positively weighting the scores relating to railheads and navigable waterways within the site assessment. The site assessment also takes account of sites near to main trunk roads and routing of vehicles to site.

4.15.4 Alternative options:

- Do nothing to encourage alternative transport methods and assess the opportunity of alternative transport at the planning application stage; this was

rejected as not providing a strategic lead for north London but moving the decision making process down to the borough level.

- Prioritise sites at locations providing access to just main arterial roads or other significant roads; these were both rejected as they would not encourage developers to think about reducing road transport and sustainability impacts of transport on waste management activities.
5 Policies to deliver the North London Waste Plan

5.1 How should developers use the North London Waste Plan?

5.1.1 Developers proposing waste management facilities within north London must apply for planning permission from the borough in which the intended development site lies. Each borough has its own local development control management policies which the application must be in compliance with. In addition to this the North London Waste Plan has developed five complementary policies. Developers and planning applicants should ensure that their proposals are in compliance with the borough’s local development management policies, the policies contained in the North London Waste Plan and with the Mayor’s London Plan.

5.1.2 The “North London Boroughs” are the London Boroughs of:

- Barnet,
- Camden,
- Enfield,
- Hackney,
- Haringey,
- Islington, and
- Waltham Forest.

5.1.3 Waste developments are usually in the B2 and B8 use classes but may also be in the B1 or sui generis category. Applicants should also be aware that, under the Mayor of London Order (2008)\(^\text{22}\), certain classes of waste development are referable to the Mayor and that as a result further pieces of information may be required at planning application stage.

---

5.2 Policy NLWP 1 – Location of waste development

5.2.1 The North London Waste Plan identifies a requirement for new waste facilities to be provided so that the level of waste in the Apportionment set out in the Mayor’s London Plan can be managed in the North London Boroughs. Policy NLWP 1 sets out how the location of those facilities will be determined in line with the targets and aspirations set out in the London Plan and directs developers first to existing safeguarded sites before considering potential new sites for waste management use as identified in the plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy NLWP 1 – Location of waste development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In assessing proposals for the development of waste management facilities, the North London Boroughs will require that the following sequential test has been applied:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Developers have first considered sites in Schedule A for continued and, where appropriate, intensification of waste use on existing waste management sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 If it can be demonstrated that there are no suitable, reasonably available sites in Schedule A, consideration should then be given to the development of waste management facilities on existing waste transfer stations set out in Schedule B. Applications that re-orientate the transfer facility into a waste management facility are encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 An application will only be considered for sites in Schedule C if it can be demonstrated that no suitable sites exist in Schedules A and B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 An application for waste development on a site not identified in Schedules A, B and C will only be considered when:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The developer can demonstrate that none of the sites listed in Schedules A, B and C are suitable for the proposed development;
- Existing waste management sites and sites permitted for waste management use will not meet the apportionment required by the London Plan;
- There are demonstrable sustainability benefits from bringing the site into waste use.

- The developer can demonstrate that the site is suitable for waste facilities |

5.2.2 The need for the North London Boroughs to identify 28.4ha of land to meet the apportionment is set out in section 4 of the Plan.

5.2.3 The Boroughs will be monitoring waste arisings, the take up of waste sites and other changes to waste capacity in North London in the North London Waste Plan Annual Monitoring Report. Developers are required to set out how their facility will contribute
to meeting the North London Boroughs’ apportionment of waste as set out in the London Plan and how it fits into the annual monitoring review of the North London Waste Plan. Developers need to demonstrate that there is a continuing need for their proposed waste facility to deal with North London’s waste.

5.2.4 Preference will be given to developments on existing waste management sites identified in Schedule A. This makes best use of land currently already in waste management use. In the London Plan (paragraph 4.71) waste is deemed to be managed if:

- it is used for energy recovery in London (e.g. through anaerobic digestion, pyrolysis/gasification or through existing incinerators), or
- it is compost or recyclate sorted or bulked in London material recycling facilities for reprocessing either in London or elsewhere

5.2.5 In appropriate local circumstances intensification of waste uses may be permitted on safeguarded sites. However there may be cases where intensification of use is not appropriate because of the land uses in the surrounding area.

5.2.6 Existing waste transfer stations are set out in Schedule B. North London currently has 15.3ha of land concerned with the transfer of waste to landfill out of North London. In line with London’s increasing self-sufficiency, and the increased recycling and recovery of waste within the capital, this transfer capacity can be re-orientated to actively managing waste rather than transferring it out of London. Applications for such re-orientation of use are therefore encouraged and will help to meet the Apportionment targets for North London.

5.2.7 In Schedule C the North London Boroughs have identified 25.7 hectares of land with the potential to accommodate new waste facilities. This is required because there is insufficient capacity from the re-orientation of transfer station use to meet the apportionment and to provide some flexibility, including enabling new facilities to be built while existing facilities continue in operation. The sites in Schedule C do not represent an entitlement to develop for waste use. Developers of these sites will need to demonstrate that sites in Schedules A and B are not available or not suitable for the proposed use. In applying the sequential test, developers need to provide evidence of the work they have undertaken to identify suitable sites in Schedules A and B demonstrating why it is not appropriate for their proposal to operate on any of these sites.

5.2.8 Only in exceptional circumstances will development of waste facilities be permitted on sites not allocated for waste use within the North London Waste Plan. The plan schedules identify a number of sites safeguarded and allocated for waste use in North London. These sites are either safeguarded through the London Plan or have gone through a number of assessments to test their suitability. Developers must demonstrate the steps they have taken to consider development on sites given in Schedules A, B and C and set out how each site is inappropriate for the operation of
their proposed development. They must also set out how the local area would benefit from the development of a waste facility on that site. Developers should demonstrate that the site is suitable for waste facilities taking into account the criteria for the location of waste sites set out in Planning Policy Statement 10, in the London Plan and the North London Waste Plan site assessment criteria set out in Appendix 5.

5.3 Policy NLWP 2 – Safeguarding and protection of existing sites

5.3.1 If North London is to make its fair contribution to London’s self-sufficiency, it is vital that it safeguards and protects its current waste sites. This is also required by the London Plan.

**Policy NLWP 2 – Safeguarding and protection of existing sites**

Land accommodating existing waste management and waste transfer uses in North London will be safeguarded for continued use as waste facilities (Schedules A and B). Sites in Schedule C are also allocated for potential waste use. Other forms of development in all three schedules will not be considered unless compensatory and equal provision of sites, in scale and quality, is made elsewhere within the North London Boroughs.

Proposals for adjoining sites within Schedules A, B or C should have regard to potential waste uses or intensification of existing uses on these sites.

5.3.2 Schedule A contains a list of sites in the Boroughs in current waste management use using the London Plan definition. Schedule B contains a list of sites used as waste transfer facilities. All these sites are safeguarded for waste use in the London Plan. The safeguarded waste sites are established uses and are a valuable resource for dealing with waste generated in North London. Safeguarding the sites reduces the need for additional sites. The safeguarded sites may contain the potential to increase capacity or to provide a wider range of waste facilities on site. Schedule C contains a list of potential new sites for waste management use, allocated for such use through this Plan. It is necessary to safeguard these sites for waste use to ensure that the North London Boroughs can meet the Apportionment allocated to them in the London Plan.

5.3.3 This does not mean that flexibility does not exist to consider alternative developments on waste sites. There may be some existing sites that are unsuitable for any form of waste management use, other than existing use or where the replacement of operations to another location offers a more sustainable option. While existing transfer sites have been through a basic deliverability assessment to determine their suitability for redevelopment, it is accepted that these sites may not always be appropriate. There is a presumption that such sites are safeguarded but if they are to be developed for alternative use, developers need to demonstrate that provision, equal in both scale and quality, is provided within the North London Boroughs. There will be no net loss in the amount of North London waste capacity.
5.3.4 Introducing incompatible land uses in the vicinity of the safeguarded waste sites prejudices the expansion of existing, or the development of, new waste facilities in the future.

5.3.5 Re-processing and re-manufacturing capacity for waste materials is a vital part of efficient resource management. The North London Boroughs will consider favourably proposals in suitable locations for re-processing and re-manufacturing especially where they can demonstrate that they are prioritising material supplies from North and Greater London whilst not reducing the overall capacity of the waste management systems in North London.

5.4 Policy NLWP 3 – Ensuring High Quality Development

5.4.1 Modern, correctly sited, well designed and well operated and managed waste facilities need not have significant negative impacts on the local environment. Policy NLWP 3 seeks to provide a set of criteria for ensuring that such impact is minimised and managed as far as is practicable in order to meet public concerns. Policy NLWP 3 also seeks to ensure that developers demonstrate that design considerations have been built into their proposals and that negative impacts have been mitigated. This policy needs to be read in conjunction with policies in borough development plan documents and is not an exhaustive list of issues to be considered or assessments required.

**Policy NLWP 3 – Ensuring High Quality Development**

Waste development proposals, including those on the existing sites given in Schedules A and B, will be required to demonstrate that:

- adequate means of controlling noise, dust, litter, odours and other emissions are incorporated into the scheme;

- there is no significant adverse effect on the established, permitted or allocated land uses likely to be affected by the development;

- the development is of a scale, form and character appropriate to its location and incorporates a high quality of design; to be demonstrated through the submission of a design and access statement;

- active consideration has been given to the transportation of waste by modes other than road, principally by water and rail. A Transport Impact Assessment will need to demonstrate that there are no unacceptable transport effects outside or inside the site as a result of the development;

- The development makes a contribution to climate change adaptation and mitigation to be demonstrated through the submission of a sustainable design and construction statement;

- The development has no significant adverse effects on local biodiversity and
that there are no likely significant impacts or adverse effects affecting the integrity of an area designated under the Habitats Directive;

- that there will be no significant impact on the quality of surface and groundwater and that the development does not increase flood risk in line with PPS25;

- that there is no adverse impact on health to be demonstrated through the submission of a Health Impact Assessment.

5.4.2 Noise, dust, litter, odours and other impacts have been a major concern of the public consultation. However, well sited, and well managed facilities can ensure such impacts are minimised. Details of controls for emissions from the site need to be supplied with the application. Planning conditions will be used to secure measures to address these issues where necessary and where control is not already exercised through site permitting (as administered by the Environment Agency). The North London Boroughs expect that any development can safely complement surrounding uses.

5.4.3 The North London Boroughs expect well controlled and well designed waste facilities to be able to fit in with surrounding land uses and to act as a good neighbour. The North London Boroughs will require sufficient controls so that there is no adverse impact on the surrounding area.

5.4.4 Good design is fundamental to the development of high quality waste infrastructure and the North London Boroughs seek innovative approaches, where appropriate, to deliver high quality designs and safe and inclusive environments. The design and access statement should set out how the development takes on board good practice such as the Defra/CABE guidance "Designing waste facilities – a guide to modern design in waste". The design statement should set out how the siting and appearance complements the existing topography and vegetation. Materials and colouring need to be appropriate to the location.

5.4.5 The design statement should set out how landscape proposals can be incorporated as an integral part of the overall development of the site and how the development contributes to the quality of the wider urban environment. There should be no unacceptable adverse effect on areas or features of landscape, historic or nature conservation value nor unacceptable adverse effect on the recreational or tourist use of an area, or the use of existing public access or rights of way.

5.4.6 Waste and recyclables require transportation at various stages of their collection and management. North London is characterised by heavy transport use on all principal roads. That is why the developers need to make every endeavour to use non-road forms of transport if at all possible and to set this out in a Transport Impact Assessment. In North London there exists considerable potential for sustainable transport of waste as part of the waste management process. There are a number of railway lines and navigable waterways in North London including the Regents Canal and the Lee Navigation. It is existing practice to transport waste by train and pilot projects have taken place to transport waste by water. Developers should demonstrate that they have considered the potential to use water and rail to transport waste.

5.4.7 The Transport Impact Assessment will need to demonstrate that access arrangements are adequate for the volume and nature of traffic generated by the proposal and that no unacceptable safety hazards for other road users, cyclists or pedestrians would be generated. It should set out how the level of traffic generated would not exceed the capacity of the local road network and that no unacceptable adverse impact upon existing highway conditions in terms of traffic congestion and parking would arise. The assessment should also show that there are adequate arrangements for on-site vehicle manoeuvring, parking and loading/unloading areas and that any adverse traffic impacts that would arise from the proposal can be satisfactorily mitigated by routing controls or other highway improvements. The assessment should also set out how the user of greener vehicles will contribute to lessening impacts. The production of a Green Travel Plan may be required.

5.4.8 The North London Boroughs expect a high standard of sustainable design, construction and operation of waste management development. The sustainable design and construction statement should set out how the development proposes to combat climate change and promote energy and resource efficiency during construction and operation. The layout and orientation of the site together with the energy and materials to be used can make a large impact on the long term sustainability of the development. Consideration should be given to use of an approved sustainability metric such as BREEAM or CEEQUAL to demonstrate a high level of performance. Site Waste Management Plans will also be required to be produced and approved prior to the commencement of construction of the development.

5.4.9 Waste developments should be designed to protect and enhance local biodiversity. No development will be allowed that will have likely significant impacts on any area designated under the Habitats Directive. Assessments undertaken for the plan have identified sites of European Community importance within and nearby the plan area. Sites at least partially within the plan boundary are the Lee Valley Special Protection Area (SPA) and RAMSAR site and part of Epping Forest Special Area for
Conservation (SAC). Additional sites at least partially within 10 km of the plan area boundary are Wormley-Hoddesdon Park Woods SAC and Wimbledon Common SAC. Developers need to be able to demonstrate that impacts on any of these sites are acceptable. In addition there are six Sites of Special Scientific Interest and 20 Local Nature Reserves. Developers should take note of existing Biodiversity Action Plans, protect existing features and promote enhancement for example through the use of green walls where acoustic barriers are required.

5.4.10 The North London Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) has demonstrated the risks from flooding from various sources across North London. Where a site is near or adjacent to areas of flood risk, the development is expected to contribute through design to a reduction in flood risk in line with PPS25. Waste facilities are often characterised by large areas of hardstanding for vehicles and large roof areas. Developments will be required to show that flood risk has not been increased as part of the development and, where possible, has been reduced overall. Policy NLWP 3 seeks to ensure that developers demonstrate the extent to which their proposals make the most efficient use of water resources and that there would be no significant impact on the nature conservation and amenity value of rivers and wetlands.

5.4.11 Developers of waste facilities will need to demonstrate through a Health Impact Assessment that the proposed facility will not have an adverse impact on health in the area. If the proposed waste development is required to have an Environmental Impact Assessment, then a Health Impact Assessment is also required.

5.5 Policy NLWP 4 – Decentralised energy

5.5.1 New waste management and recycling methods can reduce the impacts of climate change through more efficient use of resources. Waste facilities can further contribute through the provision of decentralised energy. Decentralised energy can make a significant contribution to reducing London’s carbon emissions and the tackling of climate change.

Policy NLWP 4 – Decentralised energy

All waste facilities that are capable of directly producing energy or a fuel must secure:

1. the local use of any excess heat in either an existing heat network or through the creation of a new network;

2. the utilisation of biogas/syngas in Combined Heat and Power facilities, either directly through piped supply or indirectly through pressurisation and

---

24 Information on European site descriptions is obtainable from the Joint Nature Conservation Committee http://www.jncc.gov.uk/
3. the utilisation of any solid recovered fuel in Combined Heat and Power facilities or as a direct replacement for fossil fuels in London

4. any other contribution to decentralised energy in London

Unless it can be demonstrated that this is not economically feasible or technically practicable, in which case the development shall not preclude the future implementation of such systems.

5.5.2 The Mayor’s Climate Change Action Plan and the London Plan seek to achieve 25% of London’s energy to be supplied through decentralised energy by 2025 rising to 50% by 2050 and that new developments deliver 20% carbon reductions through the provision of on-site renewable energy sources. Energy from waste is identified as making a 15% contribution by 2025 to carbon dioxide savings in London’s energy supply.

5.5.3 Many modern waste processing facilities produce waste heat that could be used in district heating schemes, thus adding to the Capital’s decentralised energy target. A decentralised energy system is one which produces energy near to where it is used, thereby avoiding the inefficiencies of traditional power stations. Additionally, many of these facilities, if processing waste with a high bio-mass content in order to generate energy, can be classed as ‘renewable’ energy technology and could contribute to a development’s 20% renewable target if directly supplying energy to a new development.

5.5.4 Planning applications should include an assessment of the energy generating possibilities and the feasibility of the development to contribute to decentralised energy in London. Even if current circumstances do not allow provision of district heating, combined heat and power or combined cooling heat and power, facilities should be designed in such a way that it is able to provide this in the future.

5.6 Policy NLWP 5 – Provision of capacity for the management of Construction, Demolition and Excavation wastes

5.6.1 The London Plan requires that boroughs make provision towards self-sufficiency for the management of all wastes including construction, demolition and excavation waste and hazardous waste.

---

5.6.2 A large proportion of London’s waste stream is composed of construction and demolition waste. It is important that as much as possible is kept out of landfill. The majority of this waste is recycled and reused on site due to the high costs of landfill and transportation. This trend will continue and increase as landfill costs, primary aggregate costs and transport costs all rise in the future. It is now commonplace for well managed development sites to achieve on site recycle and reuse rates of over 90%.

5.6.3 The North London Waste Plan does not therefore need to make any additional sites provision for this waste stream. However, in order to ensure that an increasing proportion of construction and demolition waste is re-used and recycled, this policy is required to confirm the intention that North London Boroughs will require all specified development to set aside land during demolition and/or construction phases for temporary facilities to enable high rates of recycling and re-use.
6 Glossary

Anaerobic Digestion (AD) A process whereby biodegradable material is broken down in the absence of air (oxygen). Material is placed into a closed vessel and in controlled conditions it breaks down into digested material and biogas.

Apportionment Please see ‘London Plan Apportionment’.

Area Action Plan Type of Development Plan Document focused on a specific location or area which guides development and improvements. It forms one component of a Local Development Framework.

Autoclave A method of sterilisation. Waste is loaded into a rotating sealed cylinder and the biodegradable fraction of this waste is then broken down by steam treatment into a homogeneous organic ‘fibre’.

Biodegradable Biodegradable materials are generally organic, such as plant and animal matter and other substances originating from living organisms. They can be chemically broken down by naturally occurring micro-organisms into simpler compounds. Waste which contains organic material can decompose producing bio-gas, leachate and other by-products.

Biodegradable Municipal Waste (BMW) The proportion of waste from households that is capable of undergoing natural decomposition such as paper and cardboard, garden and food waste. Typically BMW makes up around 68% of residual municipal solid waste (MSW).

Civic Amenity Site (CAS) Facilities where members of the public can bring a variety of household waste for recycling or disposal. Materials accepted include, for example, paper, plastic, metal, glass and bulky waste such as tyres, refrigerators, electronic products, waste from DIY activities and garden waste. These sites are also known as ‘HWRCs’ (Household Waste Recycling Centres), or ‘RRCs’ (Reuse and Recycling Centres).

Climate Change Regional or global-scale changes in historical climate patterns arising from natural and/or man-made causes that produce an increasing mean global surface temperature.

Clinical Waste Waste arising from medical, nursing, veterinary, pharmaceutical, dental or related practices, where risk of infection may be present.

Combined Heat and Power (CHP) The combined production of heat (usually in the form of steam) and power (usually in the form of electricity). The heat is often used as hot water to serve a district-heating scheme.

Commercial Waste Waste produced from premises used solely or mainly, for the purpose of a trade or business or for sport, recreation or entertainment.
Commercial and Industrial Waste (C&I) Waste arising from business and industry. Industrial waste is waste generated by factories and industrial plants. Commercial waste is waste produced from premises used solely or mainly, for the purpose of a trade or business or for sport, recreation or entertainment and arising from the activities of traders, catering establishments, shops, offices and other businesses. Commercial and Industrial waste may for example include food waste, packaging and old computer equipment.

Composting A biological process which takes place in the presence of oxygen (ie it is aerobic) in which organic wastes, such as garden and kitchen waste are converted into a stable granular material. This can be applied to land to improve soil structure and enrich the nutrient content of the soil.

Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste (CD&E) Waste arising from the construction, maintenance, repair and demolition of roads, buildings and structures. It is mostly comprised of concrete, brick, stone and soil, but can also include metals, plastics, timber and glass.

Core Strategy A Local Development Document (which is also a Development Plan Document) which provides a written statement of the core policies for delivering the spatial strategy and vision for a borough, supported by a reasoned justification.

Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Government department with national responsibility for sustainable waste management amongst other things.

Development Management Document A set of criteria-based policies in accordance with the Core Strategy, against which planning applications for the development and use of land and buildings will be considered. Also known as Site Development Policies.

Development Plan Document (DPD) These are statutory local development documents prepared under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which set out the spatial planning strategy and policies for an area. They have the weight of development plan status and are subject to community involvement, public consultation and independent examination.

Energy from Waste (EfW) Energy that is recovered through thermally treating waste. EfW is also used to describe some thermal waste treatment plants.

Energy Recovery The combustion of waste under controlled conditions in which the heat released is recovered to provide hot water and steam (usually) for electricity generation (see also Recovery).

Environment Agency (EA) Environmental regulatory authority formed in 1996, combining the functions of the former National Rivers Authority, Waste Regulation Authorities and Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Pollution.
Environmental Permit (EP) A permit issued by the Environment Agency to regulate the operation of a waste management activity. Formerly known as a Waste Management Licence.

Examination Presided over by an Inspector or a Panel of Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State; this can consist of hearing sessions, or consideration of written representations to consider whether the policies and proposals of the local planning authority's Development Plan Documents are sound. Only persons who have made representations seeking change to a Development Plan Document at the submission stage are entitled to an oral hearing at the examination.

Gasification The thermal breakdown of organic material by heating waste in a low oxygen atmosphere to produce a gas. This gas is then used to produce heat/electricity.

Greater London Authority (GLA) The GLA is a unique form of strategic citywide government for London. It is made up of a directly elected Mayor – the Mayor of London - and a separately elected Assembly – the London Assembly.

Green Belt A planning designation to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Green Waste Organic waste from households, parks, gardens, wooded and landscaped areas such as tree prunings, grass clippings, leaves etc.

Greenhouse Gas A gas in the Earth's atmosphere that traps heat and can contribute to global warming. Examples include carbon dioxide and methane.

ha Hectare (10,000m² of area, which is equivalent to 2.47 acres).

Habitat Directive Assessment This is a requirement of the European Habitats Directive. Its purpose is to assess the impacts of plans and projects on internationally designated sites and nature conservation sites.

Hazardous Waste Waste that contains potentially damaging properties which may make it harmful to human health or the environment. It includes materials such as asbestos, fluorescent light tubes and lead-acid batteries. The European Commission has issued a Directive on the controlled management of hazardous waste; wastes are defined as hazardous on the basis of a list created under that Directive.

Household Waste Waste from a private dwelling or residential house or other such specified premises, and includes waste taken to household waste recycling centres.
Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) Facilities to which the public can bring household waste, such as bottles, textiles, cans, paper, green waste and bulky household items/waste for free disposal.

Incineration The burning of waste at high temperatures in the presence of sufficient air to achieve complete combustion, either to reduce its volume (in the case of municipal solid waste) or its toxicity (such as for organic solvents). Municipal solid waste incinerators can recover power and/or heat. Incinerators are often referred to as EfW (energy from waste) plants.

Industrial Business Park (IBP) Strategic employment location designed to accommodate general industrial, light industrial and research and development uses that require a higher quality environment and less heavy goods access than a Preferred Industrial Location.

Industrial Waste Waste from a factory or industrial process.

Inert Waste Waste that is not active – it does not decompose or otherwise change.

In-vessel Composting (IVC) Shredded waste is placed inside a chamber or container through which air is forced. This speeds up the composting process. It is a controlled process and is capable of treating both food and green waste by achieving the required composting temperatures. It is also known as enclosed composting.

Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) The development of a Municipal Waste Management Strategy is a dynamic process and results in a clear framework for the management of municipal waste, and waste from other sectors as appropriate. This sets out how authorities intend to optimise current service provision as well as providing a basis for any new systems or infrastructure that may be needed. The Strategy should act as an up to date, regularly reviewed, route-map for further investment required.

Kerbside Collection Any regular collection of recyclables from premises, including collections from commercial or industrial premises as well as from households. Excludes collection services delivered on demand.

ktpa kilo-tonnes per annum (a kilo-tonne is 1,000 tonnes).

Landfill The deposit of waste onto and into land, in such a way that pollution or harm to the environment is prevented and, through restoration, to provide land which may be used for another purpose.

Local Development Framework (LDF) A portfolio of local development documents that will provide the framework for delivering the spatial planning strategy and policies for an area.

Local Development Scheme (LDS) A document setting out the local planning authority’s intentions for its Local Development Framework; in particular, the
Local Development Documents it intends to produce and the timetable for their production and review.

**London Plan** This is the Spatial Development Strategy for London. This document was produced by the Mayor of London to provide a strategic framework for the boroughs’ Unitary Development Plans. It will perform this function in respect of Local Development Frameworks. It was first published in February 2004 and alterations have since been published in September 2006 and 2007 and February 2008. It has the status of a development plan under the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

**London Plan Apportionment** Allocates to each individual borough a given proportion of London’s total waste (expressed in tonnes) for which sufficient sites for managing and processing waste must be identified within their Local Development Frameworks.

**Materials Recycling Facility or Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)** A special sorting ‘factory’ where mixed recyclables are separated into individual materials prior to despatch to reprocessors who prepare the materials for manufacturing into new recycled products.

**Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT)** A combination of mechanical separation techniques and biological treatment – either aerobic or anaerobic, or a combination of the two, which are designed to recover value form and/or treat fractions of waste.

**Municipal Solid Waste (MSW)** Any waste collected by or on behalf of a local authority. For most local authorities the vast majority of this waste is from the households of their residents. Some is from local businesses and other organisations such as schools and the local authority’s own waste.

**North London Waste Authority (NLWA)** North London’s statutory waste disposal authority. The NLWA’s main function is to arrange the disposal of waste collected by its seven constituent boroughs. These boroughs are: Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest.

**North London Joint Waste Strategy** North London Waste Authority is currently preparing a new Joint Waste Strategy that will cover up to 2020. This strategy will be used to facilitate the procurement of new waste management services to increase recycling and recovery and divert more waste from

---

26 A full copy of *The London Plan (consolidated with changes sine 2004)*, published in February 2008 can be downloaded from http://www.london.gov.uk/thelondonplan/docs/londonplan08.pdf

27 The latest version of the Strategy can be downloaded from http://www.nlondon-waste.gov.uk/resources/the_north_london_joint_waste_strategy
landfill. It will be used to design the new North London Waste Authority integrated waste management contract that is due to be let when the current contract ends in 2014.


**Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS10)** Guidance documents produced by central government relating to ‘Planning for Sustainable Waste Management’ which set out a number of key concepts which should be considered and statutory requirements of local and regional planning policy documents.


**Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25)** Guidance documents produced by central government relating to ‘Development and Flood Risk’ which aims to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct development away from areas of highest risk.

**Preferred Industrial Location (PIL)** Strategic employment site normally suitable for general industrial, light industrial and warehousing uses.

**Pyrolysis** The heating of waste in a closed environment, in the absence of oxygen, to produce a secondary fuel product.

**Railhead** This is a terminus of a railway line that interfaces with another transport mode e.g. road network.

**RAMSAR** Sites which are wetlands of international importance designated under the Ramsar Convention.

**Recovery** The process of extracting value from waste materials, including recycling, composting and energy recovery.

**Recycling** Recovering re-usable materials from waste or using a waste material for a positive purpose.

**Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF)** Material produced from waste that has undergone processing. Processing can include separation of recyclables and non-combustible materials, shredding, size reduction, and pelletising.

**Re-use** The re-use of materials in their original form, without any processing other than cleaning.

**Re-use and Recycling Centre (RRC)** Facilities to which the public can bring household waste, such as bottles, textiles, cans, paper, green waste and bulky household items/waste for free disposal.
**Scoping** The process of deciding the scope and level of detail of the strategic environmental assessment (SEA) or environmental impact assessment (EIA) which might be required to support a planning application.

**Self-sufficiency** Dealing with wastes within the administrative region where they are produced.

**Site Development Policies** A set of criteria-based policies in accordance with the Core Strategy, against which planning applications for the development and use of land and buildings will be considered. To set out all qualifying site allocations other than those contained in Area Action Plans.

**Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)** A specifically defined area which protects ecological or geological features.

**Spatial Planning** Spatial Planning goes beyond traditional land use planning to bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function.

**Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF)** These are solid fuels (also known as ‘Refuse Derived Fuels’ – RDF) prepared from non-hazardous waste to be utilised for energy recovery.

**Sound (Soundness)** tbc

**Special Protection Areas (SPA)** A SSSI considered to be of international importance designated under the EC Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds.

**Strategic Employment Locations (SELs)** These comprise Preferred Industrial Locations, Industrial Business Parks and Science Parks and exist to ensure that London provides sufficient quality sites, in appropriate locations, to meet the needs of the general business, industrial and warehousing sectors.

**Sub-Regions** Sub-regions are the primary geographical features for implementing strategic policy at the sub-regional level.

**Sustainable Waste Management** Using material resources efficiently to cut down on the amount of waste we produce and, where waste is generated, dealing with it in a way that actively contributes to economic, social and environmental goals of sustainable development.

**Sustainability Appraisal (SA)** A formal process which analyses and evaluates the environmental, social and economic impacts of a plan or programme.

**Sustainability Appraisal Commentary** A commentary report that raises sustainability issues relating to the Issues and Options report.
**Sustainability Appraisal Panel (SAP)** An independent appraisal panel set by the seven north London boroughs to comment on and influence the North London Waste Plan preparation.

**Transport for London (TfL)** An integrated body responsible for the Capital's transport system. The primary role of TfL, which is a functional body of the Greater London Authority, is to implement the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy and manage transport services across London.

**Thermal Treatment** Treatment of waste using heat e.g. incineration, pyrolysis, gasification, etc.

**tpa** Tonnes per annum.

**Unitary Development Plan (UDP)** A type of development plan introduced in 1986, that is to be replaced by Local Development Frameworks.

**Waste Arising** The amount of waste generated in a given locality over a given period of time.

**Waste Collection Authority (WCA)** Organisation responsible for collection of household waste e.g. your local council.

**Waste Development Plan Document (WDPD)** Planning document which will provide a basis for the provision of waste management infrastructure in the sub-region e.g. the North London Waste Plan (see ‘North London Waste Plan’).

**Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)** Organisation responsible for disposing of municipal waste. For north London this is the North London Waste Authority (NLWA).

**Waste Hierarchy** An order of waste management methods, enshrined in European and UK legislation, based on their predicted sustainability. The hierarchy is summarised as “reduce (prevent), re-use, recycle/compost, recover, dispose”.

**Waste Management Capacity** The amounts of waste currently able to be managed (recycled, composted or recovered) by waste management facilities within north London.

**Waste Management Licence (WML)** The licence required by anyone who proposes to deposit, recover or dispose of controlled waste. These are now known as Environmental Permits.

**Waste Minimisation** Reducing the volume of waste that is produced. This is at the top of the Waste Hierarchy.
**Waste Planning Authority (WPA)** Local authority responsible for waste planning. In north London all seven boroughs form the Waste Planning Authority for their area.

**Waste Transfer Station** A facility where waste is delivered for sorting prior to transfer to another place e.g. landfill.
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## Appendix 1

### Schedule A – Existing Waste Management Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Southgate Metal Co Ltd</td>
<td>BR Goods Yard, N11 1QH, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L A L - G R S Ltd,</td>
<td>M1 Motorway, NW7 3HU, Barnet</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Fisher</td>
<td>Station Road, NW4 4PN, Barnet</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savecase Ltd</td>
<td>Colindeep Lane, NW9 6HD, Barnet</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Simpole &amp; Ronald Hall</td>
<td>Brownlow Road, E8 4NS, Hackney</td>
<td>Hackney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Life Vehicle Ltd</td>
<td>Montague Road Industrial Estate N18 3PH, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Metal Company</td>
<td>Theobalds Park Road, EN2 9BW, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Vehicle Disposal</td>
<td>Alexandra Road, EN3 3PH, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal &amp; Waste Recycling Group Ltd</td>
<td>Albert Works, Kenninghall Road, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressbay Ltd</td>
<td>Mollison Avenue, EN3 7NJ, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Anthony Edward, (Vehicle Dismantlers)</td>
<td>Montague Industrial Estate, N18 3PS, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polkacrest Ltd</td>
<td>The Ridgeway, EN2 8JL, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polkacrest Ltd</td>
<td>EcoPark, Advent Way, N18 3AG</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E L V Ltd</td>
<td>New Park Estate, N18, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasterboard Recycling UK Ltd</td>
<td>Harbet Road, N18 3HT, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea Valley Motors Ltd</td>
<td>Second Avenue, N18 2PG, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcorn Ltd</td>
<td>White Hart Lane, N17 8DP, Haringey</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Community Projects</td>
<td>Ashley Road, N17 9LJ, Haringey</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantwood Auto Breakers Ltd</td>
<td>Brantwood Road, N17 0DT, Haringey</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Plant Ltd</td>
<td>Lower Hall Lane, E4 8JG, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LondonWaste Composting Facility</td>
<td>EcoPark, Advent Way, N18 3AG</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenstar MRF (received planning permission)</td>
<td>Ardra Way, Enfield,</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LondonWaste Incinerator</td>
<td>EcoPark, Advent Way, N18 3AG</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Waltham Forest</td>
<td>Kings Road, Chingford, E4</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Barnet</td>
<td>Summers Lane, N12 0RF</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Enfield</td>
<td>Barrowell Green, N21 3AR</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule A – Existing Waste Management Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Camden</td>
<td>Regis Road Recycling Centre, Kentish Town, NW5 3EW</td>
<td>Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey Council</td>
<td>Park View Road, N17 9AY</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Islington</td>
<td>Hornsey Street, N7 8HU</td>
<td>Islington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Waltham Forest</td>
<td>Gateway Road, E10 5BY</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Waltham Forest</td>
<td>South Access Rd, Walthamstow, E17 8AX</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey Council</td>
<td>Hornsey High Street</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD&amp;G parts for Rover</td>
<td>Argall Avenue</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantwood Auto Recycling</td>
<td>Willoughby Lane</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 B’s Motorcycles Ltd</td>
<td>Blackboy Lane</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseforce Metals</td>
<td>Staffa Road</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix 2

### Schedule B – Existing Waste Transfer Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste Recycling Group (WRG)</td>
<td>Solid Waste Transfer Station, Brent Terrace Hendon NW2 1LN</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LondonWaste</td>
<td>EcoPark, Advent Way, London N18 3AG</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bywaters</td>
<td>Gateway Road, E10 5BY</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem'cy Contractors Ltd</td>
<td>Staffa Road, E10 7PY</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cripps Skips Limited</td>
<td>Brent Terrace, NW2 1LR, Barnet</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBN Services Ltd</td>
<td>Church Road, E10 7JN</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P B Donoghue (Haulage &amp; Plant Hire) Ltd</td>
<td>Shannon Close, NW2 1RR</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern Brothers (Haulage) Ltd</td>
<td>26-27 Brent Terrace, Claremont Ind. estate, NW2 1BG</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Waste (Tuglord Enterprises Ltd)</td>
<td>Stacey Avenue, N18 3PH</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerday Plc</td>
<td>Jeffreys Road, EN3 7UA</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Plant Ltd</td>
<td>Nobel Road, Eley Ind. Estate, N18 3BH</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Waste Disposal Ltd</td>
<td>Greenwood House, EN3 7PJ</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biffa Waste Services Ltd</td>
<td>Garman Road, N17 0UN</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Donovan (Waste Disposal) Ltd</td>
<td>Markfield Road, N15 4QF</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters Haulage</td>
<td>Oakleigh Road South, N11 1HJ</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LondonWaste</td>
<td>Hornsey Street, Off Holloway Road, London N7</td>
<td>Islington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Hackney</td>
<td>Millfields Road Depot, Millfields Road, E5 0AR</td>
<td>Hackney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Skips Ltd</td>
<td>Theobalds Park Road, EN2 9BH, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Tyre Disposals Ltd</td>
<td>Phoenix Wharf, N18 3QX, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Hygiene Services Ltd</td>
<td>Princes Road, N18 3PR, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polkacreast Ltd</td>
<td>LondonWaste Eco Park, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBN Services</td>
<td>Oakleigh Road South, N11 1HJ</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule B – Existing Waste Transfer Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunt Skips</td>
<td>Commercial Rd, Edmonton N18 1SY</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J O’ Doherty Haulage</td>
<td>Pegamoid Site, Nobel Rd, Edmonton London N18 3BH</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Waste Recycling Ltd</td>
<td>Hastingwood Trading Estate, Harbet Rd, Edmonton N18 3HR</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARNET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFIELD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACKNEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARINGEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTHAMFORD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix 3

#### Schedule C – Potential Waste Management Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail land at Aerodrome Road</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site on Edgware Rd and Geron Way</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory Park</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building premises, Kynoch Road</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makanji House, Kynoch Road</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinbridge Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobel Road</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friern Barnet former Sewage Treatment Works (Pinkham Way)</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Lane</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigg Approach</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total area                 | 25.7 ha          |

*Note: Sites are presents Alphabetically in Borough order*
Appendix 4 – Existing Waste Capacity and Waste Arisings

1.1 Existing waste capacity

A list of licensed waste management facilities in the north London area was obtained from the Environment Agency. The list contained point data for the sites and from that we have estimated the land take of the facilities. The following 4 tables list the licensed waste management facilities, the Reuse and Recycling Centres, licensed waste transfer facilities and the incinerator. The tables also show the capacity of each facility. All facilities are safeguarded in the London Plan.

Further analysis of the transfer facilities was undertaken by using site plans to ascertain the area licensed for transfer activity and the overall potential for re-orientation of each site. See Appendix 2 for site information sheets on transfer facilities.

Table 1.1 Existing Waste management facilities in North London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Capacity (tonnes per annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Southgate Metal Co Ltd</td>
<td>BR Goods Yard, N11 1QH</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>289,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L A L - G R S Ltd,</td>
<td>M1 Motorway, NW7 3HU</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Fisher</td>
<td>Station Road, NW4 4PN</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savecase Ltd</td>
<td>Colindeep Lane, NW9 6HD</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>2,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Simpole &amp; Ronald Hall</td>
<td>Brownlow Road, E8 4NS</td>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Life Vehicle Ltd</td>
<td>Montague Road Industrial Estate, N18 3PH</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>20,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Metal Company</td>
<td>Theobalds Park Road, EN2 9BW</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Vehicle Disposal</td>
<td>Alexandra Road, EN3 3PH</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal &amp; Waste Recycling Group Ltd</td>
<td>Albert Works, Kenninghall Road</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>199,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressbay Ltd</td>
<td>Mollison Avenue, EN3 7NJ</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Edward Morris, (Vehicle Dismantlers)</td>
<td>Montague Industrial Estate, N18 3PS</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polkacrest Ltd</td>
<td>The Ridgeway, EN2 8JL</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>4,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E L V Ltd</td>
<td>New Park Estate, N18</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasterboard Recycling UK Ltd</td>
<td>Harbet Road, N18 3HT</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea Valley Motors Ltd</td>
<td>Second Avenue, N18 2PG</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>4,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polkacrest Ltd</td>
<td>EcoPark, Advent Way, N18 3AG</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Capacity (tonnes per annum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcorn Ltd</td>
<td>White Hart Lane, N17 8DP</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Community Projects</td>
<td>Ashley Road, N17 9LJ</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantwood Auto Breakers Ltd</td>
<td>Brantwood Road, N17 0DT</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Plant Ltd</td>
<td>Lower Hall Lane, E4 8JG</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>112,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonwaste Composting Facility</td>
<td>Londonwaste Eco Park</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenstar MRF (received planning permission)</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD&amp;G parts for Rover</td>
<td>Argall Avenue</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantwood Auto Recycling</td>
<td>Willoughby Lane</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 B’s Motorcycles Ltd</td>
<td>Blackboy Lane</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseforce Metals</td>
<td>Staffa Road</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Licensed capacity (tpa)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,178,534</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1.2 North London Reuse and Recycling Centres*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Capacity (tonnes per annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>E10 5BY</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Waltham Forest</td>
<td>South Access Rd, Walthamstow, E17 8AX</td>
<td>45,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey Council</td>
<td>Hornsey High Street</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Licensed capacity (tpa) 265,930
Total Licensed capacity minus 50% recycling 132,965

Table 1.3 Waste transfer facilities in north London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Licensed Transfer Area</th>
<th>Suitable for Re-orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste Recycling Group (WRG)</td>
<td>Solid Waste Transfer Station, Brent Terrace (off Tilling Road) Hendon NW2 1LN</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LondonWaste</td>
<td>EcoPark, Advent Way, London N18 3AG</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bywaters</td>
<td>Gateway Road, E10 5BY</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem’cy Contractors Ltd</td>
<td>Staffa Road, E10 7PY</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Tyre Disposals Ltd</td>
<td>Phoenix Wharf, N18 3QX</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Skips Ltd</td>
<td>Crews Hill Transfer Station, Kingswood Nursery, Theobalds Park Road, EN2 9BH</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cripps Skips Limited</td>
<td>Brent Terrace, NW2 1LR</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBN Services Ltd</td>
<td>Church Road, E10 7JN</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P B Donoghue (Haulage &amp; Plant Hire) Ltd</td>
<td>Shannon Close, NW2 1RR</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Hygiene Services Ltd</td>
<td>Princes Road, N18 3PR</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern Brothers</td>
<td>26-27 Brent Terrace, Claremont Ind. estate,</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Licensed Transfer Area</td>
<td>Suitable for Re-orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Haulage) Ltd</td>
<td>NW2 1BG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Waste (Tuglord Enterprises Ltd)</td>
<td>Stacey Avenue, N18 3PH</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerday Plc</td>
<td>Jeffrey's road, EN3 7UA</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Plant Ltd</td>
<td>Nobel Road, Eley Ind. Estate, N18 3BH</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Waste Disposal Ltd</td>
<td>Greenwood House, EN3 7PJ</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biffa Waste Services Ltd</td>
<td>Garman Road, N17 0UN</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Donovan (Waste Disposal) Ltd</td>
<td>Markfield Road, N15 4QF</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters Haulage</td>
<td>Oakleigh Road South, British Rail Sidings, Southgate, London N11 1HJ</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Waste</td>
<td>Hornsey Street, Off Holloway Road, London N7</td>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Hackney</td>
<td>Millfields Road Depot, Millfields Road, E5 0AR</td>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBN Services</td>
<td>Oakleigh Road South, N11 1HJ</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt Skips</td>
<td>Commercial Rd, Edmonton N18 1SY</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J O’ Doherty Haulage</td>
<td>Pegamoid Site, Nobel Rd, Edmonton London N18 3BH</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Waste Recycling Ltd</td>
<td>Hastingwood Trading Estate, Harbet Rd, Edmonton N18 3HR</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polkacrest Ltd</td>
<td>LondonWaste Eco Park, Enfield</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total licenced area of transfer facilities (ha) 15.30

Total area suitable for re-orientation 14.30
The total existing capacity has been counted as all sites except transfer facilities (Tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4). Reuse and Recycling Centres are considered as treatment facilities only in terms of the waste that is sent for recycling, therefore the capacity of the Sites has been taken as 50% as it is assumed that an average recycling rate of 50% is achieved across the sites.

1.2 Waste arisings data assumptions

1.2.1 Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) and Commercial and Industrial wastes (C&I)

1.2.2 The data used is taken from the London Plan which predicts the quantities of MSW and C&I wastes arising in each borough to 2020. The London Plan predicts waste annual waste growth of 2% and this assumption has been applied to estimate waste arisings for 2021.

1.2.3 Construction Demolition and Excavation Wastes (CDE)

1.2.4 A lack of sub-regional data required a crude apportionment of CDE waste arising in London to the North London boroughs. In 2005 8 million tonnes of CDE waste were produced in London1. This has been apportioned to north London on the basis of land area. London occupies 1587km² of land and north London occupies 263km² of land which proportionately means that north London produced approximately 1.5 million tonnes of CDE wastes in 2005.

1.2.5 Economic growth was considered as a means to predict the arisings of CDE but given that the UK is in economic recession, CDE waste arisings are increasingly decoupled from economic growth. It is also worth noting that CDE wastes are largely dealt with on site and the construction for the London Olympics is operating at a rate of 97% of CDE wastes recycled or reused on site.

1.2.6 Annual monitoring of the NLWP will pick up any updates in CDE arisings and amend the plan accordingly if necessary.

1.2.7 Hazardous wastes

1.2.8 Hazardous waste arisings for north London from 1999 to 2004 were obtained from the Environment Agency. The hazardous waste arisings differed greatly over the period and it was not possible to establish a robust rate of growth or decline.

---

1 Survey of Arisings and Use of Alternatives to Primary Aggregates in England, 2005
Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste, DCLG www.comunities.gov.uk
However a linear regression showed a slight overall decrease in arisings. The 2004 arisings amounted to 63,400 tonnes.

1.2.9 Annual monitoring of the NLWP will pick up any updates in hazardous waste arisings and amend the plan accordingly if necessary.
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This document contains a preliminary assessment of the impact on key social groups of the planning for waste facilities in North London up to 2020. If you require assistance with translation, please tick this box, add your name and address in the box at the bottom of this form and return to the address shown.

Albanian  □ Ky dokument përmban një vlerësim paraprak të impaktit ndaj grupeve kryesore shoqërore në planifikimin për pajisjet e mbeturinave të Londrës Veriore deri në 2020. Në qoftë se ju duhet ndihmë me përkthimin, lutemi shënoni (tick) këtë kuti, shkruani emrin dhe adresën tuaj tek kutia në fund të këtij formularit dhe dërgojeni tek adresa e dhënë.

Arabic  □ تحتوي هذه الوثيقة على تقييم أولي على تأثير التخطيط لمواقع النفايات في شمال لندن حتى 2020 على المجموعات الاجتماعية الأساسية. إن كنت بحاجة إلى ترجمة، ضع شارة في الإطار ووضع اسمك والعناوين في إطار السرير في أسفل هذه الإعلان وأرسلها إلى العنوان التالي.

Bengali  □ ২০২০ সাল পর্যন্ত লন্ডনে আর্জেন্টিনা সংঘাতে সুযোগ-সুযোগের ব্যাপারে পরিসংখ্যান তথ্যের সময় যোগসূত্র নিষিদ্ধ প্রথীত প্রধান সমাজিক সংগঠনের উদ্দেশ্য এই পরিসংখ্যানের মে চতুর্থ পর্যায়ে সীমা দিয়ে যে একটি প্রাথমিক মূল্যায়ন করা হয়েছিলো যে সমস্তকে এই দলিলমূলক (ডুমুনেট) ইতিহাস করা হয়েছে। উক্ত দলিলমূলক অনুসারে যে অংশ তাদের সমস্ত সমাবেশকতা সম্পন্ন হয়, তারা সহ করে এই দলিলমূলক টিক দিয়ে, যাতে এই ফর্মের দিনের দিকে দেওয়া যায় অ্যাপারেন্ট নাম ও টিকানা দিয়ে যাচাইকৃত প্রক্রিয়া দলিলমূলকে মিলতে পারে নিঃসন্দেহ বিরুদ্ধে দলিল।

Chinese  □ 本文件对直到2020年的北伦敦废物设施规划给主要社会群体的影响进行初步评估。如果你需要翻译方面的帮助，请在上面的小方格里打钩号，并在表格底部的方格里填上你的名字和地址，把表格寄到指定地址。

French  □ Ce document contient une évaluation préliminaire de l’impact sur les groupes sociaux majeurs dans la planification des installations de déchets dans le Nord de Londres jusqu’en 2020. Si vous avez besoin d’une traduction, vous êtes prié de cocher cette case, d’inscrire votre nom et adresse dans la case au bas de ce formulaire et de nous le retourner à l’adresse montrée.

Greek  □ Αυτό το εγγράφο περιέχει μια προκαταρκτική αξιολόγηση του αντικτυπού σε βασικές κοινωνικές ομάδες, του προγραμματισμού για τις εγκαταστάσεις αποβλήτων στο Βορείο Λονδίνο μέχρι το 2020. Αν χρειάζεστε βοήθεια με την μετάφρασή του, παρακαλούμε να θέσετε τιμή σε αυτό το τετραγωνίκο, προσθέστε το όνομά σας και τη διεύθυνσή σας στο κουτάκι του βρισκόμενο στο κάτω μέρος αυτής της αυτοκοινωνίας και επιστρέψτε την στην διεύθυνση που δίνεται.
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Polish  □ Niniejszy dokument zawiera wstępną ocenę wpływu planowania usług i udogodnień w zakresie zagospodarowania odpadów w północnym Londynie do
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Executive Summary

This report presents the results of the screening assessment of the Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) of the proposed policies of the Joint Waste Development Plan Document (Waste DPD). The Waste DPD is also known as the North London Waste Plan (NLWP).

The report has identified the following target groups: women; black and ethnic minority people; young people and children; older people; disabled people; lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgendered; and different faith groups.

The results show that the majority of the proposed policies for the NLWP will have indiscriminate mixed impacts upon all target groups and will not lead to an adverse discriminatory impact upon specific target groups.

Recommendations are provided for modifications to the proposed policies to remove the effects of low negative impacts and offer general enhancement of the policies.
1 Introduction

1.1 Background
This Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been undertaken to provide a more detailed investigation into the implications of the emerging Joint Waste Development Plan Document (Waste DPD) on diversity and equality. The waste DPD is also known as the North London Waste Plan (NLWP) and compliments the ongoing sustainability appraisal process.

The NLWP will define the core waste strategies of the North London sub-region it encompasses. Seven London Boroughs are within the plan area. These are Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest.

1.2 What is an EqIA
The purpose of an EqIA is to ensure policies and strategies do not discriminate against specific target groups and, where possible, contribute to improving the lives of local communities. It is a systematic process which considers the needs of each target group and is in effect, similar to undertaking a risk assessment.

It is a two stage process. This report represents the first stage or screening stage of the assessment process. Screening identifies the positive and negative impacts of the policy or strategy on the equality target groups and identifies any gaps in knowledge. If any negative effects that are considered of high significance are identified and/or if the impact is not intended and illegal, then a full stage two assessment will be undertaken. The second stage process forms a more detailed assessment focusing on the significant negative impacts and identifying possible mitigation scenarios. Consultation with stakeholders and members of the equality target groups is undertaken during this phase.

1.2.1 Legislation
Under certain legislative requirements, it is necessary to consider the impacts of policies and strategies upon certain equality target groups. The requirements are as follows;

- Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000
  - The amendment requires Local Authorities to be pro-active and positive in promoting racial equality. The authorities are required to undertake a Race Equality Impact Assessment of their strategies and plans. Failure to do so may lead to legal action being taken against them by the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE). The CRE is now part of the Equalities and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) as detailed on the next page.
• Disability Discrimination (Amendment) Act 2005
  
  o The Act requires Local Authorities to promote equality of opportunity for disabled people and avoid discrimination. The authorities must ensure that their policies, practices, procedures and services are not discriminatory against disabled people.

• Equality Act 2006
  
  o The Act establishes the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) which came into force in October 2007. It brought together as one organisation the CRE, Disability Rights Commission (DRC) and Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC). As well as gaining the powers of the three former commissions, it has additional powers to enforce equality legislation on age, disability, gender, race, religion and sexual orientation or transgender status more effectively.

• Gender Equality Duty 2007 (as required by the Equality Act 2006)
  
  o This came into effect in April 2007 and is aimed at public authorities (including Local Authorities) to eliminate unlawful discrimination and harassment and promote gender equality. There is a requirement to produce and publish a gender equality scheme. As part of this, the authorities must assess the impact of their existing and future policies and practices on gender equality as well as consult stakeholders with a scheme review every 3 years.

An EqIA takes into account all of the existing enforced legislation and also impending and probable future legal requirements therefore ensuring that it is in line with diversity groups highlighted by the emerging CEHR. It is also in line with the requirements of the Equality Standard for Local Government and a best value indicator.

1.2.2 Equality Target Groups

Table 1-1 sets out the equality target groups and identifies the equality areas or strands. These target groups and strands are based on those considered appropriate in undertaking an EqIA and adopted in the regional guidance written by Transport for London (TfL), the Greater London Authority (GLA) and other functional bodies. These identified groups are also reflected in the available EqIA guidance citing target groups and strands of the London Borough’s within the plan area. These were considered suitable to reflect the diverse population within the seven London Boroughs.
Table 1-1 Equality Target Groups and Strands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Equality Target Strand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and minority ethnic people</td>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people and children</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgendered</td>
<td>Sexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different faith groups</td>
<td>Faith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recognised however that many of these equality target groups may overlap and have similar needs and/or prejudices.

An example of this is in a “community visioning” exercise carried out in Brighton and Hove in 1998/9. The local authority targeted consultations of the then new Local Plan on the following groups – older people, disability groups, BME groups, gays and lesbians, women and people on low incomes. They discovered that there were common aims shared by all societal groups reviewed, that is to say, clean and safe environment, integrated public transport, community facilities, affordable housing and access to jobs. Although communities in London are likely to have some differing needs to other communities in the country, it is considered likely that they will also share common ideals and goals.

It is also not always true that all members of one particular target group will have the same needs. However it is recognised that many members of a target group share similar ideals, beliefs and needs.

1.2.3 Women

Access to convenient, affordable and safe transport is important to women. They often make a range of complex journeys combining routes for work, leisure, shopping and childcare. Therefore access to reliable public transport and safe walking and cycling routes are important to maintain mobility and independence. Women are also the greatest users of public services so good access is particularly important. Community safety is an important issue. Urban design and the accessibility of the urban environment are key aspects of this. Women with families are also more likely to use open space and parks, therefore it is essential that access to these areas is maintained.

Women are also more likely to spend more time around the home and local community so the provision of locally accessible services is important. Mobility is often restricted through low income, child care responsibilities, dependents, lack of access to a car, inadequate public transport and fear of harassment or attack.
Women, especially mothers, are more likely to carry out part-time work. It is essential that local employment and training opportunities are provided to suit the needs of women. Barriers to employment should be removed through the provision of child care facilities, SME business opportunities and good public transport accessibility. Women are also highly represented as users of and volunteers at community and voluntary facilities so the provision and accessibility of such schemes are important.

Table 1-2 shows the total populations of the seven North London Boroughs and Table 1-3 illustrates the gender divisions of the seven North London Boroughs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>314,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>198,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>273,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>202,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>216,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>175,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>218,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>7,172,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>49,138,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between the Boroughs, there is a fairly consistent pattern with just under half the population male and just over half the population female. This is in line with the rest of London and England.

Table 1-3 Percentage of Male and Females in Boroughs within the North London Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>52.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>48.18</td>
<td>51.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>47.78</td>
<td>52.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>47.83</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>52.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>47.91</td>
<td>52.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>48.66</td>
<td>51.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>48.37</td>
<td>51.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>48.68</td>
<td>51.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.4 Black and Minority Ethnic People (BME)

Access to employment opportunities is an important issue for BME groups and fundamental to this is the provision of education, training and SME business facilities. BME men in London (58%) are less likely to be employed than white British males (75%). BME employees are also likely to earn less money than their white counterparts with 30% of BME employees earning less than £7/hr compared with 18% for white groups. Members of BME groups sometimes have difficulties in gaining access to social facilities often through discrimination, racism and cultural
insensitivity. Fear of crime and safety is a constant issue for BME groups, in particular, fear of racial abuse.

BME groups are less likely to drive cars (21% compared to 31% of their white counterparts) and more likely to work unsociable hours when public transport services are less frequent. Safe, reliable and accessible public transport to access employment, leisure and other facilities is an important issue.

A national survey in 2006 identified that poverty risks were greatest for Bangladeshis, Pakistanis and Black Africans. Chinese, Caribbean and Indian people also have an above average poverty risk. Therefore where particular BME groups live together as a community, it is likely that a greater number of these will be in areas of deprivation.

In 2002, the Audit Commission found that Local Authorities had made little or no progress in engaging local ethnic minority communities. Therefore effective consultation strategies are particularly important for the inclusion of BME groups.

Table 1-4 illustrates the ethnic mix of the seven North London Boroughs. It highlights that the ethnic diversity of the population within these boroughs is greater than in the rest of England and, for some BME target groups, greater than the average for London. Hackney and Haringey have over twice or nearly twice the London average of Black or Black British residents respectively. Waltham Forest and Barnet have a higher than London average of Asian or Asian British residents whilst Islington, Haringey, Hackney, Camden and Barnet have a higher than London average of Chinese or other ethnic groups.

Table 1-4 Ethnic Diversity within the North London Area (shown as percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Barnet</th>
<th>Camden</th>
<th>Enfield</th>
<th>Hackney</th>
<th>Haringey</th>
<th>Islington</th>
<th>Waltham Forest</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>England and Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74.03</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>77.11</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>65.62</td>
<td>75.35</td>
<td>64.49</td>
<td>71.15</td>
<td>90.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or Other Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.5 Young People and Children

London, one of the world’s richest cities, has one of the highest rates of child poverty in Europe, which is linked to many particular needs and issues for this target group. Parental unemployment is a major cause of child poverty so access to suitable employment and training opportunities for adults is an important issue. In London particular groups of children are at a higher risk of living in poverty. These include Black, Pakistani and Bangladeshi children, those with a disabled parent and asylum seekers/refugees. All young people need access to suitable open spaces and leisure facilities. It is particularly important to encourage their use by young people and children by providing welcoming and safe sites. A study by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) found that improving the design, maintenance and supervision of open spaces, contributed more to combating anti-social behaviour than increasing security measures.

The provision of good public transport links and walking and cycling routes close to social and educational facilities is another important issue to consider.

Figures 1.1 to 1.7 illustrate the age structure for the seven North London Boroughs.

Figure 1.1 illustrates the gender and age structure for Barnet. It shows that there are slightly more younger male children and young adults than women but as the population ages, this changes and more older people are women. Generally the largest proportion of the population is between twenty five and thirty nine. The age structure is fairly close to the UK average.

Figure 1.2 illustrates the gender and age structure for Camden. There are slightly more younger male children than girls but once over seventy five, there is a larger number of females. Generally, there is a significantly larger proportion of the population in their late twenties and early thirties. The older population is markedly less than the former categories.
Figure 1.3 illustrates the gender and age structure for Enfield. The ratio of males to females is fairly balanced but with slightly more male children and more females in the older population. The majority of the population is in their mid thirties but the age structure is a lot more balanced than in Camden with a relatively large proportion of children and young adults. The age structure is fairly close to the UK average.

Figure 1.3 Gender and Age of the Population of Enfield

Figure 1.4 illustrates the gender and age structure for Hackney. A higher proportion of children and young adults are male with more females in their mid twenties/early thirties. The older male population is greater than the female population until the mid seventies’ is reached. The largest section of society is in their twenties and thirties but a large proportion of residents are also below four years.

Figure 1.4 Gender and Age of the Population of Hackney

Figure 1.5 illustrates the gender and age structure for Haringey. A significantly higher proportion than the UK average is in their twenties and thirties and there are a lot fewer than average in their mid forties and older.

Figure 1.5 Gender and Age of the Population of Haringey
Figure 1.6 illustrates the gender and age structure for Islington. The majority of the population is in their mid twenties and early thirties, and this is greater than the UK average. There are slightly more male children and young adults than female although once past the age of seventy five, there is a larger proportion of females than males.

Figure 1.6 Gender and Age of the Population of Islington

Figure 1.7 illustrates the gender and age structure for Waltham Forest. The greatest number of the population is aged between their mid twenties to late thirties and this is fairly balanced between gender. There are also slightly more male births and younger male children than female.

Figure 1.7 Gender and Age of the Population of Waltham Forest

1.2.6 Older People

Older people are disproportionately more likely to be living in poverty and suffering from isolation. Linked to this is a fear of crime and safety which means that creating safe, accessible and well designed urban environments should be a priority. This means creating over-looked and well used areas with space for benches, public toilets and suitable lighting. Accessibility and mobility is a key issue for older people and they are particularly reliant on public transport therefore an increase of public transport provision and accessibility, together with specialist transport is a key issue to maintaining and increasing access to goods and services. These transport services must have good connecting services and well designed transport modes. Affordable, accessible and well located housing is also extremely important.

Older people often volunteer and enjoy social interaction so the provision of facilities and services to allow this is important in contributing to ensuring that older people stay engaged and active within the community.

A survey by Age Concern found that people over 55 were twice as likely to suffer age discrimination than any other form of discrimination and one third of the people thought that those over seventy are typically viewed as “incompetent and incapable”. It is therefore important to understand the needs of this particular group (as with all target groups) without forming ill judged prejudices.
1.2.7  Disabled People

Access to community facilities including open spaces is a key issue amongst disabled people. They often suffer from isolation and social exclusion due to inadequate provision and/or discrimination. It is particularly important to provide disabled access to parks and recreational facilities for disabled children.

Transport accessibility is an important issue as is providing accessible and safe walkways and paths. Car parking spaces for blue badge holders should be ensured at all community facilities. Access to employment and training opportunities is important as disabled people are twice as likely to be unemployed than non-disabled people. This is often as a result of a lack of awareness of potential employers.

Table 1-5 shows the percentages of people with a long term limiting illness in the seven North London Boroughs. A limiting long term illness incorporates health problems and disabilities which limit daily activities. Hackney has the largest proportion of people with a long term limiting illness while Barnet has the least.

Table 1-5 Percentage of People with a Long Term Limiting Illness in the North London Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>People with a limiting long-term illness (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>14.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>15.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>16.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>18.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>15.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>17.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>16.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>15.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>17.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.8  Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals and Transgendered (LGBT)

Table 1.6 illustrates the percentage of the population that are living together as same sex couples. LGBT groups particularly suffer from harassment leading to personal safety and security issues. Ensuring community facilities include well overlooked spaces which are lit and/or have CCTV is a way of reducing this fear and contributing to community inclusion.

LGBT groups also suffer discrimination in relation to employment and accessing social facilities such as health care services. Therefore safe and secure open spaces, community facilities with access to good transport links including walkways and cycle ways are important considerations for this target group.
1.2.9 People from Different Faith Groups

People from different faith groups often experience the same sort of key issues as BME groups. This includes access to employment, training and fear of crime and safety. In addition, they require access to specific religious community facilities which should be easily accessed by public transport, walkways and cycle ways. A significantly larger proportion of the Muslim community live in socially deprived areas than any other faith group and Muslims also have the highest unemployment rates and levels of economic inactivity.

Table 1-7 highlights the number of people belonging to different faith groups in the NLWP area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Barnet</th>
<th>Camden</th>
<th>Enfield</th>
<th>Hackney</th>
<th>Haringey</th>
<th>Islington</th>
<th>Waltham Forest</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>59.33</td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td>50.53</td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other religions</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Christian faith is the highest represented faith in all of the seven London Boroughs. In Barnet, the second most popular faith is Jewish but in all the other boroughs, no religion is the second highest representation of the population.
However in Waltham Forest, the percentage of Muslims is almost the same as the percentage of people who stated that they have no religion. The Muslim faith represents the second highest faith group of people who state that they have a religion in six of the seven boroughs, the exception being Barnet.
2  Methodology

The EqIA process considers the impact of potential issues and options which are being considered as part of the North London Waste Plan on certain target equality groups. Two possible impacts are considered as part of this process;

- Positive impact. Occurs when the issue/option will have a positive effect on one or more of the equality target groups or, improve equal opportunities and/or relationships between groups.

- Negative or adverse impact. Occurs when the issue/option could have a negative/adverse impact on one or more of the equality target groups.

2.1 EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening

As stated in Section 1.1, an initial screening stage identifies whether the policy or strategy is likely to result in any negative or positive impacts upon the specific target equality groups and to identify any data gaps.

In order to assess this, an Initial Screening Form (ISF) has been developed based on the established guidance of the GLA. This has also taken into account specific questions raised within the available EqIA guidance documents of the seven North London boroughs. The ISF identifies each NLWP Policy and then the likely impacts are assessed against each of the equality target groups, explaining why this assessment outcome was agreed. This allows for a transparent assessment process.

2.2 NLWP Policies

The draft Preferred Options for the NLWP contains the following policies.

1. Policy NLWP 1 – Achieving the apportionment and contributing to sub-regional self-sufficiency
2. Policy NLWP 2 – Managing waste according to the Waste hierarchy
3. Policy NLWP 3 – Sites for management of wastes
4. Policy NLWP 4 – Management and mitigation of potential impacts on landscape and amenity
5. Policy NLWP 5 – Traffic impacts and sensitive vehicle routing
6. Policy NLWP 6 – Water quality and flooding considerations
7. Policy NLWP 7 – Visual Impact and Design
8. Policy NLWP 8 – Safeguarding of existing sites and compensatory site provision.
9. Policy NLWP 9 – Re-processing and re-manufacturing
10. Policy NLWP 10 – Incorporation of waste management considerations in design

11. Policy NLWP 11 – Decentralised energy considerations

12. Policy NLWP 12 – Alternative transport

13. Policy NLWP 13 – Provision of capacity for the management of Construction, demolition and excavation wastes

14. Policy NWLP 14 - Provision of capacity for the management of hazardous waste
3 Results

The following Table represents a summary of the results of the screening assessment as carried out using the Initial Screening Forms (ISF). The full results are provided as appendices. Please note that this Table shows positive or negative impacts only. It does not highlight illegal or intended effects or provide explanations of the reasoning behind the conclusions reached in the assessment. These are shown in the ISF forms and/or in the textual summaries on the following pages.

The symbols in the Table illustrate the following:

++ = High level positive impact  + = Low level positive impact
- - = High level negative impact  - = Low level negative impact
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Asian or Asian British</th>
<th>Black or black British</th>
<th>Chinese and other</th>
<th>Mixed Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Lesbians, gay, and bisexuals</th>
<th>Transgender</th>
<th>Older people</th>
<th>Younger people</th>
<th>Faith groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 **Specific Impacts on Equalities Target Groups**

Specific impacts on equalities target groups are summarised in the following subsections.

3.1.1 **Women**

Women will benefit from those policies which encourage a greater number of smaller waste collection sites (e.g., Household Waste Recycling Centres, HWRC) in the area rather than fewer larger sites. This will increase accessibility through greater transportation options. Women are great users of public transport and often lead hectic lives so locally based sites allow women to fit in waste management activities with their schedules which may include child care responsibilities or part time employment.

Policies that encourage voluntary engagement also benefit women in particular as more women are more likely to be interested in these types of projects than many other target groups.

Community safety is a key concern for women; therefore knowledge, including about where waste sites are going to be located, is important to women. ‘Secured by design’ features and good urban design features must be incorporated into all designs to encourage community safety.

Parks and open space are important to women with families; therefore new waste facilities should avoid the loss of open space.

3.1.2 **Black and Minority Ethnic People (BME)**

All seven north London boroughs have a high number of BME groups. As for women, BME groups have more reliance on public transport than non BME groups. Therefore policies which increase the accessibility of waste collection sites (e.g. HWRC) are particularly beneficial to this group. This is likely to be achieved through the provision of a larger number of smaller sites rather than large, centralised facilities.

BME groups are disproportionately more likely to be living in poverty than non BME groups; new waste facilities can provide employment opportunities and assist with unemployment related poverty.

It is particularly important that BME groups are involved in consultations and special effort should be made to encourage this. This is because there has been little progress in engaging with the community in recent years, appropriate methods of communication may differ for each BME group and these should be identified.

Local employment and training opportunities should be incorporated into local policy, Fear of crime and safety are constant issues for BME and should be considered. ‘Secured by design’ features and good urban design features must be included.
3.1.3 Young People and Children

London, one of the world’s richest cities, has one of the highest rates of child poverty in Europe. In London these include Black, Pakistani and Bangladeshi children, those with disabled parents and asylum seekers/refugees. All seven of the North London boroughs have a higher than the national average population of BME groups, in particular Hackney and Haringey. Parental unemployment is a major cause of child poverty so access to suitable education, employment and training opportunities for adults is an important issue.

More sites increase accessibility/transportation options in the area which will benefit all. Young people and children in particular are likely to be quite reliant on public transport so more local sites will result in more public transport options/greater frequency/shorter journey times etc, additional cycle lanes and improvements to walkways should be associated with ensuring adequate accessibility of new or improved sites.

Parks and open space are important for children and young people; therefore new waste facilities should avoid the loss of open space and ‘secured by design’ features and good urban design features must be incorporated into all designs to encourage community safety.

If hazardous waste disposal facilities are required and not provided this may lead to fly tipping of hazardous waste which poses a health and safety risk to all target groups especially young people and children as they are more likely to use green/open spaces.

3.1.4 Older People

Barnet and Camden have populations with a higher proportion of older people compared to the other north London Boroughs. Older people are disproportionately more likely to be living in poverty and suffering from isolation, linked to this is a fear of crime and safety which means that creating safe, accessible and well designed urban environments should be a priority.

Older people may be more affected by noise and dust and this should be addressed as part of policy requirements.

Protection of parks and open space may be important to older people; therefore new waste facilities should avoid the loss of open space.

Older people often enjoy social interaction and voluntary pursuits so it is essential to encourage community participation and consultation in the NLWP.

Design of recycling facilities and community composting facilities within new residential developments need to provide easy access for the elderly.
3.1.5 Disabled People

Limiting illness in Hackney is high at 18.07% this is higher than the national average of 15.49% and London average at 17.93%.

Disabled people have particular needs and this should be taken into consideration when educating and promoting awareness of waste issues. In all new sites, accessibility for disabled people is a key issue and there should be adequate provision for blue badge holders and access for powered off road vehicles that disabled and elderly groups often rely on for mobility. Transport and accessibility is an important issue, as is providing accessible and safe walkways and paths.

Due to the low level of employment amongst disabled people, those policies which provide employment and educational opportunities are particularly beneficial. This is likely to be greater through allowing for more sites rather than fewer, and developments involving alternative transport modes such as railway/road and sustainable waste transport vehicles.

Community safety should be considered; ‘secured by design’ features and good urban design features must be included to improve existing site locations and new development sites.

3.1.6 Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals and Transgendered

BGLT groups suffer from harassment, linked to this is a fear of crime and safety which means that creating, safe accessible and well designed urban environments should be a priority.

3.1.7 People from Different Faith Groups

Muslim groups have the highest level of deprivation of any faith group; all seven of the North London Boroughs have higher than average Muslim population.

People from different faith groups will also, as with all target groups, benefit from the increased accessibility that is coupled with an increase in the number of waste collection sites and availability of transport options to access them.

Fear of crime and safety are constant issues for this target group in particular fear of racial abuse, therefore community facilities need to be safe, accessible and well designed within the urban environment.

New sites should seek to employ local people both during construction and operational stages; this may assist with unemployment related poverty. Fear of crime and safety are constant issues for this target group in particular fear of racial abuse.

3.2 Summary

The screening stage of the EqIA has ascertained that the policies of the NLWP are predominantly positive. Some of the policies will have primarily positive or negative impacts whereas other policies will have both positive and negative impacts. The majority of these impacts will be shared across all target groups and include low
level negative effects such as an increase in noise, dust, pollutants, traffic associated impacts and community safety issues.

Those policies which will be particularly beneficial include the following;

- Policy NLWP 1 – Achieving the apportionment and contributing to sub-regional self-sufficiency.
- Policy NLWP 2 – Managing waste according to the waste hierarchy.
- Policy NLWP 4 – Management and mitigation of potential impacts on landscape and amenity.
- Policy NLWP 5 – Traffic impacts and sensitive vehicle routing.
- Policy NLWP 6 – Water quality and flooding considerations.
- Policy NLWP 7 – Visual impact.
- Policy NLWP 13 – Provision of capacity for the management of construction, demolition and excavation waste.

The results show that the majority of the proposed policies for the NLWP will have indiscriminate mixed impacts upon all target groups and will not lead to an adverse discriminatory impact upon specific target groups.

3.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations are provided for modifications to the proposed policies to remove the effects of low negative impacts and offer general enhancement of the policies.

- Local employment and training opportunities should be incorporated into local policy,
- Apprentice schemes should be used as part of the construction of waste facilities in North London Boroughs.
- It is essential that appropriate waste awareness education is provided for all target groups.
- Education should be inclusive this can be provided in a number of ways through schools, churches, visually and in a number of languages to ensure that all groups are targeted.
- Identify sites located near places of interest for example churches, open space and ensure that targets groups are not impacted.
- Loss of open space should be avoided.
• Ensure community involvement in decision making.

• Fear of crime and safety are constant issues for this target group in particular fear of racial abuse, therefore community facilities need to be safe accessible and well designed within the urban environment.

• ‘Secured by design’ should be used for all waste management facilities.

• ‘Good urban design’ features must be included.

• EMS should be implemented, CEMP should be produced and considerate constructor’s scheme should be signed up to during the construction phase.

3.4 Monitoring
Aims and methods for monitoring will be finalised during preparation of the adopted version of the NLWP. The finalised monitoring arrangements will be designed to provide information that can be used to highlight specific performance issues and significant effects, and lead to more informed decision-making. Monitoring can also be a useful source of baseline information for future DPD’s.

The following performance indicators are recommended to be incorporated into the monitoring systems for the NLWP.

• Number of fly tipping incidences

• Number of consultations/modes

• Number of apprentice schemes used as part of the construction of waste facilities in North London Boroughs.

• Monitor waste minimisation, recycling and composting, recovery rates.

• Number of waste related complaints

• Monitoring of existing waste facilities should take place to determine existing negative impacts on local communities.

• Establish the current baseline of hazardous waste in north London for example
  • ‘How much hazardous waste is produced?’
  • ‘Where is north London hazardous wasted currently disposed of?’
  • ‘Number of waste related complaints?’
3.5 **Next Steps**

The draft Sustainability Appraisal will undergo a period of consultation. The consultation will involve identified stakeholders and members of the public and will take the form of workshops, with opportunities for written comments and e-comments also provided (www.nlwp.net).

A full assessment is normally required if the screening process identifies a negative impact that falls into one of the categories listed below:

- It is of high significance or;
- It is not intentional and;
- It is illegal or possibly illegal.

This stage is a more in-depth study into the possible negative impacts and allows for consultations with identified stakeholders. The consultation process will aim to be accessible to all members of the target groups, particularly those who are under represented or “hard to reach”. In order to reach these groups, it is recommended that the consultation process follows the general principle of “going out to them” rather than “expecting them to come to you”. In this sense, those organisations representing minority groups in the locations potentially affected will be targeted and discussions about the EqIA should be brought to established minority group meetings and places where minority groups attend i.e. playgroups, cultural centres, advice bureaus etc. In addition, additional workshops/exhibitions may be set up and advertised to attract certain minority groups. Other consultation techniques include targeted questionnaires and/or telephone interviews and other opportunities for written comments and e-comments.

The assessment leads to an action plan aimed at minimising any negative impacts and maximising any positive impacts. A review process will be put in place to monitor the effects of the policy on the targeted equality groups.
Appendices

Appendix A details the EqIA Initial Screening Forms (ISF) for each of the Policies set out in the draft North London Waste Preferred Options report, July 2008.

For each ISF form the following information is relevant to the assessment and generic to all Policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the main purpose of the strategy?</th>
<th>To provide a range of suitable and viable sites for North London to meet its future waste management needs and increased self sufficiency.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To maximise the contribution of the plan to North London’s environment, economy and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To prepare the plan in an open, transparent and inclusive way, ensuring the fullest possible involvement of North London’s communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List the main activities of the project/policy (for strategies list the main policy areas)</th>
<th>To regulate the strategic approach to waste management facilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who will be impacted by the policy?</th>
<th>Residents, developers, business community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who will be the main beneficiaries of the strategy/project/policy?</th>
<th>Residents, UK economy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form

Policy NLWP 1 – Achieving the apportionment and contributing to sub-regional self-sufficiency

The seven north London boroughs have identified enough land capable of meeting future capacity required to meet both the London Plan apportionment and 85% self sufficiency in municipal and commercial and industrial wastes.

This land is identified in the following schedules:
A. existing waste management facilities
B. existing waste transfer facilities
C. new sites identified for waste management purposes
### Equality Impact Assessment

**Officer completing assessment:** Anne Hugh-White  
**Date of assessment:** 01/12/08  
**Contact details:** anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>All seven north London boroughs have a similar % of females, just fewer than 50% of the total population. Accessibility to waste facilities will increase in each borough if new waste facilities are provided; this maybe beneficial to woman if these are these accessible by public transport. Women are the greatest users of public transport and often combine daily chores with employment, motherhood etc so need accessible and conveniently located sites too. More sites will also mean that there will be greater employment and educational opportunities. More sites will also provide greater opportunities for a reduction in fly tipping. Community safety is a key issue for woman, so this must be a consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>All seven north London boroughs have a similar % of males in all boroughs just over 50% of total population. More sites increase accessibility/transportation options in the area which will benefit all. More sites will also mean that there will be greater employment and educational opportunities. More sites will also provide greater opportunities for a reduction in fly tipping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Target Group</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Reason/comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All seven of the London boroughs have a higher than national average population of Asian or Asian British residents,

London average of 12.08% is exceeded by both Barnet and Waltham Forest.

Members of BME groups are less likely to drive cars and more likely to rely on public transport. Therefore greater accessibility provides more transportation options.

New sites should seek to employ local people both during construction and operational stages; this may assist with unemployment related poverty. Fear of crime and safety are constant issues for in particular fear of racial abuse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese people and other ethnic people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of mixed race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Target Group</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Reason/comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equality Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25), and children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Positive Impact

- Younger people (17-25), and children

#### Negative Impact

- Illegal

#### Reason/comment

- Older people (60+)
  - Barnet and Camden have high populations of older people compared to the other north London Boroughs.
  - Older people are disproportionately more likely to be living in poverty and suffering from isolation, linked to this is a fear of crime and safety which means that creating, safe accessible and well designed urban environments should be a priority.

- Younger people (17-25), and children
  - London, one of the world’s richest cities, has one of the highest rates of child poverty in Europe. In London these include Black, Pakistani and Bangladeshi children, those with disabled parents and asylum seekers/refugees.
  - Parental unemployment is a major cause of child poverty so access to suitable employment and training opportunities for adults is an important issue.
  - All seven of the London boroughs have a higher than the national average population of BME groups, in particular Hackney and Haringey.
  - More sites increase accessibility/transportation options in the area which will benefit all. Young people and children in particular are likely to be quite reliant on public transport so more local sites will result in more public transport options/greater frequency/shorter journey times etc.
  - More sites will also mean that there will be greater employment and educational opportunities. More sites will also provide greater opportunities for a reduction in fly tipping.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Positive Impact**
  - More sites will also mean that there will be greater employment and educational opportunities.
  - More sites will also provide greater opportunities for a reduction in fly tipping.

- **Reason/comment**
  - More sites will also mean that there will be greater employment and educational opportunities.
  - More sites will also provide greater opportunities for a reduction in fly tipping.

---

### Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts?

If so, you must complete a stage 2 assessment.

- **Positive Impact**
  - More sites will also mean that there will be greater employment and educational opportunities.
  - More sites will also provide greater opportunities for a reduction in fly tipping.

- **Negative Impact**
  - No.

---

### Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)

- **Can the strategy, project or policy’s positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)**
  - Initiate community engagement.

- **What monitoring systems for the policy are/will be in place? Performance indicators etc.**
  - Local employment and training opportunities should be incorporated into local policy, community safety should be considered, ‘secured by design’ features and good urban design features must be included.

- **Do we need to consult on the policy?**
  - Fly tipping incidences, number of consultations/modes. Monitor the number of apprentice schemes used as part of the construction of waste facilities in North London Boroughs.

---

### Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Resource Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locating waste facilities of waste</td>
<td>Research the available apprentice schemes in all north London Boroughs</td>
<td>Anne Hugh-White</td>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>Time to research both written documents and possibly site visits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form

Policy NLWP 2 – Managing waste according to the Waste hierarchy

Policy NLWP 2 supports the management of waste according to the waste hierarchy as identified in the London Plan and the National Waste strategy for England and Wales. The policy seeks to reassure the community that the boroughs will work towards waste minimisation and resource efficiency by encouraging reuse and recycling on site in new developments and the incorporation of elements in new developments to encourage potential occupiers to reduce, reuse and recycle wastes.

Policy NLWP 2

The seven North London boroughs will seek to promote waste minimisation, recycling and composting, recovery and resource efficiency over landfill. This will help to meet both national waste targets and the overall diversion targets as set out in the London Plan. They will do this through:

1. Promoting waste minimisation and resource efficiency in partnership with business, communities and residents and the third sector;
2. Ensuring that any new development design residential, commercial and community buildings and infrastructure to maximise sustainable waste and resource behaviour;
3. Seeking to maximise the contribution that organic waste processing can make to meeting targets on locally generated, renewable energy;
4. Ensuring that all new development maximise opportunities for waste reduction and on site recycling of construction and demolition wastes

Officer completing assessment: Anne Hugh-White    Date of assessment: 01/12/08    Contact details: anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting waste minimisation, recycling and composting, recovery and resource efficiency to business, communities and residents will be beneficial to all target groups. Waste education is beneficial all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting waste minimisation, recycling and composting, recovery and resource efficiency to business, communities and residents will be beneficial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equality Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian or Asian British people</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black or black British people</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese people and other people</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People of mixed race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White people (including Irish people)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Target Group</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Reason/comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25), and children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equality Target Group: Faith groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promoting waste minimisation, recycling and composting, recovery and resource efficiency to business, communities and residents will be beneficial to all target groups. Waste education is beneficial all target groups.

**Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts?**

If so, you must complete a stage 2 assessment.

**Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)**

**Can the strategy, project or policy’s positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)**

**What monitoring systems for the policy are/will be in place? Performance indicators etc.**

**Do we need to consult on the policy?**

- **No.**
- Monitor waste minimisation, recycling and composting, recovery rates. Number of waste related complaints, number and type of fly tipping, level of consultations with community, education opportunities.
- The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The SA looks at social, economic and environmental impacts and will reference the findings of the EqIA.
EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form

Policy NLWP 3 – Sites for management of wastes

When reviewing applications for waste development a sequential approach will be applied. Applications for new waste development will need to demonstrate that opportunities have been sought for:

1. The management of waste generated at the point of production
2. Where this is not possible, opportunities should be sought for development on existing waste sites or co-location with compatible land uses. Such uses would be other light industrial processes or facilities, particular where mutual benefit can be gained from the co-location. For example the provision of sustainable energy, or sharing of joint facilities such as weighbridges, wharfage etc. Schedules A and B list all existing sites and transfer sites respectively.
3. If proposals are not feasible or practicable for either on site management or at existing sites, then development on the sites opportunities given in schedule c will be approved.

All applications will be assessed in line with the policies in this plan and the specific development control policies within borough planning documents.

Officer completing assessment: Anne Hugh-White  Date of assessment: 01/12/08  Contact details: anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As discussed in Policy 1, waste facilities can provide employment opportunities which may be beneficial to all target groups in all boroughs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation of waste can lead to an increase traffic and air pollutants which will have a negative impact on all targets groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of waste facilities can lead to an increase in dust and noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As discussed in Policy 1, waste facilities can provide employment opportunities which may be beneficial to all target groups in all boroughs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Target Group</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Reason/comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese people and other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Target Group</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Reason/comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of mixed race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As discussed in Policy 1, waste facilities can provide employment opportunities which may be beneficial to all target groups in all boroughs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation of waste can lead to an increase traffic and air pollutants which will have a negative impact on all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of waste facilities can lead to an increase in dust and noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As discussed in Policy 1, waste facilities can provide employment opportunities which may be beneficial to all target groups in all boroughs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation of waste can lead to an increase traffic and air pollutants which will have a negative impact on all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of waste facilities can lead to an increase in dust and noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As discussed in Policy 1, waste facilities can provide employment opportunities which may be beneficial to all target groups in all boroughs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation of waste can lead to an increase traffic and air pollutants which will have a negative impact on all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of waste facilities can lead to an increase in dust and noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As discussed in Policy 1, waste facilities can provide employment opportunities which may be beneficial to all target groups in all boroughs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation of waste can lead to an increase traffic and air pollutants which will have a negative impact on all target groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Equality Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>Intended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transgender people

- Positive Impact: 
  - Low Level: \( \checkmark \)

- Negative Impact: 
  - Low Level: \( \checkmark \)

Reason/comment:
- As discussed in Policy 1, waste facilities can provide employment opportunities which may be beneficial to all target groups in all boroughs.
- Transportation of waste can lead to an increase traffic and air pollutants which will have a negative impact on all targets groups.
- Construction of waste facilities can lead to an increase in dust and noise.

### Older people (60+)

- Positive Impact: 
  - Low Level: \( \checkmark \)

- Negative Impact: 
  - Low Level: \( \checkmark \)

Reason/comment:
- As discussed in Policy 1, waste facilities can provide employment opportunities which may be beneficial to all target groups in all boroughs.
- Transportation of waste can lead to an increase traffic and air pollutants which will have a negative impact on all targets groups.
- Construction of waste facilities can lead to an increase in dust and noise.

### Younger people (17-25), and children

- Positive Impact: 
  - Low Level: \( \checkmark \)

- Negative Impact: 
  - Low Level: \( \checkmark \)

Reason/comment:
- As discussed in Policy 1, waste facilities can provide employment opportunities which may be beneficial to all target groups in all boroughs.
- Transportation of waste can lead to an increase traffic and air pollutants which will have a negative impact on all targets groups.
- Construction of waste facilities can lead to an increase in dust and noise.

### Faith groups

- Positive Impact: 
  - Low Level: \( \checkmark \)

- Negative Impact: 
  - Low Level: \( \checkmark \)

Reason/comment:
- As discussed in Policy 1, waste facilities can provide
## Sustainability Appraisal of the North London Waste Plan

### Equalities Impact Assessment: Policies Screening

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>Intended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>employment opportunities which may be beneficial to all target groups in all boroughs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation of waste can lead to an increase traffic and air pollutants which will have a negative impact on all targets groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of waste facilities can lead to an increase in dust and noise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions:**

- **Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts?**
  - Yes

- **Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)**
  - CEMP should apply to construction of waste facilities. This is considered in Policy 4

- **Can the strategy, project or policy’s positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)**
  - Local Employment and training opportunities should be incorporated into local policy. Community safety should be considered, ‘secured by design’ features and good urban design features must be included to improve existing site locations and new developments.

- **What monitoring systems for the policy are/will be in place? Performance indicators etc.**
  - Monitoring of existing waste facilities should take pace to determine existing negative impacts on local communities. Number of waste related complaints, number and type of fly tipping, level of consultations with community, education opportunities.

- **Do we need to consult on the policy?**
  - The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Resource Implications</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locating waste facilities.</td>
<td>Monitor existing waste facilities to determine existing negative impacts on local communities.</td>
<td>Anne Hugh-White</td>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>Time to monitor existing waste facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form

Policy NLWP 4 – Management and mitigation of potential impacts on landscape and amenity

Protection of the landscape and visual amenity of the area are required by PPS10 and are implicit within the sustainability objectives of the plan. Waste development proposals will be permitted if:

- the development is of a scale, form and character appropriate to its location
- there is no unacceptable adverse effect on the standard of amenity of established, permitted or allocated land uses likely to be affected by the development
- adequate means of controlling noise, dust, litter, odours and other emissions are incorporated into the scheme
- there is no unacceptable adverse effect on the recreational or tourist use of an area, or the use of existing public access or rights of way
- there is no unacceptable adverse effect on areas or features of landscape, historic or nature conservation value

Officer completing assessment: Anne Hugh-White  Date of assessment: 01/12/08  Contact details: anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall this policy will be positive to all target groups, however it should be noted that each target group may perceive features of landscape, historic or nature conservation value differently. Protection of parks and open space is particularly important to women with families; they are more likely to use these amenities on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall this policy will be positive to all target groups, however it should be noted that each target group may perceive features of landscape, historic or nature conservation value differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Target Group</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Reason/comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall this policy will be positive to all target groups, however it should be noted that each target group may perceive features of landscape, historic or nature conservation value differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall this policy will be positive to all target groups, however it should be noted that each target group may perceive features of landscape, historic or nature conservation value differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese people and other people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall this policy will be positive to all target groups, however it should be noted that each target group may perceive features of landscape, historic or nature conservation value differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of mixed race</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall this policy will be positive to all target groups, however it should be noted that each target group may perceive features of landscape, historic or nature conservation value differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall this policy will be positive to all target groups, however it should be noted that each target group may perceive features of landscape, historic or nature conservation value differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall this policy will be positive to all target groups, however it should be noted that each target group may perceive features of landscape, historic or nature conservation value differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall this policy will be positive to all target groups, however it should be noted that each target group may perceive features of landscape, historic or nature conservation value differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall this policy will be positive to all target groups, however it should be noted that each target group may perceive features of landscape, historic or nature conservation value differently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equality Target Group Impact Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25), and children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts?**

If so, you must complete a stage 2 assessment.

**Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)**

**Can the strategy, project or policy’s positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)**

<p>| Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts? | No |
| Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.) | |
| Can the strategy, project or policy’s positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.) | Identify sites located near places of interest for example churches, open space and ensure that targets groups are not impacted. Loss of open space should be |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What monitoring systems for the policy are/will be in place? Performance indicators etc.</td>
<td>Number of waste related complaints, number and type of fly tipping, level of consultations with community, education opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we need to consult on the policy?</td>
<td>The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The SA looks at social, economic and environmental impacts and will reference the findings of the EqIA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form

Policy NLWP 5 – Traffic impacts and sensitive vehicle routing

Proposals will be permitted where:
- access arrangements are adequate for the volume and nature of traffic generated by the proposal
- no unacceptable safety hazards for other road users, cyclists or pedestrians would be generated
- the level of traffic generated would not exceed the capacity of the local road network
- no unacceptable adverse impact upon existing highway conditions in terms of traffic congestion and parking would arise
- there are adequate arrangements for on-site vehicle manoeuvring, parking and loading/unloading areas
- any adverse impacts that would arise from the proposal can be satisfactorily mitigated by routing controls or other highway improvements

The above would need to be objectively demonstrated through the required Transport Impact Assessment where development over 10,000 tonnes per annum is proposed.

Officer completing assessment: Anne Hugh-White Date of assessment: 01/12/08 Contact details: anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese people and other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of mixed race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equality Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>Illegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25), and children</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts? If so, you must complete a stage 2 assessment.

- **No**

### Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)

- **N/a**

### Can the strategy, project or policy’s positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)

- Ensure community involvement in decision making.

### What monitoring systems for the policy are/will be in place? Performance indicators etc.

### Do we need to consult on the policy?

- The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The SA looks at social, economic and environmental impacts and will reference the findings of the EqIA.
EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form

Policy NLWP 6 – Water quality and flooding considerations

Waste development proposals will be permitted if it can be demonstrated that:

- there will be no significant impact on the quality of surface and groundwater
- where disposal is proposed below the water table, the proposal includes a comprehensive groundwater management plan
- there will be no net loss of flood plain, nor an increased risk of flooding as a result of increased surface water run-off
- there would be no significant impact on the nature conservation and amenity value of rivers and wetlands

Officer completing assessment: Anne Hugh-White  Date of assessment: 01/12/08  Contact details: anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese people and other people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People of mixed race</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equality Impact Assessment: Policies Screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25), and children</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>This policy is positive to all target groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts?**
  - **Reason/comment:** No.

- **Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against?**
  - **Reason/comment:** N/a

- **Can the strategy, project or policy’s positive impacts be improved?**
  - **Reason/comment:** Ensure community involvement in decision making.

- **What monitoring systems for the policy are/will be in place? Performance indicators etc.**

- **Do we need to consult on the policy?**
  - **Reason/comment:** The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The SA looks at social, economic and environmental impacts and will reference the findings of the EqIA.
EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form

Policy NLWP 7 – Visual Impact

The design, siting and appearance of proposals shall:

- complement the existing topography and vegetation
- use of materials and colouring appropriate to the location
- incorporate landscape proposals as an integral part of the overall development of the site
- where appropriate, use high quality, innovative designs

Proposals that would have an unacceptable adverse visual impact or would have an unacceptable adverse effect on adjoining land uses by virtue of the scale and location of the development will not be permitted unless satisfactory mitigation measures are incorporated.

Officer completing assessment: Anne Hugh-White  Date of assessment: 01/12/08  Contact details: anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese people and other people</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of mixed race</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy is positive to all target groups.
### Equality Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25), and children</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy is positive to all target groups.

Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts? If so, you must complete a stage 2 assessment.

Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)

Can the strategy, project or policy's positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)

Ensure community involvement in decision making

What monitoring systems for the policy are/will be in place? Performance indicators etc.

Do we need to consult on the policy?

The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The SA looks at social, economic and environmental impacts and will reference the findings of the EqIA.
**EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form**

**Policy NLWP 8 – Safeguarding of existing sites and compensatory site provision**

Land accommodating existing waste management uses in North London will be safeguarded (Schedules A and B). Other forms of development at these sites will not be considered unless compensatory and equal provision is made elsewhere within the seven north London boroughs. Additional site opportunities have been identified where such provision could be made (Schedule C).

**Officer completing assessment:** Anne Hugh-White  \n**Date of assessment:** 01/12/08  \n**Contact details:** anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safeguarding existing sites may not be beneficial to any targets groups if their existence is having an impact on local communities. For example there may be existing traffic, noise, dust and community safety and health impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safeguarding existing sites may not be beneficial to any targets groups if their existence is having an impact on local communities. For example there may be existing traffic, noise, dust and community safety and health impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safeguarding existing sites may not be beneficial to any targets groups if their existence is having an impact on local communities. For example there may be existing traffic, noise, dust and community safety and health impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safeguarding existing sites may not be beneficial to any targets groups if their existence is having an impact on local communities. For example there may be existing traffic, noise, dust and community safety and health impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Target Group</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Reason/comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese people and other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of mixed race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Disabled people                          |                 |                 |           |           |         | Safeguarding existing sites may not be beneficial to any targets groups if their existence is having an impact on local communities. For example there maybe existing traffic, noise, dust and community safety and health impacts.  
  Limiting illness is higher than the national average (15.49%) and London (17.93%) average, in hackney 15.49%
| Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals          |                 |                 |           |           |         | Safeguarding existing sites may not be beneficial to any targets groups if their existence is having an impact on local communities. For example there maybe existing traffic, noise, dust and community safety and health impacts. |
| Transgender people                       |                 |                 |           |           |         | Safeguarding existing sites may not be beneficial to any targets groups if their existence is having an impact on local communities. For example there
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maybe existing traffic, noise, dust and community safety and health impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25), and children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>¥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts? If so, you must complete a stage 2 assessment.

Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)

Can the strategy, project or policy’s positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)

What monitoring systems for the policy are/will be in place? Performance indicators etc.

- Number of waste related complaints, number and type of fly tipping, level of consultations with community, education opportunities.
The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The SA looks at social, economic and environmental impacts and will reference the findings of the EqIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Resource Implications</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding existing sites</td>
<td>Monitor existing waste facilities to determine existing negative impacts on local communities.</td>
<td>Anne Hugh-White</td>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>Time to monitor existing waste facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form

Policy NLWP 9 – Re-processing and re-manufacturing

Re-processing and re-manufacturing capacity of waste materials is a vital part of efficient resource management. To enable the development of such infrastructure any proposals coming forward for such facilities on either existing or allocated waste sites will be permitted where they can demonstrate that they are prioritising material supplies from North and Greater London whilst not reducing the overall capacity of the waste management systems in North London.

Officer completing assessment: Anne Hugh-White  Date of assessment: 01/12/08  Contact details: anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese people and other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of mixed race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25), and children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equality Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts?

- **No impact**

If so, you must complete a stage 2 assessment.

Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)

- **N/A**

Can the strategy, project or policy's positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)

- **N/A**

What monitoring systems for the policy are/will be in place? Performance indicators etc.

- **N/A**

Do we need to consult on the policy?

- The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The SA looks at social, economic and environmental impacts and will reference the findings of the EqIA.
**EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form**

**Policy NLWP 10 – Incorporation of waste management considerations in design**

All new developments must demonstrate how consideration has been given to the design of features that maximise sustainable waste behaviour. This could include but is not restricted to:

- Appropriate internal and external storage space for recyclables;
- Adequate road layout and space for waste collection vehicles and or alternative collection systems;
- Garden space and provision for home or community composting
- On site management of waste

**Officer completing assessment:** Anne Hugh-White  
**Date of assessment:** 01/12/08  
**Contact details:** anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy is positive to all target groups; however the needs of each target group may differ.

Fear of crime and safety are constant issues for this target group in particular fear of racial abuse, therefore community facilities need to be safe accessible and well designed within the urban environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese people and other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of mixed race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table provides a detailed assessment of the positive and negative impacts on various equality target groups, along with specific comments for each group. The assessment includes considerations for the provision of education leaflets and the importance of community facilities being safe, accessible, and well designed within the urban environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy is positive to all target groups; however the needs of each target group may differ. Disabled people requirements will differ from other groups, for example internal and external storage will need to be accessible. Community composting maybe not be suitable.

Fear of crime and safety are constant issues for this target group in particular fear of racial abuse, therefore community facilities need to be safe accessible and well designed within the urban environment.

This policy is positive to all target groups; however the needs of each target group may differ.

Fear of crime and safety are constant issues for this target group in particular fear of racial abuse, therefore community facilities need to be safe accessible and well designed within the urban environment.

This policy is positive to all target groups; however the needs of each target group may differ.

Fear of crime and safety are constant issues for this target group in particular fear of racial abuse, therefore community facilities need to be safe accessible and well designed within the urban environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25), and children</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts?</td>
<td>Fear of crime and safety are constant issues for this target group in particular fear of racial abuse, therefore community facilities need to be safe accessible and well designed within the urban environment. Secured by design should be used for all waste management facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)</td>
<td>'Secured by design' should be included in all the design of all new waste facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the strategy, project or policy’s positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)</td>
<td>The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The SA looks at social, economic and environmental impacts and will reference the findings of the EqIA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form

Policy NLWP 11 – Decentralised energy considerations

Mayor’s Climate change strategy and the London Plan

All waste facilities that are capable of directly producing energy or an energy producing fuel must demonstrate that active consideration has been given to:

1. the local use of any heat an either an existing heat network or in the creation of a new network;
2. the utilisation of biogas/syngas in Combined Heat and Power Facilities, either directly through piped supply or indirectly through pressurisation and transport

Officer completing assessment: Anne Hugh-White    Date of assessment: 01/12/08    Contact details: anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Equality Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese people and other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of mixed race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Target Group</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Reason/comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25), and children</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts?</td>
<td>If so, you must complete a stage 2 assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)</td>
<td>EMS should be implemented, CEMP should be produced and considerate constructor's scheme should be signed up to during the construction phase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the strategy, project or policy’s positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What monitoring systems for the policy are/will be in place? Performance indicators etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we need to consult on the policy?</td>
<td>The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The SA looks at social, economic and environmental impacts and will reference the findings of the EqIA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form

Policy NLWP 12 – Alternative transport

Proposals for development will need to demonstrate that active consideration has been given to the use of transport modes other than road, principally by water and rail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternative transport will have a positive effect on traffic congestion and air pollution, which will be positive to all target groups. However, the use of water for the transporting of waste may have an impact on all communities if areas of water are used for amenity purposes.
### Equality Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese people and other people</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People of mixed race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White people (including Irish people)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disabled people</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Target Group</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Reason/comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25), and children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts?
If so, you must complete a stage 2 assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Resource Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation of waste by water.</td>
<td>Identify any sections of water that may be considered a local amenity and ensure community involvement in decision making.</td>
<td>Anne Hugh-White</td>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>Time to research both written documents and possibly site visits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The SA looks at social, economic and environmental impacts and will reference the findings of the EqIA.
EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form

Policy NLWP 13 – Provision of capacity for the management of Construction, demolition and excavation wastes

All development (need to think about size thresholds) in north London will make on site provision for the recycling and re-use of construction and demolition of wastes during the construction programme.

**Officer completing assessment:** Anne Hugh-White  **Date of assessment:** 01/12/08  **Contact details:** anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese people and other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of mixed race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>This policy may help to prevent fly tipping, which will be beneficial to all target groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25) and children</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>This policy may help to prevent fly tipping, which will be beneficial to all target groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>This policy may help to prevent fly tipping, which will be beneficial to all target groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts? If so, you must complete a stage 2 assessment.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the strategy, project or policy's positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What monitoring systems for the policy are/will be in place? Performance indicators etc.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we need to consult on the policy?</td>
<td>The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The SA looks at social, economic and environmental impacts and will reference the findings of the EqIA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EqIA Stage One: Initial Screening Assessment Form

Policy NLWP 14 – Provision of capacity for the management of hazardous waste

The seven north London boroughs recognise the importance of ensuring that London has enough capacity to manage its own hazardous waste as self-sufficiently as possible.

While no specific provision has been made within this plan, applications for such facilities will be assessed against the policies contained in this plan and boroughs’ local development documents.

Provision of capacity for hazardous waste will be kept continually under review and will be reviewed subject to new evidence and policy produced by the Mayor of London and Environment Agency.

Officer completing assessment: Anne Hugh-White  Date of assessment: 01/12/08  Contact details: anne.hugh-white@mouchel.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hazardous waste is dealt with under strict legislation requirements and it is unknown whether facilities for the disposal of hazardous waste are required for north London.

If Hazardous waste disposal facilities are required and not provided this may lead to fly tipping of hazardous which poses a health and safety risk to all target groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese people and other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of mixed race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people (including Irish people)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Target Group</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Reason/comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (60+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger people (17-25), and children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equality Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>Low Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Target Group</th>
<th>Reason/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith groups</td>
<td>Hazardous waste is dealt with under strict legislation requirements and it is unknown whether facilities for the disposal of hazardous waste are required for north London. If Hazardous waste disposal facilities are required and not provided this may lead to fly tipping of hazardous waste which poses a health and safety risk to all target groups. Young people and children may be affected by fly tipping more than other target groups as they are more likely to use green/open spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any high level negative impacts and/or possibly discriminatory and unintentional negative impacts?

If so, you must complete a stage 2 assessment.

Can any negative impacts that are of low significance be minimised or mitigated against? If yes, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)

Yes see Action Plan

Can the strategy, project or policy’s positive impacts be improved? If so, how? (Please use action plan below if necc.)

Yes see Action Plan

What monitoring systems for the policy are/will be in place? Performance indicators etc.

Establish the current baseline of hazardous waste in north London for example ‘How much hazardous waste is produced?’ ‘Where is north London hazardous wasted currently disposed of?’
Do we need to consult on the policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Resource Implications</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous waste</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Anne Hugh-White</td>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>Time to research baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The public will be consulted upon the SA as part of the requirements of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The SA looks at social, economic and environmental impacts and will reference the findings of the EqIA.

‘Number of waste related complaints?’
‘Number and type of fly tipping?’
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This SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING THE

………………DAY OF…………

BETWEEN

(1) THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN of Town Hall, Judd Street,
   London WC1H 9LP ("Camden") and
(2) The LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET of Town Hall, The Burroughs,
   London NW4 4BG
(3) THE LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY of Hackney Town Hall, Mare
   Street, London E8 1EA
(4) THE LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY of Civic Centre, High Road,
   London N22 8LE
(5) THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD of Civic Centre, Silver Street,
   London EN1 3XY
(6) THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ISLINGTON of 222 Upper Street, London
   N1 1XR,
(7) THE LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST of Waltham Forest
   Town Hall, Forest Road, London E17 4JF

Referred to throughout this document as the “North London Boroughs”

1. This Deed is supplemental to a Memorandum of Understanding
   entered into by all the North London Boroughs on 26th February
   2007 (“the MOU”) for the purpose of producing a Joint Waste
   Development Plan Document (“the project plan”).

2. On the 29th January 2007 Camden entered into a contract with
   Mouchel Parkman (“the contract”) for the provision of
   consultancy services to the project plan.

3. Paragraph 9.5 and Schedule 3 of the MOU set out the indicative
   costs over the proposed three years of the project.

4. The original indicative costs of the project have now been revised
   and a revised base budget is attached at Schedule 1 and will be
   subject to ongoing review in accordance with the provisions of the
   MOU.

5. The North London Boroughs hereby agree to share on an equal
   basis all the revised base budget costs as set out in Schedule 1
   except for the contribution for the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
element of contract variation 1.

6. Following completion of the MOU it was agreed that a committee of the Heads of Planning or equivalent Chief Officer of each of the North London Boroughs would meet on a regular basis to review the project plan.

7. It is now agreed that Clause 9.4 of the MOU is amended to remove the words “Planning Officers Group” and replace these with “Heads of Planning in conjunction with their Planning Members Group representative”

8. In accordance with clause 9.4 of the MOU where the Heads of Planning or equivalent Chief Officer in conjunction with their Planning Members Group representative approve additional expenditure in connection with the production of the project plan, the North London Boroughs agree that Camden may seek a variation of the contract with Mouchel Parkman and to give effect to such variation each of the North London Boroughs further undertakes to make payment of their proportion of the of the costs of such contract variation.

9. For the avoidance of doubt all other provisions of the MOU save for Clause 9.5 and Schedule 3 shall apply to this supplemental Deed of Variation.

10. This Supplemental Memorandum of Agreement may be entered into in the form of two or more counterparts, each executed by one of the parties.

IN WITNESS whereof this document has been executed and delivered as a Deed by the parties the day and year first before written.

THE COMMON SEAL of THE )
MAYOR AND BURGESSSES OF THE )
LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN )
was hereunto affixed in the presence of:- )

Authorised Signatory
Authorised Signatory

THE COMMON SEAL of THE )
MAYOR AND BURGESSSES OF THE )
LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET )
was hereunto affixed in the presence of:- )
THE COMMON SEAL of THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY was hereunto affixed in the presence of

THE COMMON SEAL of THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY

Was hereunto affixed in the presence of

THE COMMON SEAL of THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD

THE COMMON SEAL of THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ISLINGTON

THE COMMON SEAL of THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST

was hereunto affixed in the presence of:-
**Schedule 1**

North London Waste Plan – revised budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy costs</td>
<td>£29,000</td>
<td>£127,993</td>
<td>£98,726</td>
<td>£53,845</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>£339,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>£13,000</td>
<td>£57,703</td>
<td>£60,719</td>
<td>£66,908</td>
<td>£68,944</td>
<td>£71,042</td>
<td>£338,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>£450</td>
<td>£30,140</td>
<td>£881</td>
<td>£30,744</td>
<td>£24,850</td>
<td>£16,380</td>
<td>£103,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£57,250</td>
<td>£171,750</td>
<td>£229,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Variations</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£77,998</td>
<td>£23,751</td>
<td>£79,418</td>
<td>£19,835</td>
<td></td>
<td>£201,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£42,450</td>
<td>£293,834</td>
<td>£184,077</td>
<td>£230,915</td>
<td>£185,879</td>
<td>£274,172</td>
<td>£1,211,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost per borough</td>
<td>£6,064</td>
<td>£41,976</td>
<td>£26,297</td>
<td>£32,988</td>
<td>£26,554</td>
<td>£39,167</td>
<td>£173,047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

9 September 2009

CABINET FEEDBACK:

INTEGRATED WORKING: LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST AND NHS WALTHAM FOREST

5 BOROUGH MULTI-AREA AGREEMENT

Contact Officer: Neil Murphy 020 8496 4492 Neil.Murphy@walthamforest.gov.uk Democratic Services

Classification: Open

1.0 SUMMARY

Members are asked to note the following “Record of Decisions” from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 20 May 2009

INTEGRATED WORKING: LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST AND NHS WALTHAM FOREST

Councillor Bob Sullivan Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee presented to Cabinet the recommendations of the Overview and Management Committee on this item.

He presented a report to Cabinet which recommended amendments to the main report. These were accepted.

Cabinet AGREED:

(a) To commission, jointly with NHS Waltham Forest, a detailed business case and option appraisal for closer working with NHS Waltham Forest and specifically evaluate a model based on the integration of the two organisations;

(b) To ensure that a clear and detailed plan of any proposed new management structures is presented to Scrutiny before scheme proposals;

(c) In principle, subject to a detailed consideration of a job description and person specification at the September Cabinet meeting, to the appointment of a Joint Director of Finance to service both the London Borough of Waltham Forest and NHS Waltham
Forest;

(d) That the Chief Executive arrange for a further interim appointment to manage the Council's Adult Social Care functions within LBWF upon the departure of the current interim Executive Director of Adult and Community Services in July 2009, as per the process.

(e) Agree the establishment of a Working Group comprising representatives of the two organisations to oversee the development of this work. The Council’s representatives to be the Leader, Deputy Leader, Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care, and a representative from the Conservative Group, the Chief Executive and the Strategic Director for People, Policy and Performance together with a specialist representative with expertise in Adult Social Care.

(f) that any final decision on the integration of the Authority with NHS Waltham Forest be referred to a meeting of the Council for informed debate.

Cabinet thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee for its work on this.

5 BOROUGH MULTI-AREA AGREEMENT

Councillor Bob Sullivan, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee presented to Cabinet the recommendation of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee on this matter.

The Leader disagreed with the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee that the content of the proposed Agreement reflected a lack of ambition and aspiration. He stated that Members and Officers had devoted a great deal of effort into preparing the draft submission, and that the Agreement, as a living document, would continue to develop. The Leader congratulated officers for their work in this matter.

Cabinet AGREED:

(a) In principle, to enter into a multi-area agreement with the London Boroughs of Tower Hamlets, Newham, Greenwich and Hackney to capture and maximise the benefits of the 2012 Olympics legacy.

(b) The Multi-Area Agreement draft submission at Appendix A to the report.

(c) That if the Five Borough Olympic Joint Committee is not constituted in time to meet the central Government deadline, to delegate power to the Chief Executive to negotiate and agree the finalised Olympic Legacy Multi-Area Agreement, subject to consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader.

(d) To note that the final Multi-Area Agreement will be reported back to a future meeting of Cabinet for information.
Cabinet thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee for its work on this matter.
This document outlines the decisions taken at the above Cabinet meeting.

Unless otherwise indicated, executive decisions listed in this document will come into force and may then be implemented 5 working days after publication of this document unless the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee calls in a decision. During that period the Director of Governance and Law may call-in a decision for scrutiny if so required by no less than 4 Members of the Council. (Paragraph 11 of Part 6 of the Council’s Constitution; Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules: Call-in Procedures).

Date of Publication: Friday 10th July 2009

Last Date for Call-In: Friday 17th July 2009

Contact:

Oliver Craxton
Senior Committee Manager
Democratic Services
Tel: 020 8496 4380
Email: oliver.craxton@walthamforest.gov.uk
CABINET MEETING: TUESDAY 7TH JULY 2009 (7.38-9.35 pm)

PRESENT:

Chair: Councillor Chris Robbins  Council Leader
Councillor John Macklin  Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder, Finance and Resources
Councillor Afzal Akram  Portfolio Holder, Community Safety, Enforcement and Protection
Councillor Liaquat Ali  Portfolio Holder, Children and Young People
Councillor Liz Philips  Portfolio Holder, Health, Adult and Older People
Councillor Marie Pye  Portfolio Holder, Communities and Housing
Councillor Keith Rayner  Portfolio Holder, Performance, Risk and Governance
Councillor Geraldine Reardon  Portfolio Holder, Leisure, Arts and Culture
Councillor Terry Wheeler  Portfolio Holder, Enterprise and Investment

Other Councillors Present:
Councillor Jenny Gray, Junior Lead Member, Communities and Housing
Councillor Johar Khan, Junior Lead Member, Environment
Councillor Saima Mahmud, Junior Lead Member, Children and Young People

Councillor Bob Sullivan, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee
Councillor Bob Wheatley
Councillor James O'Rourke
Councillor Bob Carey
Councillor Richard Sweden

1  APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

The Chair welcomed the following to their first meeting of Cabinet:
2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Afzal Akram declared a personal interest in item 8: Short Breaks-Adults with a Learning Disability and a prejudicial interest in item 10: Integrated Working LBWF and NHS Waltham Forest as he is the Non-Executive Chair of Waltham Forest NHS.

Councillor John Macklin declared a Prejudicial interest in item 9: Building Schools for the Future-Transfer of School sites to Trusts as he works for the University of East London.

Councillor Johar Khan declared a Prejudicial interest in item 9: Building Schools for the Future-Transfer of School sites to Trusts as his younger brother is a pupil at Norlington School.

Councillor Wheeler declared a personal interest in item 9: Building Schools for the Future-Transfer of School sites to Trusts as he is a governor of Waltham Forest College.

3 MINUTES OF CABINET

(a) The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on Tuesday 20th May 2009 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

(b) The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on Tuesday 25th June 2009 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>REFERENCES FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 (A)</td>
<td>LOCAL AUTHORITY/NHS WALTHAM FOREST INTEGRATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEE ITEM 10 BELOW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (B)</td>
<td>5 BOROUGH MULTI-AGREEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEE ITEM 12 BELOW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PROPOSAL FOR THE FUTURE USE OF THE FORMER ST JAMES’S LIBRARY PREMISES FOR THE DRUG ACTION TEAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This item was withdrawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LLOYD AND AVELING PARK – STAGE 2 LOTTERY BID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet <strong>AGREED:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) To the submission of the Stage 2 grant application to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) for the restoration and renewal of Lloyd and Aveling Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Subject to the success of the application at (a) above, to delegate authority to the Chief Executive to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Finalise and agree the grant agreement with the HLF, with an estimated value of £3.483 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) If (a) and (b)(i) above are agreed and completed, to agree to procure a public works contract with an estimated value of £4.9M to carry out the works required by the HLF grant agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) To grant a waiver of Contract Procedure Rules to allow the Council to develop and enter into a legal partnership agreement with the Waltham Forest College for the management of the new Lloyd and Aveling Park Café and Hub facilities, as set out in paragraphs 4.4. to 4.11 of the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) To agree to lease the Hub facilities to Waltham Forest College on the terms, set out in paragraphs 4.7 to 4.9. of the report, and to delegate final agreement of the terms of the lease to the Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director – Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and Regeneration in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Arts and Culture, to the extent that any decisions fall outside his existing delegation under the Council’s Property Procedure Rules.

**7 DECISION ON THE FUTURE OF CHURCH HILL CASHIERS’ OFFICE**

Councillor Bob Wheatley and Len Weiss (UNISON) addressed the meeting, requesting that Cabinet agree to keep the Cash Office open.

Councillor John Macklin, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources, commented that savings from the closure would enable the service across the Borough to be improved.

Cabinet **AGREED**:

(a) That the closure of the Church Hill Cashiers Office is fully implemented by 30 November 2009.

(b) That the findings of the Cashiers Service Customer Consultation be used to inform the scope of the Transition Project that will manage the phased changeover to other cash payment channels.

**8 SHORT BREAKS – PROPOSAL TO CONSULT SERVICE USERS AND FAMILY CARERS ON OPTIONS FOR SHORT BREAKS SERVICES, INCLUDING THE FUTURE OF SERVICES CURRENTLY PROVIDED AT TRUMPINGTON ROAD**

Having declared a prejudicial interest in this item, Councillor Akram left the room whilst the report was considered.

Chris Roper (Waltham Forest MENCAP) addressed Cabinet on this matter, referring to the need for respite care.

Councillor Liz Phillips, Portfolio Holder for Health, Adult and Older People services stated that full closure at Trumpington Road would not be considered as an option and accordingly deleted the fourth bullet point referred to in paragraph 5.2 of the report.

Cabinet **AGREED**:

(a) That a three-month consultation exercise be undertaken to consider, in the light of alternative provision, options for the future of Trumpington Road as set out in the first three bullet points of paragraph 5.2 of the report.

(b) That Cabinet receive a further report at its meeting in November 2009 on the outcome of the consultation exercise referred to
in (a) above and detailing options for the future of the Trumpington Road service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE (BSF) - TRANSFER OF SCHOOL SITES TO TRUSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having declared prejudicial interests in this report. Councillors Macklin and Khan left the room whilst the matter was considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Liaquat Ali, Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People Services, deleted recommendation 2.1.1 (b) in the report, and commented with regard to paragraph 4.5 that the Beaumont Primary School and Norlington School sites would be transferred back to the Council when, not if, the schools no longer occupied them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet AGREED:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) To note that the governing bodies of George Mitchell School and Norlington School for Boys have agreed to become trust schools under a grouped schools trust (the Leyton Trust) and that the joint governing body of Cann Hall Primary School and Tom Hood Community Science College, which are to become one school, have agreed to become trust schools under another trust (the 'Cann Hall Trust').</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) To note that Full Council will be asked at its meeting on 23 July 2009 to appoint board members to the two trusts referred to in (a) above, and in the meantime the Chief Executive be asked to agree under urgency procedures to the appointments of relevant officers as initial subscribers to enable the Trusts to be established as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) That, subject to the Director of Finance being satisfied that the financial issues, as set out in paragraph 7.1.2 of the report have been resolved, to agree:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) To the transfer of the areas of land edged in red on the plans at Appendices A, B, C and D to the report, being the sites of Beaumont Primary School, George Mitchell School and Norlington School for Boys, to the Leyton Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) To the transfer the areas of land edged in red on the plans at Appendices E and F to the report, being the sites of Cann Hall Primary School and Tom Hood Community Science College, to the Cann Hall Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) That the transfers of land should take effect on 1 September 2009, or on the date when the relevant trust is established, whichever is later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) That the transfer of each area of land should be conditional on its being transferred back to the Council should the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relevant school close, move to another site, or cease to be a trust school under the relevant trust.

## INTEGRATED WORKING: LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST AND NHS WALTHAM FOREST

Having declared a prejudicial interest in this report, Councillor Akram left the room whilst it was being considered.

The Leader referred to the Appendix to this report, which had been circulated as a confidential document at item 28 of the agenda for the meeting. He advised that the appendix would be taken in open session and that it would be made available to the press and public.

Councillor Bob Sullivan Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee presented to Cabinet the recommendations of the Overview and Management Committee on this item.

He presented a report to Cabinet which recommended amendments to the main report. These were accepted.

Cabinet **AGREED:**

(a) To commission, jointly with NHS Waltham Forest, a detailed business case and option appraisal for closer working with NHS Waltham Forest and specifically evaluate a model based on the integration of the two organisations;

(b) To ensure that a clear and detailed plan of any proposed new management structures is presented to Scrutiny before scheme proposals;

(c) In principle, subject to a detailed consideration of a job description and person specification at the September Cabinet meeting, to the appointment of a Joint Director of Finance to service both the London Borough of Waltham Forest and NHS Waltham Forest;

(d) That the Chief Executive arrange for a further interim appointment to manage the Council’s Adult Social Care functions within LBWF upon the departure of the current interim Executive Director of Adult and Community Services in July 2009. as per the process.

(e) Agree the establishment of a Working Group comprising representatives of the two organisations to oversee the development of this work. The Council’s representatives to be the Leader, Deputy Leader, Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care,
and a representative from the Conservative Group, the Chief Executive and the Strategic Director for People, Policy and Performance together with a specialist representative with expertise in Adult Social Care.

(f) that any final decision on the integration of the Authority with NHS Waltham Forest be referred to a meeting of the Council for informed debate.

Cabinet thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee for its work on this matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>PROCUREMENT OF INVESTMENT PARTNERS TO SUPPLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING - PARTNER SUBSTITUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet AGREED:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) To note that the tender from One Housing Group has now been disqualified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) To appoint Network Housing Group as one of the five Investment Partners, subject to contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) To authorise the Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Communities and Housing, to finalise the details of the Framework Agreement with Network Housing Group and execute same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This decision was taken under Rule 16 of the Council’s Access to Information Procedure Rules (regarding key decisions not on the Forward Plan).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>5 BOROUGH MULTI-AREA AGREEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Bob Sullivan, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee presented to Cabinet the recommendation of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee on this matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Leader disagreed with the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee that the content of the proposed Agreement reflected a lack of ambition and aspiration. He stated that Members and Officers had devoted a great deal of effort into preparing the draft submission, and that the Agreement, as a living document, would continue to develop. The Leader congratulated officers for their work in this matter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cabinet AGREED:

(a) In principle, to enter into a multi-area agreement with the London Boroughs of Tower Hamlets, Newham, Greenwich and Hackney to capture and maximise the benefits of the 2012 Olympics legacy.

(b) The Multi-Area Agreement draft submission at Appendix A to the report.

(c) That if the Five Borough Olympic Joint Committee is not constituted in time to meet the central Government deadline, to delegate power to the Chief Executive to negotiate and agree the finalised Olympic Legacy Multi-Area Agreement, subject to consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader.

(d) To note that the final Multi-Area Agreement will be reported back to a future meeting of Cabinet for information.

Cabinet thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee for its work on this matter.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OLYMPICS JOINT COMMITTEE

Cabinet AGREED:

(a) The establishment of a joint committee of the Five Host Boroughs for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, described in the Memorandum of Understanding, as detailed in Appendix A to the report, with immediate effect.

(b) The Memorandum of Understanding, attached at Appendix A to the report, and to authorise the Chief Executive to give effect to any matter necessary to achieve its objectives, including agreement of a revised Inter Authority Agreement.

(c) The terms of reference specified in Appendix 1 to the Memorandum of Understanding, and that the delegation of executive functions be discharged by the joint committee with effect from 1 July 2009.

(d) To nominate the Leader of the Council and Councillor Wheeler, Portfolio Holder, Enterprise and Investment to be the Council’s representatives on the joint committee for the municipal year 2009/10.

(e) To defer the appointment of two members to be the Council’s substitute representatives on the joint committee for the municipal year 2009/10.
(f) To refer this report to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee to consider its arrangements for the scrutiny of the joint committee, as set out in paragraphs 4.23 to 4.27.

14 'BETTER, FASTER, STRONGER' 2012 STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN

The Leader expressed his thanks to Symon Sentain, Head of 2012 and his team for their hard work in compiling the draft Strategy and Action Plan.

Cabinet **AGREED**:

(a) The draft 2012 Strategy and Action Plan attached at Appendix A to the report.

(b) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive to make minor changes to the Strategy prior to publication, in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council.

15 SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PROPOSALS - PROPOSALS

Cabinet **AGREED**:

(a) That the Council submit proposals under the Sustainable Communities Act 2007 to the Government via the Local Government Association, which has been appointed as the 'Selector'.

(b) That the following proposals should be submitted:

(i) Introduce the power to offer local business rates discounts (proposal 4, detailed in Appendix A to the report).

(ii) Introduce the power to act immediately to deal with fly tipping/waste/graffiti on private land if deemed to be a risk to health or safety (proposal 6, detailed in Appendix A to the report).

(iii) Make it easier for councils to take control of abandoned land (proposal 9, detailed in Appendix A to the report).

(iv) Introduce the power to have a local voting age or age for representation (proposal 10, detailed in Appendix A to the report).
(v) Reduce the length of time it takes to deal with appeals against planning enforcement notices (proposal 11, detailed in Appendix A to the report).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16</th>
<th>WALTHAM FOREST LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 2009-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet <strong>AGREED:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) The proposed draft revised Waltham Forest Local Development Scheme (LDS), attached at Appendix C to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) To delegate to the Assistant Director of Development, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Enterprise and Investment, the submission of the finalised Local Development Scheme, to the Secretary of State and Mayor of London.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17</th>
<th>INTRODUCTORY TENANCIES AND DEMOTIONS - CHANGES TO TENANCY TERMS AND CONDITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet <strong>AGREED:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) That the outcome of the consultation with the 153 tenants, following the service of the Preliminary Notice of Variation of their Council’s secure tenancy agreement, be noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) To authorise officers to issue the Notice of Variation to tenants signed up between 13th January 2009 and 29th March 2009, which will formally introduce the council’s new secure tenancy terms and conditions with effect from 17 August 2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18</th>
<th>APPOINTMENT OF ACCOMMODATION PHASE II CONSULTANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Macklin, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources stated that, in order to progress the strategy over the Summer and Autumn, an appointment needed to be made before the end of August 2009, not July as stated in paragraph 4.4 of the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet <strong>AGREED</strong> that the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder, Finance and Resources, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive, approve the award of the contract for the combined services to the bidder with the ‘Most Economically Advantageous Tender’; this being determined following evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19   TRANSFORMING WALTHAM FOREST
Cabinet AGREED to endorse the proposed Transformation Programme and timetable, and to note that a further report launching the Programme will be presented at the September 2009 Cabinet meeting.

This decision was taken under Rule 16 of the Council’s Access to Information Procedure Rules (regarding key decisions not on the Forward Plan).

20   REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF CONTRACT PROCEDURES IN RESPECT OF SENIOR INTERIM RECRUITMENT
Cabinet AGREED to waive the requirements of the Contract Procedure Rules for the reasons set out in the report, and to agree the appointment of the Interim Director of Finance and the appointment of the Assistant Director of Finance.

21   FOOD LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICE PLAN 2009/2010
The Chair extended his thanks to the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety, Enforcement and Protection and the Food Law Enforcement Team for their work in this matter.

Cabinet AGREED the Food Law Enforcement Service Plan 2009/2010, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, and to recommend its approval to Full Council.

22   MONTHLY FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT
Cabinet AGREED:

(a) To note the financial monitoring for month 2.

(b) To note the Revenue and Capital Outturn for 2008/09.

(c) The carry forward of capital budgets, as detailed in Appendix lii to the report.
| 23 | **DECENT HOMES: QUARTER ONE PERFORMANCE REPORT**  
Cabinet **NOTED:**  
(a) The first quarter performance in the delivery of the Decent Homes Programme.  
(b) That the 2009/10 programme has been redrafted in light of the £2 million forward funding approval by the Homes and Communities Agency. |
| 24 | **2008/09 PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT**  
The Portfolio Holder, Performance, Risk and Governance advised that he would be meeting fellow Cabinet Members at a series of Performance Clinics.  
Councillor Jenny Gray, Junior Lead Member, Communities and Housing congratulated Housing for exceeding its targets.  
Cabinet **NOTED** the performance information and analysis contained in the report, and the action taken to address areas of under performance. |
| 25 | **REPORTS OF PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**  
Cabinet **NOTED** the Portfolio Holder reports. |
| 26 | **CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR EXEMPT REPORTS NOT TO BE DISCLOSED TO THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**  
Cabinet resolved to exclude the public and press from the meeting during the consideration of item numbers 27 and 28 below, in accordance with Section 100 (A) of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, on the grounds that they would involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 3 and 5 of Schedule 12A of the Act, and disclosure would not be in the public interest. |
| 27 | **LEISURE CONTRACT EXTENSION**  
The report concerned the expiration of the existing contractual arrangements in March 2010. |
Cabinet AGREED:

(a) the recommendations set out in the report, including delegation to the Executive Director of Children and Young People Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Arts and Culture, the power to enter into negotiations and reach an agreement in this matter.

(b) To waive the Council’s Contract Procedure Rules in this matter.

28 INTEGRATED WORKING: LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST AND NHS WALTHAM FOREST - APPENDIX
This item was considered at item 10 above.

Chair…………………………………………………………………………………………
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report details the status of the Time Limited Scrutiny Panels agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee from the 2008/2009 municipal year to the present. Members views are sought in order to refresh the list of time limited scrutiny panels agreed to date, with a view to potentially remove any panels which may have been approved in the previous municipal year, but have yet to convene. Furthermore, in some cases the agreed Forward Work Programme’s 2009/10 for some Scrutiny Sub Committees have superseded the agreed remit/s of the time limited panels through addressing the subject matter directly or through proposals for convening joint meetings of scrutiny sub committee’s to address panel issues within the current municipal year.

1.2 A decision is also sought from Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee with regard to the introduction of a pro-forma for agreeing to the establishment of time limited scrutiny panels (Appendix 2). It is proposed that the adoption of an agreed format for the submission of time limited scrutiny panel requests to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee from the Scrutiny Sub Committee’s would provide the Management Committee with a rounded picture as to what the proposed panel entailed (for example, proposed scope, terms of reference and objectives) and whether resource should be directed towards supporting it.

1.3 Detailed in Appendix 3 is a submission from the Finance Scrutiny Sub Committee for the establishment of a time limited scrutiny panel to review the existing contract procedure arrangements in place within the authority, particularly in respect of contract extensions.
2. **APPENDICES**

2.1 Appendix 1: Status of Time Limited Scrutiny Panels

2.2 Appendix 2: Pro Forma to Request Establishing a Time Limited Scrutiny Panel

2.3 Appendix 3: Submission from the Finance Scrutiny Sub Committee (Contracts Scrutiny Panel)

**Background Papers**
1. Review Title:

Contracts Scrutiny Panel

2. Submitted by Councillor / Scrutiny Sub Committee:

Councillor Lewis (Chairman) on behalf of the Finance Scrutiny Sub Committee

3. Scope Of Review:

The primary remit of the review will be to address the areas detailed below:

1) Why does the end of service contracts come as such a surprise to the Council.

2) Is there an early warning system in place that warns officers of contracts that are about to become "time expired".

3) Are there any Financial Implications involved in any of the extensions of Contracts over the last two years.

4) What current contract monitoring systems are in place e.g. subject to internal / external audit, how are these systems effectively regulating the letting of contracts (e.g. current Contracts Register processes).

4. Proposed Timescale For Duration Of The Review:

To commence from September 2009 with draft report to be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee meeting scheduled for 02.12.2009

5. Ward / Multiple Ward / Borough Wide Issue:

Corporate / Borough Wide.
6. Proposed Terms Of Reference:

The primary terms of reference for the proposed review are detailed in 3. above.

The review will, however, also address:

1. Council Constitution Part 8 – Contract Procedure Rules – to ascertain to what degree these controls are being observed and adhered to across the organisation (SEE Sections 4.1. / 7.1)

2. To clarify the extent of the use of contract extensions across the organisation, in which areas of the Council and the size/value of the contracts concerned

3. To identify any risks accruing to the Council through using contract extensions.

4. To ascertain whether contract extensions prove to be the most financially advantageous / VfM for the Council.

5. To ascertain whether there is a robust a specific VfM strategy in place in respect of contract letting.

7. Witnesses:

Interim Head of Procurement
Director of Finance
Head of Internal Audit
Others to be confirmed

8. Relevant to Delivery of Corporate Priorities (e.g. Sustainable Community Strategy, Local Area Agreement Objectives):

Sustainable Procurement Strategy
Medium Term Financial Strategy

9. Has the Proposed Review Subject Been Raised Elsewhere via Other Fora e.g. Council Committees, Community Councils, Local Strategic Partnership?

No
Signed (Chair, Scrutiny Sub Committee): .............................................

Date: ..................................................

Date Considered at Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee:

.................................

Panel Request: ACCEPTED / DECLINED
APPENDIX 2

SUBMISSION TO THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TIME LIMITED SCRUTINY PANEL

1. Title of Panel Review:


2. Submitted by Scrutiny Sub Committee:


3. Scope of Review:


4. Proposed Timescale for Duration of Review:


5. ward / Multiple Ward / Borough Wide Issue:


6. Proposed Terms of Reference:


7. Council Partners / External Bodies to be Involved:

8. Relevant to Delivery of Corporate Priorities (e.g. Sustainable Community Strategy, Local Area Agreement Objectives) or Community Issue:

9. Has the Proposed Review Subject Been Raised Via other Forums ? E.G. Council Committees, Community Councils, Local Strategic Partnership?

Signed: (Chair of Scrutiny Sub Committee):..................................................

Date:.............................................

Date Considered at Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee:.................................

Panel Request: ACCEPTED / DECLINED
## APPENDIX 1

### Status of Time Limited Scrutiny Panels: Updated 25.08.2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PANEL</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Traffic Calming Measures</td>
<td>Cllr Asim Mahmood</td>
<td>Status?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling Obesity (Younger People) Panel</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Sweden, Cllr James O’Rourke</td>
<td>Member Nominations Required. Status?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Panel</td>
<td>Cllr Michael Lewis, Cllr Peter Barnett</td>
<td>Ended in light of commencement of the Efficiency Review. Subject area currently scrutinised via Finance Scrutiny Sub Committee FWP 2009/10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing Support Needs of Carers (including young carers)</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Sweden, Cllr James O’Rourke</td>
<td>Proposed that topic to be addressed jointly via Children &amp; Young People and Health &amp; Older Adults Scrutiny Sub Committee’s within the 2009/10 municipal year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The new ‘Councillor Call for Action’ (CCfA) powers, contained in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, and the Police and Justice Act came into force on 1st April 2009. The CCfA powers provide Members with the ability to call for debate and discussion at a scrutiny committee topics of neighbourhood concern; the powers are limited to issues affecting single council wards.

1.2 Following the formation of a Member working group, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee considered and agreed a protocol for managing the Councillor Call for Action process at the Management Committee meeting of 22nd April 2009.

1.3 The protocol was subsequently submitted to and approved by the Governance Committee on 25th June 2009 and a meeting of Council on 23rd July 2009. It was agreed at the Governance Committee meeting that the protocol would be operated as a pilot scheme and further reviewed by the Governance Committee after six months of operation (i.e. an update report to be submitted to the Governance Committee meeting scheduled for 18th March 2010).

1.4 As of 26th August 2009, no CCfA requests have been received by the Scrutiny Unit.