

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

**Councillors:** Councillor Claire Kober (Chair), Councillor Jason Arthur, Councillor Ali Demirci, Councillor Joe Goldberg, Councillor Stuart McNamara, Councillor Peter Morton, Councillor Alan Strickland, Councillor Bernice Vanier, Councillor Ann Waters.

**Also Present:** Councillor Charles Adje and Councillor Sarah Elliott.

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
<b>CAB671.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>  There were no apologies for absence.	
<b>CAB672.</b>	<b>URGENT BUSINESS</b>  There were no items of urgent business.	
<b>CAB673.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>  No declarations of interest were made.	
<b>CAB674.</b>	<b>NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH REPRESENTATIONS</b>  No representations were received.	
<b>CAB675.</b>	<b>MINUTES</b>  <b>RESOLVED:</b>  That, subject to the addition of the sentence underlined below, in relation to minute CAB657, the minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2014 be confirmed as a correct record:  <u>Minute: CAB657 'The Council's Provisional Outturn'</u>  'In response to two questions from the Leader of the Opposition, it was noted that although the cost of redundancies made by schools were met by the Council, decisions regarding staff and redundancies were made by schools themselves and therefore the Council was limited in its ability to control these costs. <u>With regard to the cost of redundancies made by Homes for Haringey the Leader requested that officers provided further detail with respect to these to the Leader of the Opposition outside the meeting.</u> With regard to a	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>question in relation to the redevelopment of Hornsey Town Hall and the costs attached to the 'gateway review', which was referred to in Appendix 2 of the report; Cabinet was advised that as part of a redevelopment project such as this it was usual to have a review of this kind in order to review all of the options available. A full report setting out the findings of the gateway review would be considered by Cabinet on 15 July'.</p>	
<p><b>CAB676.</b></p>	<p><b>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS</b></p> <p>A deputation was accepted in relation to Item 11: Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework Delivery Plan, from Mr Philip Udeh of the 'Our Tottenham Network'.</p> <p>Mr Udeh began by noting that the Our Tottenham Network was an umbrella group covering over forty-five local community organisations. In April 2013 the network had brought together these groups and formulated and adopted a Community Charter for Tottenham, which was followed in February 2014, by a conference to promote community planning.</p> <p>Mr Udeh noted that the network wanted to see improvements for the existing residents of Tottenham and community empowerment and he contended that the Council's approach to the development of Tottenham would see large numbers of people priced out of their neighbourhoods. Mr Udeh noted that the network welcomed recommendations within the Tottenham Future report with respect to the expansion of social and affordable housing, defending small businesses and social and community facilities and community engagement and empowerment; however, he considered that the Council had not fully taken on board these points in its approach to the regeneration of Tottenham.</p> <p>In conclusion Mr Udeh noted that the network considered that the Council could improve its approach by committing to five 'quick wins' including; implementing the Wards Corner Coalition's community plan; scrapping proposals for demolition at High Road West and the creation of a 'Spurs walkway' and creating new plans in partnership with local traders and residents; improving, rather than demolishing, existing Council estates; extending the leases of community run community centres and committing to no evictions and; expanding health related services from the St Ann's Hospital site.</p> <p>In addition Mr Burnham, also of the Our Tottenham Network and Haringey Defend Council Housing, contended that the Council's approach to development was overly influenced by private developers and that the emphasis on working with private developers meant that existing residents and Council tenants would eventually be priced out of the area. Changes to Council tenants' leases and the demolition of Council housing were not welcomed and Mr Burnham contended that the Council should be improving and investing in existing homes and facilities rather than demolishing homes.</p> <p>A statement was also tabled by Patricia Percy, Co-Vice Chair of the Tottenham</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>Business Group, which called on the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration to explore options that would retain existing shops and businesses in area before the next phase of consultation began. The statement also noted that a petition had been signed by four thousand residents against demolition in the area and urged that the weight of opinion in relation to this was considered.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council thanked the Our Tottenham Network for its deputation and asked how the network had gauged public support for the five 'quick wins' outlined. In response it was noted that the petition referred to by Ms Pearcy demonstrated that residents were against demolition and changes to High Road West.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Housing, Councillor Alan Strickland, formally responded to the deputation and began by thanking Mr Udeh and other members of the Our Tottenham Network for attending the meeting and outlining their concerns. He noted that Tottenham Future report had marked a changed in the way that the Council consulted with residents and noted that issues highlighted by residents within this, such as creating the right mix of housing, had been taken on board.</p> <p>Councillor Strickland noted that extensive consultation with the residents of the Love Lane estate and High Road West had taken place over a two year period and that this had included meetings with individuals, resident and traders groups and door knocking. He noted that the Council's priority on housing was to support existing residents and was not, as suggested, intended to displace people or price people out of the area. With regard to the use of community centres Councillor Strickland noted that the Council wanted to expand the opportunities that these provided to local residents in the most efficient way.</p> <p>With regard to the St Ann's Hospital site Councillor Strickland noted that the Mental Health Trust (MHT) had submitted a planning application for the redevelopment of the site and that this would now be subject to the planning process. The intention of the MHT was to realise the potential on unused land in order to enable it to invest in services.</p>	
<p><b>CAB677.</b></p>	<p><b>THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT - QUARTER FOUR AND END OF YEAR 2013/14</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Leader of the Council, which set out the progress made in relation to the Council's outcomes and strategic priorities for 2013/14.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That progress against the Council's Corporate Plan priorities in 2013/14 be noted and;</li> <li>ii. That the areas for focus and emerging issues going forward, as outlined</li> </ul>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>in the report, be noted.</p> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b> Not applicable as the report is for noting.</p> <p><b>Reasons for decision</b> Not applicable as the report is for noting.</p>	
<p><b>CAB678.</b></p>	<p><b>FEEDBACK FROM CONSULTATION FOR A BOROUGH-WIDE 20MPH SPEED LIMIT</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Environment, Councillor Stuart McNamara, which set out the feedback received from consultation with residents and businesses to gauge support for Haringey to become a 20mph borough and that also set out plans for the implementation of this.</p> <p>Councillor McNamara thanked residents and local groups for the contributions that they had made as part of the consultation process and noted the support received for the implementation of a 20mph limit on residential roads and roads with schools.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That the results of the public consultation, outlined in the report, be noted;</li> <li>ii. That authorisation be given to officers to proceed to detailed design and implementation of a 20 mph limit on residential roads in the vicinity of schools and in town centres; and</li> <li>iii. That approval of the detailed design and decisions relating to changes to Traffic Management Orders be delegated to the Assistant Director Environmental Services and Community Safety, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b> The Council had the option of doing nothing, of implementing a borough wide 20mph limit on all roads (exempt roads on the TLRN), or proceeding as proposed in the report. These options were all considered within the report.</p> <p><b>Reasons for decision</b> The feedback from the public was mixed although it was generally acknowledged that a 20mph limit for our residential roads, particularly around schools, was a positive way forward.</p> <p>The main area of opposition appeared to be the need for a blanket approach to include the main roads. It was felt that the main roads, which were mostly wide and straight, were suitable for a 30mph and that a reduction to 20mph would increase journey times and congestion. As with all speed limits, if the</p>	<p>Interim Chief Operating Officer</p> <p>Interim Chief Operating Officer</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

site does not look like or feel like the limit imposed then there would be larger scale offending. Reports of non-compliance along Islington's main roads, particularly at night when traffic is light, provides a good example of why further investigation was required prior to determining if all main roads were suitable.

The majority of collisions (accidents) in Haringey occur on the main roads, particularly in the vicinity of town centres, as this is where the potential conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles is greatest. This must be considered a priority when determining the appropriateness of speed limit.

The Roads Task Force considered the 20mph debate and concluded that a 'one cap fits all approach' was not practicable. A 'street family' was developed comprising of nine road types based on functionality and usage to reflect the complexity of London's street environment. Speed limits play an important role where 'movement and place' need to be better balanced, where there are high levels of pedestrian activity and where safety issues have been identified. This approach should be adopted to determine the feasibility of introducing a 20mph for Haringey's main roads. For example, where 20mph would be suitable for Wood Green High Road as its function is a town centre attracting high numbers of pedestrians and cyclists, a 20mph limit may not be suitable for Watermead Way, which provides more of a movement function for motorists.

General compliance of a 20mph limit is essential to the success of this initiative. The Metropolitan Police, whilst supporting the initiative, do not have the resource to provide additional enforcement and therefore police enforcement will be mainly reactive and concentrate at locations where safety is compromised. Haringey has provided the SNT with five speed guns to deliver enforcement exercises and a partnership approach needs to be developed with the Police Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT) to deliver joint initiatives to educate the public, particularly at vulnerable locations such as schools and town centres.

Compliance will only be achieved if sufficient interventions are provided with regards to signing and, more importantly, traffic calming / management at locations where speed may remain high. It is likely that compliance along the main roads, outside of town centres, will be low as movement is the main function. Consideration would therefore need to be given to engineer a limit, which could have significant cost implications and limited impact subject to what measures would be consider appropriate.

The success of our Smarter Travel and Community Street programmes, along with our continued investment in cycling and walking, provides us with the opportunity to increase sustainable travel throughout the borough. Through these programmes we need to focus on educating all roads users on the importance of road safety to achieve a cultural change to the present dominance of motor vehicles, thereby securing health, wellbeing and safety benefits for all. This includes education for cyclists who are often just as guilt of using the road inappropriately.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>In summary, it is recommended that the Cabinet approve for officers to proceed with introducing a 20mph limit for all residential roads and in the vicinity of schools. Further consideration should also be given to introducing a 20mph limit at town centre locations.</p> <p>Based on the feedback received and compliance issues that may arise, it is recommended, with the exception of town centre locations, not to proceed with a 20mph limit on our main roads at the present time. We should however continue to monitor analysis and reviews of 20mph limits along main roads and keep an open mind for future possible inclusion.</p>	
<p><b>CAB679.</b></p>	<p><b>IMPROVEMENT AND UNIFICATION OF HOUSING MANAGEMENT SERVICES</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, which provided an update on progress made in reviewing the Housing Management Service and that also sought approval to establish a formal programme for the delivery of change and outcomes across Housing Services.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That approval be given to set up a Housing Unification and Improvement Programme to be managed alongside existing corporate transformation programmes;</li> <li>ii. That the proposed method of staff transfer into and out of Homes for Haringey be noted and that it also be noted that this would be reported to the Corporate Committee;</li> <li>iii. That it be noted that an interim funding bid from the Transformation Reserve (previously approved by Council) of around £400,000 was requested to support the delivery of the whole programme; and</li> <li>iv. That approval be given to the transfer of the management of the budgets related to the associated transfer of housing services from the Council to Homes for Haringey, being around £8.5m, following review and confirmation of need, and that the agreement of the final amount relating to these services be delegated to the Assistant Director for Finance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b>          Alternatives were considered by Cabinet at its meeting in March. This report takes forward the decisions made at that meeting.</p> <p><b>Reasons for decision</b>          In order to meet savings targets across the Council, housing services need to be reviewed. The best option for this is a root and branch review to move services from 'doing' to 'enabling'. A decision is required in order to establish a</p>	<p>Interim Chief Operating Officer</p> <p>Assistant Director Finance</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>corporate programme alongside existing corporate programmes, ensuring consistency, alignment and efficiency.</p>	
<p><b>CAB680.</b></p>	<p><b>HORNSEY TOWN HALL: GATEWAY REVIEW</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, which provided a summary of the Gateway Review recommendations and how these had been addressed. The report also proposed that a further report was provided to Cabinet in Autumn 2014 on an options appraisal.</p> <p>In response to a point made with regard the public interest in Hornsey Town and the need to communicate the changes planned to local residents, the Cabinet Member noted that the Council’s Communications Team was developing a communications plan and that this would set out how residents would be kept informed of progress in relation to the project.</p> <p>In addition it was also agreed that a record of all consultation with residents and stakeholders should be kept and presented with the options appraisal considered by Cabinet in the Autumn.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That the Review the Gateway Review report and its recommendations, as set out in Section 4 and Appendix A of the report, be noted; and</li> <li>ii. That agreement be given to a report being brought to Cabinet in Autumn 2014 presenting the options generated and results of the options appraisal and seeking agreement as to how to proceed with the options considered for the Hornsey Town Hall site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b> <u>Gateway Review</u></p> <p>The Council initiated and organised a Gateway Review, run by Local Partnerships, which was held in December 2013. A Local Partnerships Gateway Review is a peer review process applied to a project or programme at key decision points in its life cycle. It is designed to provide fully independent external quality assurance. The purpose of the Gateway Review for Hornsey Town Hall was as a mechanism to assess the progress of the project to deliver the outcomes expected both by the Council and Mountview and to enable the Council to make informed decisions about the level of risk it was prepared to take in proceeding to the next stage in the delivery of the project.</p> <p>The timing of the Gateway Review coincided with conclusion of Mountview’s outline design stage and the release of their cost plan and fundraising report to indicate the costs and available funds for the project. This indicated a significant funding gap for delivery of the project, much higher than previously reported. This gap was a result of both an increase in costs associated with delivering the Mountview scheme and a reduction in Mountview’s fundraising target.</p>	<p>Dir of Regen Planning and Dev</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

The Gateway Review provided a delivery confidence assessment of Amber/Red. This assessment is defined as 'Successful delivery of the project/programme is in doubt with major risks or issues apparent in a number of key areas. Urgent action is needed to ensure these are addressed, and whether resolution is feasible.'

The Gateway Review also made eight prioritised recommendations. The full Gateway Review report is available at Appendix A.

Options Appraisal

To address the Gateway Review recommendations, the Council appointed GVA Ltd in February 2014 to undertake a detailed options appraisal of the Hornsey Town Hall project, including broader options for the Town Hall complex.

The options appraisal has generated a series of options for the Hornsey Town Hall site, which will be evaluated against a set of criteria based on the objectives of the project. A financial assessment of each option will also be completed.

The scope of work prepared for GVA includes:

- Undertaking an options appraisal considering the recommendations of the Gateway Review and including a review of the existing and potential options for the development of HTH
- To appraise each of those options and to prepare a business case for the recommended option.
- Undertaking an open book appraisal of the Mountview scheme
- A market appraisal to ascertain a potential land receipt that the Council might expect to receive for the site in consideration of recent changes in the property market
- A soft market testing exercise to assess the demand for different options to be brought to the market.

The options appraisal undertaken by GVA Ltd, is being undertaken in conjunction with the Council, Mountview and the Hornsey Town Hall Creative Trust (HTHCT), and all parties are fully sighted on the options being considered and appraised and will be involved in consideration of the conclusion and recommendations. A Working Group representing all parties meets at least once fortnightly to review progress and agree the next steps.

The options appraisal is due to conclude in Summer 2014 and a full report will be presented to Cabinet in the Autumn 2014 seeking guidance as to how to proceed.



**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p><b>Reasons for decision</b></p> <p>The Local Partnerships Gateway Review held in December 2013 provided a delivery confidence assessment of Amber/Red and set out a series of recommendations to be addressed by the project.</p> <p>One of the critical recommendations is that the Council commission a professional team to undertake an options appraisal to include broader options for the Hornsey Town Hall complex site.</p> <p>The Gateway Review report is important context to a forthcoming Cabinet Report in Autumn 2014 when the options generated, results and conclusions of the options appraisal will be presented for consideration by Members.</p>	
<p><b>CAB681.</b></p>	<p><b>TOTTENHAM STRATEGIC REGENERATION FRAMEWORK DELIVERY PLAN</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, which sought approval to adopt the Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework Delivery Plan as the programme for the delivery of regeneration in Tottenham. The report also sought approval of additional funding to support a project working with residents in Northumberland Park.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member noted that the plan would evolve as work developed and he encouraged residents and stakeholders to advise officers if revisions were required. He noted that a community event was being held in July at Tottenham Town Hall to discuss the delivery plan and this would form the first of a series of events to engage with residents on the plan.</p> <p>In response to a question the Chief Executive noted that priorities and indicators in relation to children aged 0 to 4 years of age had not been developed as yet; however, work recently undertaken as part of a Big Lottery bid, would be used as a basis for developing these.</p> <p>The Leader noted that the delivery plan demonstrated the Council's commitment to placing people at the heart of regeneration work and that the plan did not simply set out how physical regeneration would be achieved.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. That the Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework Delivery Plan, attached at Appendix 2 of the report, be adopted as the programme for the delivery of regeneration in Tottenham;</li><li>ii. That it be noted that the approach to community involvement in governance would be developed in consultation with the community and that officers would report back in Autumn 2014 with the community engagement and governance structure; and</li><li>iii. That approval be given to additional funding of £230,000 per annum to support the project working with residents in the Northumberland Park</li></ul>	<p>Dir Regen, Planning and Dev</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>ward (as outlined in Section 3 of Appendix 2, item 1a).</p> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b> Delivering the regeneration of Tottenham is a key corporate priority of the Council. The Strategic Regeneration Framework and accompanying Delivery Plan sets out the Council’s leadership and commitment to achieving the scale of change required to deliver the vision, and was developed following extensive community engagement.</p> <p>The Delivery Plan will be reviewed annually so there will be opportunities to refocus the programme or include further projects.</p> <p><b>Reasons for decision</b> The report asks Cabinet to adopt the Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework Delivery Plan as the programme for the delivery of regeneration in Tottenham, to meet the future vision for Tottenham set out in the Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework.</p> <p>The Tottenham team budget, which was agreed as part of the 2014-15 budget process, largely related to the physical regeneration aspects of the programme. As the social regeneration programme has been developed since the approval of the Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework in March 2014, Cabinet is asked to approve additional funding of £230,000 per annum for the delivery of the project working with residents in the Northumberland Park ward to support the ‘People’ priority.</p>	
<p><b>CAB682.</b></p>	<p><b>HIGH ROAD WEST REGENERATION SCHEME CONSULTATION</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, which detailed the progress made in relation to the High Road West Regeneration Scheme and that also set out the consultation and engagement approach for the next stages of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member noted that in November 2013 Cabinet agreed to the development of a materplan for the High Road West area and that consultation would begin with residents on this in September. An engagement strategy setting out how the Council would work with local businesses and residents on the masterplan had been developed and this would include workshops on key elements of the masterplan such as housing, open space, jobs and employment.</p> <p>As part of the engagement process residents of the Love Lane estate and the Council would be working on a Residents’ Charter that would set out what the residents wanted from the proposed regeneration of their estate and how they considered that this should be undertaken.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>i. That delegated authority being given to the Director of Regeneration,</p>	<p>Dir Regen,</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>Planning and Development and Chief Operating Officer, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, to agree the High Road West masterplan for final consultation with the community in September 2014, and following this consultation there would be a report back for further consideration by Cabinet;</p> <p>ii. That the principles and approach to engagement, set out in the High Road West Consultation and Engagement Strategy, be noted;</p> <p>iii. That approval be given for officers to undertake statutory Section 105 Housing Act 1985 consultation with Council tenants on the Love Lane Estate once the masterplan and Section 105 documentation have been agreed by the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development and Chief Operating Officer, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration. The results of the Section 105 consultation will be brought back to Cabinet to consider with the High Road West master plan; and</p> <p>iv. That the details of the Love Lane Residents Charter be noted and that approval be given to officers working closely with the Residents Association to further develop the principles, and that the Resident Charter will then be brought back to Cabinet for agreement at a later date.</p> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b></p> <p>A detailed consultation and engagement strategy is required for the High Road West Scheme to ensure that the Council can meet its commitment to involve the local community in the development of the master plan and the future planning of their area.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development and the Chief Operating Officer must approve the master plan for consultation. This allows the master plan to be further developed in June and July with the community and consulted on in September 2014. If the master plan is agreed for consultation at the next Cabinet meeting (scheduled for 16 September 2014) there will be a delay (at least three months) in the development of the master plan.</p> <p>In addition to wider consultation with the community, approval to undertake statutory Section 105 consultation with Love Lane secure tenants is required to ensure the Council meets its statutory consultation duty. Under Section 105 of the Housing Act 1985, the Council has a statutory duty to undertake consultation with secure council tenants on any housing management proposals management (this includes management, maintenance, improvement or demolition of dwelling houses) that affect their tenancy. As the next iteration of the plan for High Road West will include the demolition and replacement of all properties on the Love Lane Estate, the consultation on the master plan will need to include statutory Section 105 consultation for secure tenants living on the Love Lane Estate.</p>	<p>Planning and Dev</p> <p>Dir Regen, Planning and Dev</p>
--	--	--

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>Approval for Officers to continue to work closely with the Residents Association to further develop the principles of the Resident Charter is required to ensure the Council meets its commitment to involve the local communities in the development of the master plan and the future of their area.</p> <p><b>Reasons for decision</b> To deliver comprehensive regeneration across the High Road West area and maximise the number of homes, jobs and benefits for local people and to make best use of existing Council homes and assets.</p> <p>The proposals will maximise the provision of a range of housing tenures across the borough and contribute to the creation of mixed and balanced communities and also ensure that the local community are fully involved in the development of the master plan and the future plans for their area.</p>	
<p><b>CAB683.</b></p>	<p><b>TOTTENHAM HALE REGENERATION PROGRAMME</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, which sought approval to dispose of Council land and to agree the approach to housing delivery for the Housing Zone and the submission of a Housing Zone bid to the Greater London Authority.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member noted the report marked an important milestone in the regeneration of Tottenham and for Tottenham Hale as a new affordable neighbourhood within London. The Council’s bid for a Housing Zone at Tottenham Hale would accelerate investment in the area and bring greater cohesion to the proposals coming forward.</p> <p>The Leader noted that she had been contacted by Haringey Health Watch who had raised concerns with regard to the capacity of primary health care services in the area and their ability to meet the needs of a growing population. This issue had also been of concern to local Ward Members and the Council for some time. The Leader advised that the Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) had invited NHS England to attend its next meeting in order to provide an overview of how the provision of GP services was being addressed in Tottenham and in London as a whole and she noted that this was an issue that the Council would continue to monitor.</p> <p>In response to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, as to how the Council would ensure that the target of 50% affordable housing was achieved, given that this had not been achieved on other sites, the Cabinet Member noted that, if approved, Housing Zone status would mean that additional funding would be received that would support this aspiration.</p> <p>It was suggested that it may be useful to consider providing an explanation as to what the term ‘affordable housing’ actually meant in terms of cost.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>Exempt information pertaining to the report was considered at agenda item 24.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That approval be given to the disposal of the Council lands at Monument Way, the Welbourne Centre and lands adjacent to Tottenham Hale bus station (all of which are shown within red boundaries on the plans in Appendix 3A, 3B and 3C) as part of the Housing Zone delivery process, subject to terms to be agreed;</li> <li>ii. That approval be given to delegate authority to the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Housing, to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with other public sector partners (at this point only Transport for London/London Underground Ltd) with regard to the pooling of relevant public sector land assets within the Tottenham Hale Housing Zone priority area and to include the land referred to in paragraph 3.1 and to agree the terms for disposal of the land;</li> <li>iii. That approval be given the approach to housing delivery for the Housing Zone (set out in the report);</li> <li>iv. That approval be given to the submission of a Housing Zone bid to the Greater London Authority based on the above described ask (set out in the report and the paper in Appendix 2);</li> <li>v. That approval be given to delegate authority to the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development and the Assistant Director of Finance, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Housing, to enter into Housing Zone grant agreements with the Greater London Authority (there are likely to be multiple grant agreements covering loan, equity, grant and gap funding); and</li> <li>vi. That the potential requirement to use the Site Acquisition Fund to support the Housing Zone process be noted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b></p> <p>The Council has long been committed to the regeneration of Tottenham Hale and it has for some time been earmarked as a Growth Area (Haringey Local Plan: Strategic Policies, Tottenham Hale Urban Centre Master-plan SPD, Strategic Regeneration Framework and Physical Development Framework). These plans include the development of a new mixed-use urban centre, or district centre.</p> <p><b>Do nothing:</b> allow sites to come forward in isolation using current planning policy as a steer, and allowing for infrastructure to be delivered in parts by</p>	<p>Dir Regen, Planning and Dev</p> <p>Dir Regen, Planning and Dev</p> <p>Dir Regen, Planning and Dev</p> <p>Dir Regen, Planning and Dev</p> <p>Dir Regen, Planning and Dev / Assistant Dir Finance</p>
--	---	--

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>different sites as they come forward.</p> <p><b>Interventionist:</b> Developing a comprehensive Council led master plan and aggressively seeking to acquire sites.</p> <p>These two options were discounted in preference of a strategy which will see significant public sector control over the key place-shaping investments, while still allowing for substantial private sector investment to come forward on individual sites. There were significant concerns that a do-nothing approach would result in far fewer homes being delivered at lower quality over a longer period of time. An aggressively interventionist approach was felt to have excessive risks associated with it, however the Housing Zone does seek to acquire sites where necessary to see the regeneration plans for Tottenham Hale come forward, thus expressing the Council’s commitment to use its powers where sites are stalled or not coming forward in a reasonable timeframe.</p> <p><b>Reasons for decision</b></p> <p>This report asks Cabinet to agree to bid for Housing Zone resources from the Greater London Authority and to enter into grants in relation to these resources if successful. The purpose of these grants would be help shape the development of a sustainable mixed use community at Tottenham Hale and would comprise a combination of funding types ranging from direct grant funding, equity investment, loans and gap funding.</p> <p>This report also asks Cabinet to agree to the disposal of identified sites currently in Council ownership, and to pool these sites with other public sector parties. These sites would then be disposed of through direct sale or through the appointment of a development partner or partners, following a procurement process. This report also asks Cabinet to note that the site acquisition fund may be used to acquire additional sites across the Housing Zone and that these may be pooled into the above procurement process.</p> <p>Additionally, this report asks Cabinet to agree the approach to housing delivery which places an emphasis on affordable home ownership within the affordable portion of housing delivery and on bringing forward a proportion of homes within the private rental sector on the private portion of housing delivery.</p>	
<p><b>CAB684.</b></p>	<p><b>SEVEN SISTERS REGENERATION, TOTTENHAM - APEX HOUSE AND WARDS CORNER</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, which sought approval of proposed next steps in securing the necessary investment in these sites to realise their regeneration potential.</p> <p>In response to a question from the Leader of the Opposition as to why the level of affordable housing within the scheme was not higher the Cabinet Member advised that the decision made in relation to Wards Corner had been made by the Planning Committee based on advice from the District Valuer. With regard to the Apex House site the Cabinet Member noted that 40% affordable housing</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

was still considered to be a good level, particularly given the difficulty that boroughs across London face in achieving this. The Cabinet Member noted that in order to achieve 40% affordable housing on the site the Council had used the receipt from the land value to support this.

The Leader noted that the provision of affordable housing should be seen as part of the overall public value of the scheme, which also included relocating the market and creating a civic heart at Tottenham Green by relocating Council services there.

In response to a question from Councillor Adje the Leader noted that exempt information in relation to the leasehold interest of Apex House would be supplied to him outside the meeting. With regard to proposals for the relocation of the Customer Services Centre the Chief Executive noted that two sets of proposals would be presented to Cabinet in the Autumn; one in the relation to the short term relocation of the centre and a second set of proposals in relation to the long term relocation of the centre.

Exempt information pertaining to the report was considered at agenda item 25.

**RESOLVED:**

- i. That the original decision, made by Cabinet on 14 October 2008 that Apex House N15 is surplus to service requirements, be re-confirmed;
- ii. That it be noted that the Customer Service Centre at Apex House could be moved to Tottenham Green and that a report on this would be presented to Cabinet in due course;
- iii. That approval be given to the appropriation of the Apex House site for planning purposes pursuant to Section 122 Local Government Act 1972 and subject to the powers provided by Section 237 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 5.15-5.24 of the report;
- iv. That approval be given to sell, pursuant to Section 233 Town and Country Planning Act 1990, a long leasehold interest in Apex House, N15 to a wholly owned subsidiary of Grainger plc (to be incorporated prior to exchange of contracts) based on the Heads of Terms set out in the exempt Appendix 3 to the report and authorises the Assistant Director Corporate Property and Major Projects to approve the detailed terms and conditions of sale (consistent with the terms set out in the exempt Appendix 3 to this report) after consultation with the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance and the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration;
- v. That approval of support be given for the provision (subject to planning permission) of ground floor retail space as part of the Apex House site

Dir Regen,  
Planning  
and Dev

Assistant  
Dir  
Corporate  
Property  
and Major  
Projects

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>redevelopment offering the potential to extend retail opportunities for local traders, including as a possible temporary or permanent relocation site for the Wards Corner market (subject to discussions with the traders and subject to any necessary variation of the Section 106 agreement in respect thereof) to enable easier continuity of trading;</p> <p>vi. That it be noted the application by Grainger plc. to the Homes and Communities Agency for Build to Rent loan funding to support the potential provision of private rented homes in both the Wards Corner and Apex House schemes (together with affordable rented homes at Apex House) - subject to the grant of planning permission for Apex House;</p> <p>vii. That it be noted that the proposed tenure mix at any new development at the Apex House site would include a minimum of 39% affordable housing consistent with policy to broaden tenure mix in Tottenham – all of that housing being reserved for rented accommodation and capped at reasonable rent levels, i.e. 50% of market rent for family sized dwellings;</p> <p>viii. That approval be given to the variations to the Wards Corner Development Agreement dated 3 August 2007 with Grainger Seven Sisters Ltd. to reflect the changes as outlined in this report (as detailed in paragraphs 5.27-5.35 of the report and in the exempt Appendix 3) and authorises the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development and the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration to approve detailed changes (including any additional changes) to the Wards Corner Development Agreement;</p> <p>ix. That it be noted that, subject to the grant of planning permission, the redevelopment of Apex House will begin the desired environmental and economic transformation of Seven Sisters with Wards Corner following later when site assembly has been completed;</p> <p>x. That it be agreed, in principle, to the use of Section 226 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 compulsory purchase powers, if necessary, to acquire outstanding third party land interests in the proposed Wards Corner development site (the boundary of which is shown on the Plan in Appendix 2 to this report), where acquisition by agreement (by Grainger Seven Sisters Ltd. as developer) is not possible, subject to Grainger complying with its obligations in the Development Agreement including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Grainger providing the Council with satisfactory details of the steps they have taken to seek to buy land by agreement;</li><li>➤ Confirmation by the Grainger plc Board, prior to Cabinet (at a future meeting) considering making a Compulsory Purchase</li></ul>	<p>Dir Regen, Planning and Dev / Assistant Director Corp Gov</p>
--	---	--



**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>Order, that all conditions (apart from the Site Assembly Condition) in the Wards Corner Development Agreement have been or can be satisfied on the basis of current scheme proposals;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Grainger entering into a Costs Indemnity Agreement with the Council to cover the Council’s costs &amp; liabilities in relation to compulsory purchase action; and the preparation of an Equalities Impact Assessment of the impact of compulsory acquisition;</li> </ul> <p>xi. That, subject to agreeing recommendation (x) above, authorisation be given to officers to serve information requisition notices to establish details of existing third party land interests in the proposed Wards Corner development site (see the Plan set out in Appendix 2 of the report);</p> <p>xii. That approval be given to authorise the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development and the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Enter into a guaranteed Costs Indemnity Agreement with Grainger Seven Sisters Limited to cover all of the Council’s costs and liabilities (both internal and external) in preparing for, making and seeking the confirmation of a Compulsory Purchase Order for the Wards Corner scheme; and</li> <li>➤ Enter into any other necessary legal or contractual arrangements with Grainger Seven Sisters Ltd (or other subsidiary companies within Grainger plc) and/or the GLA to give effect to the Cabinet’s decisions on the above recommendations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b></p> <p>The option to retain Apex House as a Council building was considered as part of the Strategic Property Review. The conclusion was that the building is no longer fit for purpose and is not needed for service delivery. The Customer Service Centre (currently in Apex House) is better located in Tottenham Green to help consolidate that area as Tottenham’s ‘civic heart’, complementing the environmental improvements currently underway there.</p> <p>Retaining it as a Council building would mean that residents continue to experience inadequate customer service facilities and staff continuing to operate in a poor environment that does not support the Council’s strategy for Smart Working. That would also mean the Council does not achieve the required financial efficiency in property costs, as well as increasing the risk of building condition issues creating pressure on revenue and capital budgets.</p> <p>Apex House could be let as offices as part of the commercial investment</p>	<p>Dir Regen, Planning and Dev / Assistant Director Corp Gov</p>
--	--	--

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>portfolio but, certainly in the short to medium term, as the District Valuer has previously confirmed, there is limited demand for office accommodation of this size in this area. Moreover, retaining the building as offices would deny the opportunity for more intensive development on the site, especially for retail and residential uses, to capitalise on its prominent and highly accessible position. That would also deny the opportunity for such development to provide a stimulus for investment in surrounding sites to continue the area's transformation as envisaged in the Council's regeneration vision.</p> <p>Apex House could be advertised for sale on the open market for redevelopment. However, there are significant benefits in the same developer handling both the Wards Corner and Apex sites (not least because of the potential to offer the Apex site as a relocation site for the Wards Corner market). So the Apex site can support delivery of the Wards Corner scheme and, with Grainger's offer for the Apex site being certified by the District Valuer as best consideration, there is no benefit in seeking an open market sale.</p> <p>The council is currently bringing forward a small new build housing programme funded through the HRA. The council could consider developing out this site under its own programme and this would allow the council to bring forward 100% affordable housing if it chose to do so. However, such a development would be at considerable cost. The HRA is already fully committed to infill site development and this site would a minimum of £13m to be found in the General Fund in order to bring development forward. Given the pressures in the General Fund this is not being suggested as an option in this report.</p> <p>The council could retain the site and sell it on the open market later (post Wards Corner development). While this may realise a higher value in the market, it is clear that such a sale could not take place for some time during which the Council would forgo savings, a capital receipt and would need to find alternative meanwhile uses for the building which is currently not fit for purpose as office accommodation as described above. The sale of Apex now to Grainger will assist the developer's bid for Build to Rent funding as described in paragraphs 5.10 – 5.12 of this report, a determination on which will take place in September 2014.</p> <p><b>Reasons for decision</b> The report recommends approval to the next steps in securing investment in two key sites at Seven Sisters to help realise the regeneration potential and contribute towards the delivery of the Council's vision for Tottenham.</p>	
<p><b>CAB685.</b></p>	<p><b>FASHION ENTER- FASHION TECHNICAL ACADEMY</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Social Inclusion and Carbon Reduction, which sought endorsement of project proposals and approval of the balance of funding required to be allocated to the project from Council reserves.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member invited Jenny Holloway of the Fashion Technical Academy</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

(FTA) to provide an overview of the FTA’s work. Ms Holloway noted that the FTA provided training for anyone aged 16 plus that ranged from NVQ Level 1 to NVQ Level 4 in the technical production of garments. This concentration on the development of technical skills in garment production was unique in the UK and provided an excellent basis for training in the textile industry. Ms Holloway noted that although the majority of students were aged between sixteen and nineteen there was a significant proportion of people aged fifty plus who wanted to develop new skills and this group were also in training. The FTA worked closely with Job Centre Plus and the local sixth form and further education colleague to attract students.

The Leader thanked Ms Holloway for attending and noted that the presence of the FTA in Tottenham demonstrated the Council’s role in helping to enable people to equip themselves with the skills they needed to find employment.

**RESOLVED:**

- i. That the project proposal as detailed be endorsed and approval be given to take a five year lease on Unit 13 at the Crusader Estate;
- ii. That approval be given to carry out improvements under landlord’s responsibilities to achieve statutory compliance at the costs highlighted in paragraph 5.19 of the report;
- iii. That approval be given to sub-let unit 13 to Fashion Enter for a period of 5 years to run the Fashion Technology Academy at a tapering subsidised rent as highlighted in paragraph 5.20 of the report and;
- iv. That approval be given to the balance of funding required of £539,864 to be allocated to the project be found from council reserves.

Dir Regen,  
Planning  
and Dev

Dir Regen,  
Planning  
and Dev

Dir Regen,  
Planning  
and Dev

**Alternative options considered**

As the Fashion Technical Academy will benefit London’s wider economy, and provide opportunities to people from outside Haringey, there is a case for sharing the cost of public subsidy with other authorities or agencies. However, given the particular benefits to Haringey of consolidating the fashion cluster in this area, plus the lack of alternative options which could deliver funding in the immediate term, it is on balance considered appropriate that Haringey Council should consider meeting the full public subsidy requirement at this stage in the Academy’s development. In the longer term, the Council will actively work with Fashion Enter to identify and exploit other sources of external support which could reduce the burden on Haringey, and to develop a long-term business plan that will allow Academy to become as self-sufficient as possible.

There are no other options which would achieve the same outcomes; the only other option is for the Council not to support the development of the Fashion Technical Academy at all, or to reduce its funding contribution (which would effectively have the same result). However, the Council’s emerging strategy for economic growth (and the evidence on which it is based) is clear that many

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>residents in the borough - and particularly in Tottenham - suffer from multiple barriers to employment and low rates of attainment, and that investment and intervention by the Council (beyond existing statutory provision) is necessary and appropriate to address this issue. And while the Council has not formally adopted an up-to-date economic development strategy, this project and the outcomes it delivers are consistent with the Council's emerging policy and priorities in this area.</p> <p><b>Reasons for decision</b> By supporting the Fashion Technical Academy the Council will be contributing towards Outcome 3 of the Corporate Plan by providing skills and training opportunities.</p>	
<p><b>CAB686.</b></p>	<p><b>PLANNING AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT FOR 2012/13 AND SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE (SPG) REVIEW</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Planning, which sought approval of the Planning Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) for publication on the Council's website and approval to revoke certain supplementary planning guidance.</p> <p>Cabinet was advised that within the original report SPG 11b had been recommended to be revoked under 3.2 of the report; however, this should have been listed as being withdrawn under 3.4 of the report.</p> <p>It was suggested that it would be useful to provide an explanation for members of the public as to where the provisions set out in the defunct documents would now sit.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That the Planning Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) be noted and approved for publication on the Council's website.</li> <li>ii. That approval be given to the revocation of the following supplementary planning guidance, pursuant to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and associated regulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ SPG11b – Buildings Suitable for Community Use (2003)</li> <li>➤ Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2008)</li> <li>➤ Wood Green Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document (2008)</li> </ul> </li> <li>iii. That approval be given to an application to the Secretary of State for the revocation of the above mentioned guidance under section 25 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act.</li> <li>iv. That approval be given to the withdrawal of the following guidance, pursuant to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and associated regulations:</li> </ul>	<p>Dir Regen, Planning and Dev</p> <p>Dir Regen, Planning and Dev</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

- SPG11b – Buildings Suitable for Community Use (2003)
- SPG1ai – Major Applications Protocol (2004);
- SPG1c – Strategic Views (2006);
- SPG1d – Telecom Equipment, Including Satellite Dishes (2006);
- SPG3c – Backland Development (2006);
- SPG4 – Access for all, Mobility Standards (2006);
- SPG5 – Safety by design (2006);
- SPG6c – Restaurants, Hot Food Premises, Use Class A3 etc (2006);
- SPG7b – Travel Plans (2006);
- SPG7c – Transport Assessment (2006);
- SPG8f – Land Contamination (2006);
- SPG8h – Environmental Impact Assessment (2006);
- SPG9 – Sustainability Statement Guidance Notes and Sustainability Checklist (2006);
- SPG10e – Improvements to Public Transport Infrastructure and Services (2006);
- SPG11a – Car repair workshops and garages (2006);
- SPG18 – Town Centre Retail Thresholds (2004);
- Basement Guidance Note (2012);
- Tottenham International Development Framework Section 1 (2003);
- Tottenham International Development Framework Section 2 (2003); and
- Tottenham International Development Framework Section 3 (2003).

v. That it be noted that the following guidance would be withdrawn by a decision of the Assistant Director of Planning and Building Control:

- Planning note on housing SP2: Housing

**Alternation options considered**

Planning Authority Monitoring Report

The Localism Act 2011 requires local planning authorities to produce monitoring reports. Planning authorities can now decide what is monitored and the format for reporting. Haringey's existing procedure of annual monitoring is considered an effective way for presenting outcomes and achievements of the planning service, within existing resources. As such, no other options were considered. However, the report includes information beyond the monitoring year where it helps to provide a more current picture of performance outcomes.

Supplementary Planning Document/Guidance Review

Two alternative options were considered:

Dir Regen.  
Planning  
and Dev

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

Option A: Do not review the supplementary planning guidance documents. This is not considered an appropriate option as there have been changes in national and regional guidance. Further, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recommends the review of planning documents. It is also considered that the Council's current volume of supplementary planning guidance (48 documents) is excessive, and may impede effective development management and pose a barrier to investment in the borough.

Option B: Revoke or withdraw all supplementary planning documents and guidance. This is not considered an appropriate option as the Council has some excellent supplementary planning guidance documents which provide appropriate locally specific guidance, based on extensive consultation with residents, and these documents continue to provide useful guidance for development management and investment in the borough.

The preferred option is therefore a tailor-made approach which balances multiple requirements: to update and streamline Haringey's planning policy guidance; to provide greater certainty about the types of development that the Council will support; and to ensure the protection of Haringey's interests now and in the future.

**Reasons for decision**

Authority Monitoring Report

The publication of the Authority Monitoring Report is a requirement of the Localism Act 2011. Approval of the contents of the AMR for publication will ensure that the Council meets its statutory obligations for planning performance monitoring.

Supplementary Planning Document/Guidance Review

The NPPF is a material consideration for planning decisions. It also sets out requirements and guidance for local authorities to consider when preparing planning documents. Importantly, the NPPF advocates that local planning authorities review their Local Plans in whole or in part to respond flexibly to changing circumstances.

In 2013 Haringey adopted its Local Plan: Strategic Policies, which at public examination was found to be sound under the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. In addition, the Local Plan was assessed as being consistent with the NPPF. The borough now has an up-to-date strategic plan which provides a robust basis for guiding new development and investment in the borough.

However, many of Haringey's existing Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) and Supplementary Planning Guidance documents (SPGs) were prepared prior to the publication of the NPPF and adoption of Haringey's Local Plan.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>In light of these circumstances it is appropriate for Haringey to closely examine its suite of SPD/G documents, to ensure they closely align with the local planning policy framework and positively contribute to the development management in the borough.</p>	
<p><b>CAB687.</b></p>	<p><b>COMBINED REPORT FOR PLANNING OBLIGATIONS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) CONSULTATION DRAFT AND ADOPTION OF HARINGEY'S CIL CHARGING SCHEDULE</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Planning, which sought agreement from Cabinet to recommend to Full Council that it adopt the CIL Charging Schedule and approval for the draft Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document to go out to statutory public consultation for a period of six weeks.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That the CIL be endorsed and that the CIL Charging Schedule be recommended to Full Council for adoption for implementation from 1<sup>st</sup> November 2014; and</li> <li>ii. That approval be given to the draft Planning Obligations SPD, as set out in Appendix B of the report, for a six week statutory public consultation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b></p> <p>The CIL Regulations are scheduled to restrict the pooling of s106 planning obligations to five sites from 1 April 2015. In order for infrastructure planning obligations to be pooled together from multiple sites post this date, a CIL charging schedule is required.</p> <p>To explore all of the development and infrastructural opportunities, and ensure that developments come forward along timescales that ensure these synergies are exploited efficiently is not feasible. CIL offers certainty about the quantum of infrastructure contributions to be collected on each site in the borough, without jeopardising affordable housing contributions, and while maintaining the opportunity for bespoke site-specific planning obligations to be collected. As such it is not seen as realistic to proceed with the current planning obligations regime.</p> <p><b>Reasons for decision</b></p> <p>Adoption of CIL should be recommended by Cabinet to Council. The SPD preparation requires a statutory six week public consultation which will commence after Cabinet approval.</p>	<p>Dir Regen, Planning and Dev</p>
<p><b>CAB688.</b></p>	<p><b>WAIVER OF CONTRACT STANDING ORDERS - TOTTENHAM THINKING SPACE</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, which sought approval to waive Contract Standing Order 10.01 to extend the project for a further twelve months until September 2015.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That approval be given to waive Contract Standing Order 8.02 (requirement to obtain quotations) as allowed under CSO 10.01.2 (d): “it is in the Council's overall interest.”; and</li> <li>ii. That approval be given to extend the Tottenham Thinking Space (TTS) Pilot for a further twelve months of service provision (to September 2015), with the contract for the pilot to be awarded to Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative options considered</b> Competitively tendering a second year of the pilot from other providers is not recommended for the following reasons:</p> <p>This project’s success is based on building long-term trust between the provider and the community in a facilitated way that requires specialist skills and expertise. Even with such a highly skilled staff, TTS found it hard, in the first six months, to establish this ongoing trust; this could be jeopardised by alternative service provision.</p> <p>It is unlikely another provider would have sufficient knowledge and expertise of the community therapy concept to be able to take over the project without impacting negatively on service quality.</p> <p><b>Reasons for decision</b> A waiver of CSO 8.02 as allowed under CSO 10.01.2 (d) is sought in order to provide continuity of service.</p>	<p>Dir Public Health</p> <p>Dir Public Health</p>
<p><b>CAB689.</b></p>	<p><b>PROPOSED SCHOOL EXPANSIONS</b></p> <p>Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, which sought agreement to commence stakeholder consultation on the reinstatement of the Published Admission Number (PAN) at Bounds Green Infant and Junior School and the possible expansion of St James Church of England Primary and St Mary’s church of England Primary Schools.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That approval be given for officers to commence stakeholder consultation on the possible reinstatement of the published admission number (PAN) at Bounds Green Infant and Junior School and on the possible expansion of St James CE Primary and St Mary’s CE Primary Schools;</li> <li>ii. That approval be given for the Cabinet Member for Children and Families to consider a further report from officers in December 2014 on the outcome of the consultation and to decide on whether or not a statutory notice should be published setting out the local authority’s</li> </ul>	<p>Dep Chief Exec</p> <p>Dep Chief Exec</p>



**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

intention to permanently expand St James' and St Mary's, such a decision to be informed by officers' recommendations setting out consultation feedback and other relevant material considerations including the latest available information on the demand for and supply of school places in the borough; and.

- iii. That it be agreed that, in parallel with any consultation phase, the design work would be undertaken at risk on the potential expansions of all three schools to enable planning for delivery of any expansion(s) to be delivered on time in the event that such expansion(s) be approved.

**Alternative options considered**

All available birth and school roll data concludes that we will run out of sufficient reception places in 2015 if we do not take action to increase the overall PAN for the borough.

Additional places can be provided through new schools or by expansion (permanent or one off 'bulge' classes) of existing schools.

The Education Act 2011 changed the arrangements for establishing new schools and introduced section 6A (the academy/free school presumption) to the Education and Inspections Act 2006. Where a local authority thinks there is a need for a new school in its area it must seek proposals to establish an academy/free school.

While we know that we do not have enough reception places in the borough to meet future demand, this unmet demand is not concentrated in one location but is spread across the central and western parts of the borough. This projected unmet demand can more effectively be met by the expansion of three existing schools as opposed to new provision concentrated in only one location.

As a result of the analysis of the geographical spread of the unmet demand, expansion as opposed to a new school is proposed at this time. By 2024 we expect to be more than ten classes (310 places) short of reception places if we do not take action to increase capacity. This report is recommending the commencement of consultation on up to four classes (120 places) of additional capacity.

**Reasons for decision**

Our projections show that we will not have enough places to meet projected demand if we do not increase capacity at reception level. This report seeks Cabinet agreement to carry out initial consultation on the possible expansion of two of our primary schools and the reinstatement of the PAN at one further school from its current 60 places up to its original PAN of 90.

By taking these steps at this time we ensure that we have sufficient time to actively engage with all stakeholders and seek views on these expansions, and to allow any provision to be secured in a timely way following any agreement

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

	<p>to expand any one or all three of the schools. This advance planning also allows us some time to seek alternative proposals if it is ultimately decided not to expand any one (or more) of these schools.</p> <p>During the intervening period between now and March 2015 we will continue to monitor actual and projected demand for reception places and report back to Cabinet on any impact this demand has on either the proposal before Cabinet now or where continued demand might mean that additional provision over and above that set out in this report is identified.</p>	
<b>CAB690.</b>	<p><b>MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That the minutes of the following bodies be noted:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) Cabinet Member Signing (Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration) – 27 June 2014</p>	
<b>CAB691.</b>	<p><b>SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<b>CAB692.</b>	<p><b>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>There were no new items of urgent business.</p>	
<b>CAB693.</b>	<p><b>EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as the items below contain exempt information, as defined under paragraphs 3 and 5, Part 1, schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.</p>	
<b>CAB694.</b>	<p><b>TOTTENHAM HALE REGENERATION PROGRAMME</b></p> <p>Exempt information pertaining to Item 13 was considered.</p>	
<b>CAB695.</b>	<p><b>SEVEN SISTERS REGENERATION, TOTTENHAM - APEX HOUSE AND WARDS CORNER</b></p> <p>Exempt information pertaining to Item 14 was considered.</p>	
<b>CAB696.</b>	<p><b>NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>There were no new items of exempt urgent business.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 15 JULY 2014**

--	--	--

The meeting closed at 7.40pm.

COUNCILLOR CLAIRE KOBER

.....

Chair