

# Public Document Pack



**MINUTES OF A CABINET MEETING**  
**Council Chamber - Town Hall**  
**Wednesday, 8 July 2015**  
**(7.30 - 8.45 pm)**

**Present:**

Councillor Roger Ramsey (Leader of the Council), Chairman

Councillor Damian White

Councillor Robert Benham

Councillor Wendy Brice-Thompson

Councillor Meg Davis

Councillor Osman Dervish

Councillor Clarence Barrett

Councillor Ron Ower

**Cabinet Member responsibility:**

Housing

Environment

Adult Social Services and Health

Children and Learning

Regulatory Services and Community Safety

Financial Management

Housing Company Development and OneSource Management

Apologies were received from Councillor Melvin Wallace

Councillors Ray Morgon, Jeffrey Tucker, Ian de Wulverton, Keith Darvill and David Johnson also attended.

There were no members of the public present, but a representative of the press was in attendance.

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest.

Unless otherwise indicated, all decisions were agreed unanimously with no Member voting against.

The Leader opened the meeting by reminding Cabinet that this was the Group Director of Children, Adults and Housing, Joy Hollister's last Cabinet meeting and, on behalf of Members, he wished her well in her future career and thanked her for all she had done whilst in Havering.

## 5 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2015 were agreed as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

## 6 APPROVAL OF THE ROMFORD DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

*Councillor Osman Dervish, Cabinet Member for Regulatory Services and Community Safety, introduced the report*

Cabinet was reminded that approval for the Romford Development Framework to guide the future development of the town over the next 20 years was sought. It would provide support to the Council to enable it to have more control over the quality of design and materials of the built form and clearly articulate its ambitions, preferences and improve engagement with prospective developers/landowners if adopted.

The Framework set out an ambitious but realistic physical vision for the town and the mechanism by which it would be delivered. It proposed six strategic objectives which sought to ensure Romford capitalised on the town centre's significant potential for economic growth – with the aim of delivering thousands of high quality new homes and jobs, attracting more shoppers and leisure visitors, and capitalising on property demand and value growth driven by the arrival of Crossrail in 2018/19.

The development Framework took a holistic view of the town centre and its key character areas rather than solely concentrating on the individual development opportunities. Character areas had been developed and the Framework provided specific guidance and principles for each of these which sought to control and influence new development in the individual areas.

More detailed proposals for each of the character areas and key opportunity sites had been underpinned by urban design analysis, viability appraisal and analysis of development constraints, to ensure that any barriers to delivery could be overcome within the requisite timescales. This analysis had provided the basis for the development of a town centre-wide Framework designed to strengthen Romford's identity, helping Romford over time to become more legible, coherent and prosperous.

Proposed guidance on development densities provided opportunities for residential led, mixed-use schemes providing high quality urban living for a new economically active community, whilst new social infrastructure brought forward in parallel with development would better serve the needs of existing residents in the town centre and beyond.

The Framework was broadly consistent with national and Mayoral planning policy and it would be taken forward as part of the evidence base of, and, subject to Member approval, be incorporated, as appropriate, in the emerging new Havering Local Plan. It would not be subject to public consultation nor adopted as a formal statutory planning document but would be taken into account as a material planning consideration by development management planners in pre-application discussions and / or the consideration of planning applications.

### **Reasons for the Decision**

It was recommended that Members approve the Development Framework. The Framework was intended to form part of the evidence base for the new Havering Local Plan, superseding the Havering Local Development Framework and the Romford Area Action Plan (2008) and, to that end, it included recommendations to inform and support proposed future site allocations and policy subject to Member approval. The Framework was consistent with the national and Mayoral planning policy which promoted the importance of a plan-led approach to development. It would also serve as a marketing tool for the town as well as a guide to developers.

As a non-statutory document that was not formal planning policy it would give the Council a tool to use when discussing applications with developers and it would have the status of a material planning consideration. Applications could be discussed on a site by site basis within the guidelines for the character area and with a key focus on the quality of design and the appropriateness of material choices.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

Not to publish the Romford Development Framework. This option was considered and rejected as there was a need to have a clear and comprehensive set of principles that could be discussed with developers. The current Romford Action Plan did provide policy guidance and the Framework built on current policy but with an increased emphasis on high quality design.

Cabinet:

- (1) **Approved** the Romford Development Framework (which was a background paper to this report) and **agreed** that the Romford Development Framework should be a material planning consideration when considering development proposals.
- (2) **Agreed** to work proactively with developers and key stakeholders to bring forward developments that met the aspirations of the Framework and to take forward the actions proposed in the Framework.

## **7 LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN ANNUAL SPENDING SUBMISSION 2016/17**

*Councillor Robert Benham, Cabinet Member for Environment, introduced the report*

Cabinet was reminded that The Council made an annual Local Implementation Plan (LIP) Spending Submission to Transport for London

(TfL) for funding transportation initiatives. This was the major source of funding for transport for the Council.

The Submission had to be consistent with the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy, the Council's own adopted Local Implementation Plan strategy document and its approved 2014/15 to 2016/17 Three Year Delivery Plan. The Delivery Plan formed an important context for the submission for 2016/17 and, as in previous years, included the 'core' elements of the current year's submission.

TfL had informed the Council that Havering's indicative LIP funding for 2016/17 was **£2.822m** and later this year it must tell TfL in detail how it planned to spend this.

The report recommended that Cabinet's approval of the detailed and full LIP Submission (including its Principal Road Maintenance and Bridge Strengthening bids) should be delegated to the Lead Member for Environment prior to it being submitted to TfL in October 2015.

TfL was expected to confirm the funding for the proposed programme in the 2016/17 submission in late 2015 and, as in previous years, Members would be advised about the outcome.

This report confirmed that the Council would continue to explore additional opportunities for funding transport programmes/policies to supplement those from the LIP allocation such as other TfL funding streams (e.g. TfL Major Schemes funding, Bus Stop Accessibility Programme and the Mayor's Air Quality Fund), as well as other external funding sources and contributions from development proposals.

Additionally - and separate from the main TfL LIP funding stream - the Council would continue to develop public realm proposals for the areas around the stations at Romford, Gidea Park and Harold Wood as a result of funding secured through the Crossrail Complementary Measures funding package.

The report also explained that the Council was also starting to progress a Major Scheme Step-One funding application for public realm improvements to the A1306 in Rainham and was preparing a funding submission for the Mayor's Air Quality Fund.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The LIP Funding Submission was a statutory requirement submitted annually to TfL in order to secure funding for a range of initiatives in the Borough with a focus on transport but also encompassing public realm, safety and the environment. Without the LIP funding, it was extremely unlikely that the Council would have the resources to take these forward.

**Other options considered:**

There were no alternatives if the Council wished TfL to confirm its LIP funding award to Havering for 2016/17.

Cabinet

1. **Noted** the context provided by Havering's LIP strategy and its 2014/15 – 2016/17 Three Year Delivery Plan for the preparation of the Havering funding submission for 2016/17 (as set out in paragraph 2 of the report).
2. **Endorsed** the content of Havering's approved 2016/17 LIP Programme (as outlined in Appendix A to the report) as the basis of the Council's 2016/17 Spending Submission.
3. **Agreed** that the approval of Havering's full final LIP Funding Submission for 2016/17 be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Environment.
4. **Approved** that the Council sought other opportunities for investment in transportation initiatives from TfL including potential Major Scheme applications outside the LIP Annual Spending Submission process and those would be delegated to the Leader Member for Environment as necessary.

## 8 **ONESOURCE DELEGATIONS**

*Councillor Roger Ramsey, Leader of the Council, introduced the report*

Cabinet was reminded that upon the establishment of the oneSource Joint Committee and the implementation of joint services, both Councils had delegated similar functions to the Joint Committee. These separate delegations had been reviewed and brought together into a single scheme of delegation suitable for approval by both Councils. The joint scheme of delegation would make it easier for both Councils and for the Joint Committee to appreciate the precise extent of what was delegated and what had been retained.

### **Reasons for the decision:**

To enable oneSource to operate more efficiently by having the same functions delegated by both Councils in similar terms.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

None. The only alternative option had been not to delegate afresh and for matters to continue on the current basis.

Cabinet **accepted** the report and **agreed** that the executive functions in Appendix 3 to the report be delegated to the oneSource Joint Committee; and **Referred to Council for approval** the remaining functions listed in Appendix 3 to the report which should also be delegated to the oneSource Joint Committee.

9 **CORPORATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: ANNUAL (2014/15)**

*Councillor Clarence Barrett Cabinet Member for Financial Management, introduced the report*

The report before Cabinet set out the Council's performance against the corporate performance indicators and annual targets for 2014/15 according to the five Living Ambition goals of the previous year's Corporate Plan (Environment, Learning, Towns & Communities, Individuals and Value).

The report identified where the Council was performing well (**Green**) and not so well (**Amber** and **Red**). The "RAG" ratings for 2014/15 were:

- **Red** = more than **10%** off the annual target and where performance had *not improved* compared to the same quarter last year
- **Amber** = more than **10%** off the annual target and where performance had *improved or been maintained* compared to the same quarter in the previous year
- **Green** = on or within **10%** of the annual target

Where the RAG rating was 'Red', corrective action had been included in the report. This highlighted what action the Council was taking to address poor performance, where appropriate.

Also included in the report was a Direction of Travel (DoT) column to compare:

- Short term performance – with the previous quarter (Quarter 4 / annual 2014/15 with Quarter 3 2014/15)
- Long term performance – with the previous year (annual 2014/15 with annual 2013/14)

**Reasons for the decision:**

To provide Cabinet Members with an update on the Council's performance against the Corporate Performance Indicators and annual targets in line with best practice.

**Alternative Options Considered**

N/A.

Cabinet:

**Reviewed** the performance indicators set out in Appendix 1 to the report and **noted** the corrective action that was being taken where necessary.

**Agreed** the proposed amendments to the performance targets for various corporate performance indicators set as part of the Corporate Plan and detailed in the report.

**Noted** the content of the Demand Pressures Dashboard attached at Appendix 2 to the report.

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank