- Councillors Kober (Chair), Arthur, Demirci, Goldberg, McNamara, Strickland, Vanier and Waters
- Apologies Councillor Morton
- Also Present: Councillor Barbara Blake

| MINUTE<br>NO. | SUBJECT/DECISION   |       |
|---------------|--|-------|
| CAB59         | FILMING AT MEETINGS  |       |
|               | The Leader referred to agenda item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted this information.   |       |
| CAB60         | APOLOGIES  |       |
|               | Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Peter Morton.  | Clerk |
|               | Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor McNamara and Councillor Goldberg.   |       |
| CAB61         | URGENT BUSINESS  |       |
|               | There were no items of urgent business. An exempt addendum would be tabled at item 21, sale of land at Keston Road.  |       |
| CAB62         | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST   |       |
|               | There were no declarations of interest put forward.  |       |
| CAB63         | NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY<br>REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH<br>REPRESENTATIONS<br>No representations were received.   |       |
| CAB64         | MINUTES  |       |
|               | The minutes of the meeting held on the 14 <sup>th</sup> of July were agreed as a correct record.   | Clerk |
| CAB65         | MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY<br>COMMITTEE<br>Councillor Blake was invited to introduce, the Scrutiny Review of Violence<br>against Women and Girls , compiled by the Environment and Community<br>Safety Panel, which she had chaired, in 2014/15.<br>The aim of project was to help with the identification ,prevention and reduction<br>of domestic violence and abuse in Haringey. The report drew attention to the<br>different types of abuse that can be suffered by women and girls and sought to<br>bring to light that abuse is preventable and that agencies have a role in<br>achieving this through a framework of services. |       |

|       | Councillor Blake asked Cabinet to endorse the recommendations of the review which would allow good practice around supporting women and girls and help the voices of victims to be heard.   |
|-------|---|
|       | Local communities also had a role to play in recognising the issues and supporting women and girls to come forward and access support services.   |
|       | RESOLVED  |
|       | To note the conclusions and recommendations of the final report of the scrutiny project on Violence against Women and Girls.  |
| CAB66 | CABINET RESPONSE TO THE SCRUTINY REVIEW OF VIOLENCE<br>AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS<br>Councillor Vanier, Deputy Leader, and Cabinet Member for Communities,<br>thanked the Environment and Community Safety Panel for their work on<br>identifying and investigating this significant issue. Violence against women and<br>girls was a corporate priority as part of outcome 3. The Cabinet Member<br>endorsed the recommendations of the review and was pleased that a violence<br>against women and girls strategy was being developed. The strategy group<br>would be the vehicle through which the issues raised by the review will be<br>considered. |
|       | It was noted that some of the recommendations would be challenging and will require working with partners as part of the coordinated community response to violence against women and girls which were being implemented locally.   |
|       | The Cabinet Member for Communities further explained that some of the recommendations had been partially agreed as there were budget implications which needed to be explored further.  |
|       | RESOLVED  |
|       | That the responses to the scrutiny review be agreed.  |
| CAB67 | <b>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS</b><br>Councillor Kober, Leader of the Council, invited Paul Burnham to put forward<br>is representations in relation to item 10, Housing Review.  |
|       | <b>Deputation 1 – Paul Burham</b><br>Mr Burnham began his deputation by asking Cabinet to not agree the<br>recommendations of the report and consider its long term ramifications on the<br>availability of Council housing and secure tenancies. He felt the findings of the<br>review would lead to new estates being transferred to private companies by<br>stealth and demolition with tenants placed on private rented tenancies. Private<br>landlords would have financial rather than social interests as their main aim and<br>this would also had a detrimental impact on equalities.  |
|       | The deputation disputed the findings of the tenant consultation and contested<br>how it had been conducted and framed. They contended that the consultation<br>was not adequate with any choices between the housing management options<br>put forward to tenants.  |
|       | The deputation continued to make the following requests:  |
|       | <ul> <li>That Cabinet close down the ALMO to prevent future privatisation of this<br/>housing management service and to consider alternative options.</li> </ul>  |

| <ul> <li>Consider the future financial housing situation which indicates that there will be a lack of funding for maintaining and investing in estates.</li> <li>Lobby government to reverse the Right to Buy policy as this will have a detrimental impact on the future social housing available for residents.</li> </ul>  |
|---|
| <ul> <li>Consider the political climate and contribute towards a movement<br/>against the Conservative Housing polices coming forward.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>Ballot Council and Homes for Haringey tenants on the retention of the ALMO.</li> </ul>   |
| The Leader of the Council further asked the deputation party about what their solution would be to the Government's new enforced regulation that will require all local authorities' to sell high value home assets. This would have a significant impact on the future availability of affordable housing in the borough. All London councils were working together to find solutions to mitigate against future decreased availability of social housing.   |
| The deputation party responded by condemning this Conservative policy but contended that there were still choices for the Council to make and this should not include demolishing homes and replacing them with private rented homes.   |
| Councillor Strickland was invited by the Leader to respond to the issues raised by the deputation.  |
| Cllr Strickland began by emphasising the long examination given to the future<br>of housing management, investment and regeneration in the borough,<br>culminating in the findings and recommendations of the Member Housing<br>Review Steering group. The process had begun 9 months ago with a cross<br>party steering group including a tenant representative considering tried and<br>tested models for housing management. They had also visited a range of<br>Councils around the country to discuss these models and get first hand<br>experience of them. |
| In terms of new regeneration estate housing ownership, the Council had<br>continued to be explicit in not yet having a view on this. This was still subject to<br>financial considerations and tenants views .The recent Love Lane estate<br>transfer of tenants was referred to as a positive experience for the residents<br>which was as a result of early engagement and understanding of their needs.  |
| The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration clarified that this was a 10 year agreement being sought with the ALMO with a 5 year break clause which would allow the Council to consider the arrangement and how it was working.   |
| It was further made clear that no Council decision had been made on a development vehicle; this was subject to a separate report to Cabinet which would be examined carefully in the same way as all Cabinet reports.   |
| The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration reiterated that, as a Labour Council, they were trying new innovative ways to deliver housing to residents in the difficult context of government housing policy which against social housing. The Council had also publicly spoken against the RTB policy, arguing that this is not a good deal for social housing.  |
| There had been an extensive consultation exercise with tenants, as part of the review process, showing that ultimately tenants are expecting good housing management service and maintenance of their homes.  |

#### Deputation 2 - UNISON

Chris Taylor of UNISON was invited by the Leader of the Council to put forward his deputation on behalf of UNISON.

Mr Taylor began by speaking against the recommendation to continue with the ALMO. This was out of step with neighbouring boroughs which had agreed to bring the housing services back in house.

UNISON felt that there should be a ballot of tenants on whether to continue with the ALMO as this was a significant change in direction from the original reason of having an ALMO. [Access to decent homes funding ,which had now ceased.]

Mr Taylor felt that that Homes for Haringey should not have been allowed to have a meeting with the Housing Steering Group as they were given an unfair advantage by being allowed to pitch for this service against other potential providers.

There was reference to the proposed transfer of Council staff to and from the ALMO which would have an impact on some staff terms and conditions.

Mr Taylor further argued that the review did not make a strong case for either the in house option or ALMO and therefore there was no reason to continue with the ALMO.

Cllr Strickland responded to the issues raised by Mr Taylor and thanked UNISON for their participation in meetings, discussing the future housing options, and acknowledged that the recommendation on the ALMO continuation was against the national Union view but the steering group had approached the review from the perspective of a best possible solution for tenants.

Cllr Strickland continued to make the following responses the deputation:

- The tenant survey which had received thousands of responses and a whole range of housing issues had been considered with a myriad of different housing arrangements analysed. The group had looked at Councils with supposed in house arrangements and discovered that these were not all straight forward arrangements. Newham had an in house housing management service coupled with a commercial based lettings agency.
- There was no precedent for holding a ballot on the ALMO. With the policy feedback received, and the cost of a ballot considered, the steering group had debated this issue and decided against this course of action.
- The Steering Group's meeting with the ALMO was appropriate and sensible course of action given they were the current housing management provider they should be able to put forward their future offer. The Steering Group also had access to performance figures of the ALMO which they could use to benchmark against other ALMO'S and Council run housing management services. Therefore their proposals were subject to intensive scrutiny.

|       | There were no plans to change staff terms and conditions.   |     |
|-------|---|-----|
| CAB68 | <b>REPORT OF THE STEERING GROUP ON THE FUTURE HOUSING REVIEW</b><br>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report<br>which considered the future approach to managing and investing in the<br>Council's housing in Haringey. The recommendations had been compiled by a<br>cross party housing steering group which had consisted of Councillor Barbara<br>Blake, Councillor Mann, Councillor Ejiofor, Councillor Beacham and Mabel<br>Obeng, a Haringey tenant. The Cabinet Member thanked the group and the<br>independent advisor to the group Julian Wain for their considerable efforts over<br>the last 9 months in investigating and analysing the best solution for<br>management, regeneration and improvement of homes in the borough.<br>Tenant's interests and the best outcome for getting new housing into the<br>borough had been key considerations of the review group and this had been<br>continually kept in mind throughout the review, leading to the recommendations<br>of the report. |     |
|       | The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration also highlighted the future<br>funding gap for housing improvement and management and there would be a<br>further financial review of the housing funding situation with a paper coming<br>forward on this issue.   |     |
|       | The Cabinet Member further flagged a future review of the Council's relationship with leaseholders.   |     |
|       | RESOLVED  |     |
|       | <ul> <li>a) That Homes for Haringey is retained as the Council's Arms Length<br/>Housing Management company, and is offered an extended contract of<br/>10 years in duration, with a review after 5 years, such extended contract<br/>to expire on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2026</li> </ul>  | C00 |
|       | b) That a new management agreement with Homes for Haringey is<br>agreed, the approval of such agreement being brought back to Cabinet<br>not later than March 2016.   | соо |
|       | <ul> <li>c) That the new management agreement should include:</li> <li>- an expectation of continued improvement in performance, including reaching top quartile performance by March 2018, as per their business plan.</li> </ul>  | C00 |
|       | <ul> <li>that Homes for Haringey expands its offer to involve and engage<br/>tenants in the management of their homes</li> <li>that Homes for Haringey continues to maintain a high standard of<br/>leadership and staffing within the organisation and the board.</li> </ul>   | соо |
|       | <ul> <li>d) That at this time, the functions relating to homelessness and allocations services as set out in Appendix A, continue to be managed by Homes for Haringey as part of this contract to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016.</li> </ul>  | соо |
|       | Cabinet further resolved to note:   |     |
|       | a) That a development vehicle is potentially the best solution to progress<br>major estate renewal, maximise the potential for investment in the<br>Council's housing stock, and the delivery of new social and affordable<br>housing. That the Council should aim to replace the same number of  |     |

|    | affordable habitable rooms and that the deal for tenants is broadly<br>comparable under the Vehicle. A separate report on this will be brought<br>to Cabinet in due course.  |
|----|--|
| b) | <b>Other estates:</b><br>That the regeneration of Northumberland Park is considered in the context of a potential development vehicle.   |
| c) | That given the high stock condition needs and repairs costs at<br>Broadwater Farm, a solution is developed in conjunction with the<br>residents in this context, and consultation with tenants should begin by<br>December 2015.   |
| d) | That a regeneration scheme at Noel Park is developed, which builds on<br>the high land values and retains the estate within Council control for the<br>long term and is self-funding.  |
| e) | That those staff seconded to Homes for Haringey in 2014 from<br>Community Housing Services, where it is appropriate to do so, be<br>transferred to Homes for Haringey's employment. In addition, roles<br>identified within Homes for Haringey that are in scope of the Business<br>Infrastructure Programme and Customer Services Transformation will<br>be transferred from Homes for Haringey to the Council. Trades Unions<br>and employees will be consulted. Following this meeting, and if<br>approved, the process by which this will happen will be agreed with the<br>relevant parties. It is likely that TUPE will apply to both transfers. |
| f) | That any additional services that the Council considers it appropriate to commission through Homes for Haringey, or to transfer from Homes for Haringey to the Council, are identified by the Council through the Assistant Director of Regeneration - the agreement of such being either part of the management agreement, or as appropriate to the decision to be made. No specific change to Homes for Haringey's functions is proposed at this time.   |
| g) | <ul> <li>Ongoing Investment needs</li> <li>That the Council determines an asset management approach that delivers the following:</li> <li>Prioritisation between stock maintenance, regeneration and new - build housing.</li> </ul>   |
|    | <ul> <li>Clear standards of maintenance to be achieved for the housing<br/>stock</li> </ul>  |
|    | <ul> <li>Clarity of resources to meet those standards both in terms of<br/>amount and source</li> </ul>  |
|    | <ul> <li>Programmes to meet those standards</li> </ul>   |
|    | <ul> <li>Management of costs to help mitigate the continuing capital<br/>funding deficit</li> <li>This should be in line with the Council's overall Capital Strategy, and<br/>should inform the HRA 30 year business plan.</li> </ul>  |
| h) | Based on the models established for this review the Council should develop a 30 year business plan that provides a balanced budget and   |

develop a 30 year business plan that provides a balanced budget and manages the continuing capital funding deficit on the Council's housing

| stock. The Council should establish and maintain a consistent set of assumptions and financial approaches to Housing Revenue account management going forward.  |   |
|---|---|
| Reviews:  |   |
| That Homes for Haringey must ensure a stronger system of reconciliations between work done, stock condition data and financial investment to ensure accurate physical and financial information are available at overall and estate level, such action to be in place by March 2016.  |   |
| That Homes for Haringey conducts a review of the leaseholder<br>management service, consulting with leaseholders as to the best way<br>forward, based on the formal and informal satisfaction survey results<br>provided to the review, and reports to the Cabinet Member and Chief<br>Operating Officer by March 2016. Such a review should ensure<br>resulting increases in Leaseholder satisfaction rates. |   |
| That Homes for Haringey carries out a review of repairs responsibilities<br>to ensure that appropriate responsibility is borne by the Council and its<br>tenants and leaseholders, and reports to the Chief Operating Officer<br>and Cabinet member in early 2016.  |   |
| That there must be a review of the Council's rent policy, whilst recognising that the awaited rent regime changes due to be put in place shortly may prevent any changes to rent levels.  |   |
| ative Options Considered<br>course of the review a number of options were considered and are listed   |   |
| ouncil retains ownership of the housing stock and:<br>the existing ALMO model to deliver housing services (the "as is" option)<br>gs the management of housing services back into the Council   |   |
| ouncil transfers ownership of its housing stock to;<br>existing housing association or other organisation<br>ew Housing Association (or other delivery vehicle) set up for the<br>ses of receiving the stock and services.  |   |
| s in 4.3 above also included consideration of the following alternatives:   |   |
| Tenant Management Organisation<br>Co-operative model<br>Community Gateway<br>Tenant Management Owned Association  |   |
| how quickly things are changing in the world of housing policy, making a<br>on about the future is no simple task. That's why, over the last nine<br>s, a group of Councillors from both parties and a tenant representative<br>been meeting to think hard about how Haringey Council should manage,<br>in and improve its homes in the future.   |   |
|   | assumptions and financial approaches to Housing Revenue account<br>management going forward.<br><b>Reviews:</b><br>That Homes for Haringey must ensure a stronger system of<br>reconciliations between work done, stock condition data and financial<br>investment to ensure accurate physical and financial information are<br>available at overall and estate level, such action to be in place by March<br>2016.<br>That Homes for Haringey conducts a review of the leaseholder<br>management service, consulting with leaseholders as to the best way<br>forward, based on the formal and informal satisfaction survey results<br>provided to the review, and reports to the Cabinet Member and Chief<br>Operating Officer by March 2016. Such a review should ensure<br>resulting increases in Leaseholder satisfaction rates.<br>That Homes for Haringey carries out a review of repairs responsibilities<br>to ensure that appropriate responsibility is borne by the Council and its<br>tenants and leaseholders, and reports to the Chief Operating Officer<br>and Cabinet member in early 2016.<br>That there must be a review of the Council's rent policy, whilst<br>recognising that the awaited rent regime changes due to be put in place<br>shortly may prevent any changes to rent levels.<br><b>ative Options Considered</b><br>course of the review a number of options were considered and are listed<br>vancil retains ownership of the housing stock and:<br>the existing ALMO model to deliver housing services (the "as is" option)<br>gs the management of housing stock to;<br>wisting housing association or other organisation<br>aw Housing Association (or other delivery vehicle) set up for the<br>es of receiving the stock and services.<br>s in 4.3 above also included consideration of the following alternatives:<br>Tenant Management Organisation<br>Co-operative model<br>Community Gateway<br>Tenant Management Owned Association<br><b>ms for Decision</b><br><b>now</b> quickly things are changing in the world of housing policy, making a<br>n about the future is no simple task. That's why, over the last nine<br>s, a group of Councillors from both parties and a tenant representativ |

|       | It is important that the Council makes a clear decision about the future of housing management and improvement in Haringey. These three reports of the Future of Housing Review explain why a new approach is needed which combines retention of the arms-length management company to manage the majority of the stock, alongside a new development vehicle to lead and fund the regeneration of some of our major housing estates.<br>The Review Group believe, based on the evidence presented by the Independent Adviser and Independent Financial Expert, that the recommendations put forward to Cabinet represent the best way forward for the management and long term improvement any maintenance of both existing and new homes in the borough. |        |
|-------|---|--------|
| CAB69 | ST MARY'S CE PRIMARY SCHOOL, RECTORY GARDENS  |        |
|       | The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced the report which sought agreement to an award of contract for construction works to be undertaken on the St Mary's CE Primary school building located on Rectory gardens, in order to accommodate an additional form of entry.  |        |
|       | RESOLVED  |        |
|       | i. To appoint T&B (Contractors) Ltd in the amount of £1,444,238.15 for a contract period of 57 weeks. This will allow timely delivery of the project to enable accommodation of an additional for of entry by September 2016.   | Dir CS |
|       | <li>To issue a letter of intent not exceeding 10% of the contract sum as<br/>allowed under CSO 9.07.3 whilst formal works contracts are being<br/>prepared.</li>  | Dir CS |
|       | Alternative Options Considered<br>The proposed expansion of St Mary's CE Primary School is expected to<br>support additional cohorts from September 2016. A do nothing option would not<br>support local demand for additional pupil places.  |        |
|       | The feasibility report considered 5 design options for the Rectory Gardens site, with emphasis on flexibility, programme, impact on the school and financial viability.   |        |
|       | Options 1, 2, 4 and 5 were discounted by stakeholders on the basis that the design did not offer the most beneficial outcomes to meet the project objectives and success criteria.  |        |
|       | Option 3 was considered the preferred option and approved for progression to design development.  |        |
|       | <b>Reasons for decision</b><br>To award a contract which will enable the timely mobilisation and construction<br>of works to St Mary's CE Primary School Rectory Gardens Site which aims to<br>support the Council's requirement for additional school places from September<br>2016.   |        |

#### PLANNING

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced the report which set out the consultation and feasibility work completed on the possible expansion of three primary schools in the Muswell Hill area - Coldfall Primary, Muswell Hill Primary and St James C of E Primary. These investigations were conducted against the background of school roll projections that showed continued growth in school numbers. However, since these investigations had neared completion the current school roll projections showed that in this part of the borough the numbers are likely to decrease which will lead to a surplus of school places rather than a deficit.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families advised that, while there is now no need to increase the size of any of these schools, the availability of the feasibility studies mean that if the need arises the Local authority will be able to act quickly to provide additional places and in the meantime there will be consideration of condition issues at the schools where appropriate.

Late representations, expressing concern at the decision not to expand St James's Primary school had also been received by both the Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Families. The detailed concerns would be responded to in writing, outside of the meeting, and the Council's School's Learning team had also offered to have further meetings with the school.

The Leader of the Council further spoke of the Council's good record of responding to school places and although at this stage there was no action to be taken, the Council would remain fully alive to this issue to ensure that parents are able to send their children to local, good quality schools.

Cabinet noted the following:

- the latest available school roll projections (received May 2015) show projected sufficiency of reception places in Planning Area 1 (Muswell Hill) up to and including 2024
- ii. the risks outlined in para 6.37-39 of this report in not currently proceeding with options to provide new places in Muswell Hill;
- iii. that projected falling demand for reception places in Muswell Hill by 2018 may require a review of potential surplus capacity;
- that constant monitoring of the demand for and supply of reception places in Muswell Hill will take place and a further report will be prepared if local demand varies from current projections;
- v. the outcome of the feasibility works, including construction and overall budget costs for the expansion of Coldfall Primary by two forms of entry (60 places), Muswell Hill Primary by one form of entry (30 places), and St James C of E Primary by one form of entry (30 places);
- vi. that further scoping work is proposed by the Property Services on suitability and condition issues at Coldfall and at Muswell Hill Primary, with responsibility for any suitability or condition issues at St James falling to the London Diocesan Board for Schools; the initial general assessment of the impact of the emerging Childcare Bill on Haringey's schools estate in terms of the 30 hour entitlement for three and four year olds of working parents;

RESOLVED

Deputy CE

|       | <ul> <li>that no further consultation work be carried out on the possible<br/>expansion of any primary school in Muswell Hill at the present<br/>time because current school roll projections indicate that<br/>additional reception places will not be required in the next ten<br/>years.</li> </ul>   |  |
|-------|--|--|
|       | Alternative options considered<br>Previous school roll projections set out a need to provide additional reception<br>places in Muswell Hill to meet future projected demand.   |  |
|       | Early consultation on the possible expansion of St James C of E Primary<br>School by two forms of entry met with significant resistance from parents and<br>carers at the school and from some local residents. As a result a broader<br>consultation was held in January and February 2015 with all stakeholders to<br>determine how additional local places might be delivered. From this<br>consultation three schools came forward setting out a desire to expand.   |  |
|       | Feasibility work was carried out to see if and how they could be expanded and to provide indicative costings. A full summary of the results of those feasibility studies set out in this report at Appendix 5 and headlines are set out in paras 6.22 to 6.28 below.   |  |
|       | This report directly addresses a recommendation set out in a March 2015<br>Cabinet member signing report that feasibility work be carried out on the and<br>how three Muswell Hill schools might be expanded. Having carried out wider<br>consultation (January and February 2015) and analysed feedback on place<br>provision in the Muswell Hill area (which informed the March 2015 Cabinet<br>member decision) no alternative options are being considered at the present<br>time.   |  |
|       | <b>Reasons for Decision</b><br>The Council has a duty to ensure sufficiency of primary and secondary school places for children of compulsory school are available for their area. Feasibility work was agreed on an evidence base of projections that showed unmet demand in the coming years. Current projections now show overall sufficiency of places across the borough up to 2024, although with an acknowledgement that there is greater surplus in some areas, and that projections show we will need to increase capacity in Tottenham and the Wood Green borders from 2020. |  |
|       | The decision not to proceed with consultation on the expansion of one or more<br>Muswell Hill schools is based on projected overall local sufficiency of places<br>until 2024 and accords with the agreed place planning principle of the need to<br>meet (but not to exceed) the demand for school places in the local area.  |  |
| CAB71 | SALE OF LAND AT KESTON ROAD  |  |
|       | The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report<br>which sought agreement to the sale of part of the Keston Road site to provide<br>an opportunity for Pocket Living LLP to provide a high percentage of affordable<br>housing in the Borough. There was an increasing demand for intermediate<br>housing and this site was well located to provide 67 affordable home ownership<br>units. The Goan Community Centre and West Green Play group would be<br>given the opportunity to relocate in a new community building which will provide                      |  |

|       | modor   | re facilities in the same location with minimal disruption   |            |
|-------|---|--|------------|
|       | model   | m facilities in the same location with minimal disruption.   |            |
|       | conce<br>units a<br>the Ca<br>Pocke<br>Counc        | abinet Member for Housing and Regeneration acknowledged the<br>rns received from local residents concerning the number of proposed<br>and potential height of the development .Cllr Strickland made clear that<br>abinet decision tonight was to dispose of land at Keston Road and<br>et Living LLP would still need to seek planning permission from the<br>cil's Planning Sub Committee for the development. Concerned residents<br>still be able to put forward their planning concerns at this stage. |            |
|       |   | et agreed this was a good deal to enable additional much needed able housing to made available in the borough.   |            |
|       | RESO  | LVED   |            |
|       | i.  | To declare the part of the site shown edged red on the plan attached<br>(Appendix A) surplus to requirements. This approval is with delegated<br>authority for the Director of Regeneration, Planning & Development<br>following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and<br>Regeneration to agree the final red line boundaries between the land to<br>be retained and the land to be disposed of.  | Dir<br>PRD |
|       | ii.   | To note that the Family Contact Centre will be relocated to a suitable alternative Council site close by subject to further consultation with the staff and service users.   | Dir<br>PRD |
|       | iii.  | To note that the West Green Play Group will be re-provided for within a<br>new community facility to be completed on the retained land. The Goan<br>Community Group have also been offered accommodation in the new<br>facility.   | Dir<br>PRD |
|       | iv.   | To authorise the disposal of the part of the site shown edged red on the<br>plan attached in Appendix A to Pocket Living LLP for the sum set out in<br>part B of the report for the purposes of building 102 new homes of<br>which 67 (65%) will be affordable home ownership units and on the<br>terms set out in paragraph 5.16 (including the construction of a new<br>community building on the retained Council land at their own cost).  | Dir<br>PRD |
|       | Should  | native Options Considered<br>d the Council not sell the site then it will lose the opportunity to provide<br>ousing and continue to retain a wasting asset.  |            |
|       | lt is re<br>delive                                  | on for decision<br>commended that the land is sold to Pocket Living LLP who is able to<br>r a scheme to maximise the amount of recognised affordable units on the<br>support the Councils priorities set out in the Corporate Plan.  |            |
| CAB72 | TRAN<br>The C<br>annua<br>2016/<br>infrast<br>engag | L IMPLEMENTATION PLAN ANNUAL SPENDING SUBMISSION FOR<br>SPORT 2016/17<br>abinet Member for Planning, introduced the report which set out the<br>l investment programme for transport infrastructure in the Borough for<br>17. The plan covered physical renewal of the borough's transport<br>tructure alongside softer measures to promote behaviour change and<br>le on wider safety, health and environmental objectives including air  |            |
|       | quality   | v, and support for more walking and cycling in line with Corporate   |            |

|       | Priorities 2,3 and 4,   |  |  |            |
|-------|---|--|--|------------|
|       | RESOLVED  |  |  |            |
|       |   | al Spending Submission for 2016/17 as s<br>f the report be approved  | et out in                                    | Dir<br>PRD |
|       | ii. That the progr<br>Plan targets b  | ess to date on delivering against our LIP<br>be noted  | and Corporate                                | Dir<br>PRD |
|       | Alternative Options Considered<br>The Annual Spending Submission supports our approved LIP covering 2011 to<br>2031. It is, therefore, not considered necessary to consider other options.  |  |  |            |
|       | the Council's ambition<br>wellbeing of our resid<br>[LIP] therefore repres  | rt infrastructure has a key part to play in t<br>n to deliver economic growth and improve<br>ents and businesses. The Local Impleme<br>ents a significant annual investment prog<br>Priority 2, Priority 3 and Priority 4 of the C | the health and<br>ntation Plan<br>ramme that |            |
| CAB73 |   | G RELATED SUPPORT CONTRACTS  | - PATHWAY OF                                 |            |
|       | SHORT TERM SUP  | PORTED HOUSING - PHASE THREE   |  |            |
|       | The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report<br>which detailed the outcome of an open tender process for the award of<br>contracts to provide Mental Health Accommodation Based and Floating<br>Support Services. New contracts would be awarded in 5 lots, in line with<br>Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.06.1(d) following a robust tendering process |  |  |            |
|       | RESOLVED  |  |  |            |
|       | To agree the award of contracts to the successful tenderers in accordance with  |  |  | Dir<br>PRD |
|       | Lot   | Successful Tenderer  |  |            |
|       | Lot 1 –<br>Accommodation<br>Based with<br>forensic provision<br>( Ref:<br>4400001059)   | Sanctuary Housing Association  |  |            |
|       | Lot 2 –<br>Accommodation<br>Based with 24<br>hour and visiting<br>support (1)<br>(Ref:4400001060<br>)   | Centra Support (Registered as Circle<br>Care & Support Limited)  |  |            |
|       | Lot 3 –<br>Accommodation  | St Mungo Community Housing<br>Association  |  |            |

| <b></b> |  |                    |  |  |
|---------|--|--------------------|--|--|
|         | Based with 24<br>hour and visiting   |                    |  |  |
|         | support (2)<br>(Ref:4400001061   |                    |  |  |
|         | )  |                    |  |  |
|         | Lot 4 – Floating One Housing Group<br>support – East   |                    |  |  |
|         | and Central (Ref:  |                    |  |  |
|         | 4400001063)Lot 5 – FloatingThe Richmond Fellowship Limited   |                    |  |  |
|         | Support – West   |                    |  |  |
|         | (Ref:<br>4400001065)   |                    |  |  |
|         |  |                    |  |  |
|         | Alternative Options Considered   |                    |  |  |
|         | Alternative Options Considered           The option of extending the existing contracts was not ava  |                    |  |  |
|         | 2016 as the contracts had previously been extended. No available that maintained service provision.  | other options were |  |  |
|         | Reason for Decision  |                    |  |  |
|         | The contracts for our established services are due to expir facility to extend beyond March 2016. It was therefore nec   |                    |  |  |
|         | continue to provide services to vulnerable service users and to achieve the aim<br>of developing an HRS Pathway.   |                    |  |  |
|         | As a result of the procurement exercise, which has been c  | arried out in      |  |  |
|         | accordance with the Council's Contract Standing Orders a Code of Practice, it is necessary to award the contract to the contra | nd the Procurement |  |  |
|         | tenderer in accordance outlined in 3.1 and 3.2 in accordance 9.07.1(d).  |                    |  |  |
| CAB74   | MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES  |                    |  |  |
|         | RESOLVED   |                    |  |  |
|         | To note the minutes of the following:<br>Cabinet Member Signing 7 <sup>th</sup> July 2015  |                    |  |  |
|         | Cabinet Member Signing 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2015  |                    |  |  |
|         | Cabinet Member Signing 11 <sup>th</sup> August<br>Cabinet Member Signing 1 <sup>st</sup> September 2015  |                    |  |  |
| CAB75   | SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS  |                    |  |  |
|         | RESOLVED   |                    |  |  |
|         | To note the delegated decisions taken by Directors in July   | and August.        |  |  |
| CAB76   | NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS   |                    |  |  |
|         | None   |                    |  |  |
| CAB77   | EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC  |                    |  |  |
|         | RESOLVED:  |                    |  |  |
|         |  |                    |  |  |

|       | That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as the items below contain exempt information, as defined under paragraph 3, Part 1, schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 |  |
|-------|--|--|
| CAB78 | ST MARY'S CE PRIMARY SCHOOL, RECTORY GARDENS   |  |
|       | As per item 11.  |  |
| CAB79 | SALE OF LAND AT KESTON ROAD  |  |
|       | As per item 13.  |  |
| CAB80 | AWARD OF HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT CONTRACTS - PATHWAY OF<br>SHORT TERM SUPPORTED HOUSING - PHASE THREE<br>As per item 15.   |  |
| CAB81 | NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS  |  |
|       | None   |  |

Councillor Claire Kober

Chair