# **GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY**

# **REQUEST FOR DIRECTOR DECISION - DD873**

Title:

London Borough of Haringey - Accessibility and Parking

# **Executive Summary:**

The purpose of this paper is to seek approval to release funds (£3.5m) for the Accessibility and Parking project subsequent to MD895 and the decision of the Director of Development and Environment following advice from the Regeneration Investment Group.

The Accessibility and Parking project will invest in highways, parking and pedestrian route improvements needed to address some of the key impacts of the first phase of the Northumberland Park development, to promote sustainable transport use through walking, cycling and public transport, and provide an improved public realm that enhances the environment and peoples' perception of the local area.

#### **Decision:**

That the director approves the:

- award of MRF capital grant funding of up to up to £3,500,000 to the London Borough of Haringey as a contribution to the costs of the delivery of its Accessibility and Parking project
- entry into and execution of a grant funding agreement with the London Borough of Haringey governing the GLA's provision of the funding.

#### **AUTHORISING DIRECTOR/HEAD OF UNIT**

I have reviewed the request and am satisfied it is correct and consistent with the Mayor's plans and priorities.

It has my approval.

Name Fiona Fletcher-Smith

**Position** Executive Director of Development and Environment

Signature

Date

16.8.12

#### PART I - NON-CONFIDENTIAL FACTS AND ADVICE

## Decision required - supporting report

# 1. Introduction and background

- 1.1 Prior to the civil disturbances in August 2011, Tottenham had already been identified as a regeneration priority by the Mayor, and as an area where there are considerable barriers to private sector investment in Tottenham. A cycle of economic and social deprivation, transient communities and low land values has prevented private investment, regeneration and the development of mixed tenure communities in the area.
- 1.2 Following the disturbances, the Mayor announced a fund of £70m to invest in long term regeneration in some of the worst affected boroughs. A significant proportion of this fund was earmarked for improvement works in London Borough of Haringey (LBH), and multiple proposals have been developed for the borough through consultation with the local community and investigating need for the area linked to jobs and economic growth, predominantly focused where the public disorder disturbances started.
- 1.3 The Accessibility and Parking Improvements project which form part of the North Tottenham/Northumberland Park project, provide needed improvements to the physical environment and walking routes and unlock an estimated £430m of private sector stadium, residential, retail and office investment. North Tottenham/Northumberland Park is 1 of 5 projects for LBH endorsed by the Regeneration Investment Group (RIG) which have a total budget of £41.345m comprising £28m of Mayor's Regeneration Fund (MRF), £11.7m of LBH match funding and £1.645m of other match funding.
- 1.4 In April 2012 following further development and liaison work with LBH, a paper was submitted to and endorsed by the Regeneration Investment Group (RIG) for the imminent release of £3.5m for delivery of the Accessibility and Parking Improvements project. The GLA would now like to conclude the Grant Agreement for the full amount of £3.5m, to be matched with £500,000 from LBH on this project, and commence delivery of the Accessibility and Parking Improvements project.
- 1.5 The project key activities and outputs and outcomes have not changed since the approved Stage 2 report and are summarised below:

### Key activities:

- Council to undertake detailed design of highway works and let construction contract following completion of utility works being organised by THFC. This will ensure sufficient highway capacity in phase with the opening of the new supermarket in the Phase 1 Northern Development in October 2013 (£1.06m);
- Council to design Phase 1 CPZ modifications and extensions in consultation with local residents and businesses (and with LB Enfield) in order for the CPZ to be operational prior to opening of new Northern Development supermarket in October 2013 (£0.33m.);
- Council to secure road closure (highway extinguishment) orders for Paxton Road, Bill Nicholson Way and associated Traffic Management Orders for THFC development in order to ensure new development can be undertaken on existing highway land and traffic orders are in place to support new development (£0.1m.);
- Council to design Phase 2 CPZ modifications and extensions in consultation with local residents and businesses (and with LB Enfield) - CPZ to be operational prior to opening of NDP Interim Stadium in August 2015 (£0.65m.);

 Council to design and implement highway and environmental improvements on Worcester Avenue in order to provide high quality pedestrian route improvements on east side of new NDP Stadium linked with opening of the completed Stadium(£0.5m.).

# **Outputs**

200m. of carriageways and 2,800sqm. footways improved (Phase 1); 700m. cariageway and footway improvements (Phase 2); 280m. pedestrian route imps. (Phase 3)

2 new pedestrian crossings

2 road junction layouts improved with increased traffic flow capacity

Extended control hours introduced for an existing Controlled Parking Zone covering approx. 135 hectares (subject to public consultation response)

300 hectares revised / new Controlled Parking Zone

### Outcomes

Enhanced residents' and visitors' perceptions of the area's environmental quality

Protection of residential amenity – no reduction in resident satisfaction with area.

Junctions operating within design capacity, minimising traffic delays.

Controlled non-residential parking within Zone as part of the Northern Development Travel Plan & maximum use of 400 space supermarket car park.

Controlled non-residential parking within Zone, contributing to Travel Plan targets and specifically that 77% of trips to the Stadium are by non-car modes.

10% increase in capacity to accommodate traffic flows, enabling junctions to operate within design capacity & with increased pedestrian footfall

Increased pedestrian flows with less severance

- 1.6 The original Stage 2 endorsement from the Regeneration Investment Group agreement specifically sought approval for the allocation of funds beyond a 3 year period, due to the dependence of the project timetable on external private development timetables. The Stage 2 report stated "It should be noted that because of the scale of the North Tottenham programme as a whole (and especially the Northumberland Development Project), the timescale for delivering some of the component projects in this funding submission will extend beyond 2014/15. ... While project funding will be phased, as far as possible, to maximise MRF spend by 2014/15, flexibility is requested to allow some investment, if necessary, to be carried forward to 2015/16+. This potential will be noted in the proposed Grant Agreements."
- 1.7 The timeline for delivery of the project has been amended since the Stage 2 report in consultation with LBH, and due to the need to align each Phase of works with the redevelopment of Tottenham Hotspur Football Club and phasing of the Northumberland Development Project. Please see the table below showing the Stage 2 and updated timetable. Although the sum to be allocated in 2015–16 and 2016-17 is larger than previously estimated, this revision is consistent with the Stage 2 approval:

Stage 2 and updated timetable for project spend									
	Projected spend (£000s)								
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Total		
Stage 2 report	0	1,210	640	1,700	450		4,000		
Updated timetable	40	369	1,096	47	1,783	665	4,000		

# 1.8 The table below shows and GLA and LBH projected spend across the project lifetime:

	Projected spend (£000s)							
		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Total
Source								
	GLA	40*	369	1,096	47	1,483	465	3,500
	LBH	0	0	0	0	300	200	500
	Total	40	369	1,096	47	1,783	665	4,000

<sup>\*</sup>Please note the £40,000 incurred on design development in 2011-2012 will be awarded on receipt of evidence, and will be paid in 2012-2013 financial year, meaning a total of up to £409,000 will be funded in 2012-2013.

### 2. Issues for consideration

## a) Links to strategies and Mayoral and corporate priorities

The proposed programme is not mentioned in the strategic plan directly, as it is a response to the unforeseen exceptional incidents of August 2011. However, the programme overall, and the individual projects for Tottenham is currently being scoped linking closely to 3 of the Mayor's priority themes: improving Londoners' quality of life; investing in young Londoners; and making London safer

## b) Impact assessments and Consultation

The Accessibility & Parking project will enable and improve access to sustainable methods of transport including walking, cycling and public transport, reduce vehicle dominance, and provide an improved quality of public realm that enhances the environment and perception of the area to residents, visitors and investors alike.

Since the riots in August, Haringey Council has held a dialogue with local residents, businesses and stakeholders to inform and shape the key elements of the overall approach to regeneration in Tottenham. Between 1st November 2011 and 6th January 2012 a formal public consultation exercise was held to give the local community an opportunity to have their say about shaping Tottenham's future and what their priorities for change are. Consultation questionnaires were sent to every household in Tottenham as well as being available to complete online, with over 630 responses received. Two successful public consultation events were held on the 28th and 29th November at Tottenham Town Hall (South Tottenham) and the Northumberland Park Neighbourhood Resource Centre (NRC) (North Tottenham). The event at Tottenham Town Hall attracted almost 90 attendees and the event at the NRC almost 30. Officers from the GLA were in attendance at these events.

The key themes of concern raised by local people were:

- 1. Lack of jobs and enterprise
- 2. Environmental and public realm issues
- 3. Young people lack of opportunities and engagement
- 4. Image and perception of Tottenham
- 5. Quality of housing and related issues

The key themes for aspirations for Tottenham were:

- 1. Encouraging jobs and enterprise growth
- 2. Building on the vibrant arts and cultural offer
- 3. Building on the excellent community relations

- 4. Development of a positive image for Tottenham
- 5. Better utilisation of Tottenham's many assets
- 6. An attractive, vibrant and historic High Road

On 1<sup>st</sup> August 2012 "A Vision for Tottenham" was launched. The document was produced in partnership with the Tottenham Taskforce and following wide consultation with local residents and traders, and reconfirms the commitment of the Mayor, LBH and Tottenham Hotspur FC to the Northumberland Park/Worcester Avenue area, to which the Accessibility and Parking Improvements project relates.

### c) Risk

Key risks and their control measures will be reported to IPB and the steering group as part of the regular updates and performance management. Key risks are highlighted below:

Risk	Impact	Likelihood	Rating	Mitigation Plan Summary
Actual costs exceed budget allocation.	5	3	15	Detailed cost estimates have been produced by LBH Engineers using scheduled rates so risk of cost overrun is medium/low. Estimates contain normal contingency allowance.
Consultation with residents and businesses opposes introduction of new / extended parking restrictions.	5	3	15	Decision will be guided by consultation response but also important to achieve travel mode target for new Stadium and supermarket - scheme will include offer of free permits for residents.
TfL Network Assurance rejects scheme design.	5	1	5	Phase 1 scheme is provisionally approved - main issue to resolve is the timing of the works in relation to Olympics and TH Gyratory.  Working Group established to ensure smooth implementation. Risk is low.

#### 3. Financial Comments

- 3.1 Approval is being sought to grant fund up to £3.5 million to London Borough of Haringey for capital expenditure in line with the following profile: £409,000 in 2012-13 (comprising £40,000 for design development work completed in 2011-12 and £369,000 for work in 2012-13); £1,096,000 in 2013-14; £47,000 in 2014-15; £1,483,000 in 2015-16; and £465,000 in 2016-17. There is provision for this within the Mayor' Regeneration Fund budget. The aggregate estimate of projects at pre-stage 1, stage 1 and stage 2 business cases and other top slice commitments for staffing support and programme evaluation currently exceeds the total £70 million funding available so approval of this decision is subject to the overall programme being managed within this limit.
- 3.2 MD895 gave approval for the £70 million overall programme budget for the post-riots interventions. £50 million of this budget comprises the Mayor's Regeneration Fund with the remaining £20 million grant funding from CLG through the London Enterprise Fund that is ringfenced for Tottenham and Croydon.
- 3.3 The cost of delivering highways, parking and pedestrian route improvements needed to address some of the key impacts of the first phase of the Northumberland Park development that are proposed in this project is estimated to be £3.5 million. This includes the consultation, design, delivery, permissions, construction, installation and post-implementation evaluation costs. This estimate was approved at Stage 2 in April 2012, and has not increased.
- 3.4 The Stage 2 report noted that due to the scale of the investment programme in the area as a whole, the timetable for expenditure may run beyond 2014-15. Paragraphs 1.6 and 1.7 set out that the proposed profile has been amended with significantly more project spend after 2014-15 than

included in the stage 2 business case and this slippage should be reported to the Investment & Performance Board. Any additional monitoring and support staff costs from the extension of project lifetimes should be contained within the funding envelope for the programme and additional director approvals sought as necessary.

- 3.5 As the GLA is funding the capital elements of projects that will be delivered directly by London Borough of Haringey, reliance has to be placed on its certification of the total amount of capital spending and the period over which benefits of that spending accrue. Its Chief Finance Officer will therefore be required to certify that this is in accordance with regulation and proper practice and how this will be reflected in LBH's own accounts.
- 3.6 As part of the budget monitoring process, officers will be responsible for assessing LBH's grant claims against the funding agreement and take any remedial action should output and costs vary from the agreement. The funding agreements should clearly state milestones to be met in order to claim funding. Officers should also ensure that the requirements relating to the Authority's Contracts and Funding Code is met.
- 3.7 The Mayor's Regeneration Fund team within the Development & Environment Directorate will be responsible for managing this budget proposal. All necessary budget adjustments will be made.
- 3.8 Any changes to the above proposals will be subject to further approval via the Authority's decision-making process as necessary within the overall budget for these interventions.

# 4. Legal Comments

- 4.1 The foregoing sections of this report indicate that:
  - 4.1.1 the decisions requested of the Director fall within the statutory powers, acting on behalf of the Authority (pursuant to her delegated authority granted under MD895), to promote economic development and wealth creation, to promote social development, to promote the improvement of the environment, and/or to do anything which is facilitative of or conducive or incidental to the promotion of those purposes, in Greater London; and
  - 4.1.2 in formulating the proposals in respect of which a decision is sought officers have complied with the Authority's related statutory duties to:
    - (a) pay due regard to the principle that there should be equality of opportunity for all people:
    - (b) consider how the proposals will promote the improvement of health of persons, health inequalities betweens persons and to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development in the United Kingdom; and
    - (c) consult with appropriate bodies.
- 4.2 Officers have indicated in Section 1 above of this report that the contribution of funding to the proposed recipients and projects will amount to the provision of funding and not a payment for services rendered. Officers must ensure that the funding is distributed and managed fairly, transparently, and in accordance with the Authority's Contracts and Funding Code.
- 4.3 Given that the proposed funding will be granted to a public body the risk of challenge on the basis that it constitutes unlawful state aid is considered to be low. However, for the sake of completeness and to mitigate any risk officers must ensure that:

- 4.3.1 Authority funding is not used for any activities or overheads incurred in respect of activities for which recipients charge and a clear operational limit is placed on their use of funds for the administration of the project in this regard;
- 4.3.2 recipients are required to have a separate account for the receipt and use of Authority funding, or if this is not possible, that they show the funding and related expenditure as a restricted fund in their accounts under a clear identifier, e.g. "MRF Funding"; and
- 4.3.3 any award by recipients of funding to sub-recipients (if permitted) under the funded projects are made in accordance with EU "de minimis" principles.
- 4.4 Therefore, the director (having delegated authority via MD895 pursuant to section 38 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999) may approve the proposed award of grant funding and entry into corresponding funding agreements if satisfied with the content of this report.
- 4.5 Officers must ensure that funding agreements are put in place and executed by each of the recipients and the Authority before any commitment is made to the grant of funding.

#### 5. Investment & Performance Board

- 5.1 The original MD895 was discussed and agreed at Regeneration Investment Group (RIG). On 20/02/2012 RIG received a paper seeking approval for North Tottenham/ Northumberland Park.
- The decision was made that an investment decision of £18 million and business case for North Tottenham/ Northumberland Park project be approved. Accessibility and Parking Improvements project was confirmed in the Stage 2 paper as comprising 1 of the 4 projects within North Tottenham/ Northumberland Park, the decision was made that an investment decision of £3.5m of capital funding be approved.
- 5.3 There has been a change to the timeline for spend and delivery of the project. This is due to the need to align each Phase of works with the redevelopment of Tottenham Hotspur Football Club and phasing of the Northumberland Development Project. Please see Section 1 above.

## 6. Background/supporting papers

MD895

Regeneration Investment Group – 11th April 2012 - Minutes Stage 2: Investment Decision – Northumberland Park/ North Tottenham

#### **Public access to information**

Information in this form is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOI Act) and other legislation. Information on this decision will be included in the Mayor's report and decision list. The form will be available publically from then. Any facts and advice that should not be made automatically available on request should not be included in Part 1 but instead on the separate Part 2 form. Deferment is only applicable where release before that date would compromise the implementation of the decision being approved.

Is the publication of this approval to be deferred? NO

If yes, for what reason:

Until what date:

Is there a part 2 form -NO

#### **ORIGINATING OFFICER DECLARATION:**

Tick indicates approval (✓)

# **Drafting officer:**

<u>Jas Birha and Robert Spender</u> have drafted this report in accordance with GLA procedures and confirms the following have been consulted on the final decision:

### Assistant Director/Head of Service:

<u>Joanna Rowelle</u> has reviewed the documentation and is satisfied for it to be referred to the Sponsoring Director for approval.

✓

#### **Advice:**

The Finance and Legal teams have commented on this proposal.

٧

#### **Executive Director, Resources**

I have been consulted about the proposal and confirm that financial and legal advice have been taken into account in the preparation of this report.

Signature

m. J. ala

Date

16,8.12