

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

Councillors Claire Kober (Chair), Jason Arthur, Ali Demirci and Ann Waters

Also Present: Councillor Engert, Councillor Newton, Councillor Carter

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTON BY
CAB82	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.	
CAB83	APOLOGIES Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Goldberg, Councillor Vanier, Councillor Strickland and Councillor Morton. Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr McNamara.	
CAB84	URGENT BUSINESS No items of urgent business were put forward.	
CAB85	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST There were no declarations of interest put forward.	
CAB86	NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH REPRESENTATIONS No representations were received.	
CAB87	MINUTES The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 15 th September were agreed as an accurate record.	Clerk
CAB88	DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS The Leader of the Council invited Mr Will Spokes to put forward his representations relating to Item 12, Haringey Local Plan. Mr Spokes, was speaking on behalf of the Defend Crouch End group, and began by objecting to the inclusion of Site Allocation 51[site in between 72-96 Park Road and Lynton road in the Site Allocations development Plan] and asked for this site's removal from the plan. He referred to the lack of proper information provided to local residents and business, earlier this year in the consultation period, about the inclusion of this site in the DPD. Mr Spokes set out the circumstances in which the local residents and businesses had become aware of its inclusion in the DPD which he felt did not reflect the principles of good communication and he questioned if this was indicative of the	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

consultation, as a whole, on all the local planning documents.

Mr Spokes contested the proposed height of the development at this site which would have a detrimental impact on the existing neighbourhood, with an immediate changed physical environment for households living in close quarters to the site .He also highlighted the closure of the existing discreet and unique businesses, currently taking up the site, to make way for the housing which was not in keeping with the boroughs employment commitments. He felt that due consideration had not been given to the impact of having additional housing in the area. This was in terms of parking, environment and schools. There was an obvious bias to housing development but he questioned how any mixed use employment space could be continued at this site.

The Leader provided some assurance to the deputation explaining that the Local Plan, at this stage, set out in theory what uses can be made of the site. Any eventual changes to the site would be subject to planning permission where local concerns can also be put forward

In response to the Leader's question on the local group's level of opposition to housing on this site, the deputation advised that they had a pragmatic stance. However, any housing development would need to be completed in a manner which was sympathetic to the existing area and would need to keep the community and local stakeholders in the area satisfied.

The Cabinet Member for Planning further responded to the deputation by acknowledging the concerns received both in writing and in separate meetings with residents and businesses about this site.

In response to the concerns on height, and the loss of employment on the site, the Cabinet Member for Planning advised the deputation party that there was already an existing planning consent for the northern part of the site for a 5 storey building providing for 40 net residential units. Therefore the planning documents of the Council could not discount the existing planning permission, or the principles of development that it has established on this site. Given the significant need for housing and affordable employment space in the borough this site was considered to be one that is able (subject to careful design) to make a contribution towards the borough wide housing and employment need.

The Cabinet Member for Planning further provided assurance to the deputation party that while the allocation agrees the principal of development, that if and when a proposal for development is received it will be subject to policies governing parking, height of development, and impact on surrounding properties on Lynton Rd, Park Rd and the Grove.

The Cabinet Member for Planning welcomed the proposed replacement employment floor space in the new development and hoped that local residents would be reassured that the Local Plan will help to manage how this development at SA49 [Previously SA51] comes forward in the future, and ensure that it makes a positive, rather than negative contribution to the urban fabric of Crouch End.

The Cabinet Member for Planning re-iterated the pressure faced by local authorities to provide more housing and employment for residents but was happy to meet with the residents and businesses concerned about SA 51 as part of the Regulation 19 consultation process.

The Leader asked the Assistant Director for Planning to set out the next

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

development phase of these local plans, following consideration at Cabinet and Full Council in November. The Assistant Director for Planning advised that in December there would follow a further consultation period and an examination in public in spring, testing the soundness of the planning documents. A representative of the Secretary of State will take this forward, inviting local stakeholders and groups to participate and share their views. The Crouch End community group can be provided with details about the examination exercises and how they can participate.

The Leader invited Jacob Secker to come forward and with the second deputation in relation to the Local Planning documents at agenda Item 12.

Mr Secker was speaking on behalf of a number of community groups and projects in and around the Broadwater Farm estate. Mr Secker began by objecting to the inclusion of Broadwater Farm estate along with the Northern housing areas off the estate such as Somerset Close, Moira Close and Lido square being included in the site allocations development plan [SA62]. He welcomed the removal of the Lordship recreation ground from the Plan and asked for same action to be applied to SA62.

The deputation party felt that there had been inadequate consultation with residents about the inclusion of the estate and surrounding northern housing area in the local plan as potential development areas. The deputation felt the Council had the underlying objective of demolishing the estate and rebuilding private accommodation in its place and Mr Secker referenced extracts of the September Cabinet report on the review of Housing Management [the deputation had tabled a information pack for the Cabinet supporting their deputation] which he claimed supported this underlying Council objective. This September Cabinet report had also highlighted the Council's consideration of a joint venture vehicle for housing regeneration in the borough which the deputation party felt would bring less equality and rights to Council tenants.

In response to the Leader's question on the regeneration of the estate, the deputation asked the Cabinet to consider alternative solutions for modernising the estate such as, ensuring the decent homes standards were applied, and physical estate improvements made to buildings. These details were contained in page 8 of the information pack tabled.

The Leader of the Council responded to the deputation by emphasising that the Council had no plans to demolish the Broadwater Farm Estate and replace it with private accommodation. Lack of housing was a London wide issue with no easy solutions and would mean looking at innovative ways to bring in Housing to the borough.

The required physical improvements to the Broadwater Farm estate were undeniable. Also there were structural issues with the buildings meaning there were no easy solutions for upgrading the buildings. The Leader had visited Broadwater Farm and had also heard from residents who wanted better upgraded accommodation.

The Cabinet Member for Planning began responding to the deputation by acknowledging the considerable responses received on the issues of Lordship Recreation Ground and the Broadwater Farm area. The Lordship Recreation ground had been removed from the Plan following consultation. However, the housing estate consultation responses were more mixed with request for better housing. The Council had a responsibility for ensuring high quality homes across the borough – including on the Broadwater Farm estate. Therefore the

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

	<p>plan proposed the Council work together with the local community groups, residents and stakeholders on new supplementary planning document to set out how to secure improvements to this housing estate to improve stock, design of the site, and routes through the area.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Planning further clarified that there were no detailed plans for how this will be achieved, and certainly no agreed plan for demolitions. The Council would work with local residents and stakeholders in identifying options for improvements to the estate in the future.</p> <p>The Cabinet member for Planning felt that there were differing views from residents about Broadwater Farm and advised that he had met with residents of Tangmere block and the Broad water farm residents Association who wanted better quality homes.</p>
<p>CAB89</p>	<p>BUDGET MONITORING 2015/16 - PERIOD 5</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture introduced the report which set out the range of indicators relevant to the Council's overall financial health. These included the forecast financial revenue and capital outturns for 2015/16 based on actual performance to 31 August 2015.</p> <p>Cabinet were further asked to consider the proposed management actions set out in this report and approve the budget adjustments (virements) in Appendix 1 as required by Financial Regulations.</p> <p>The current budget overspend reflected the current increased demand for services, against a decrease in the budget base of the Council. The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture continued to be concerned about the overspend in Children's and Adults. In terms of housing spend, it was evident that nationally, as well as locally, there was not enough housing available, increasing the cost of temporary accommodation.</p> <p>In terms of the recent announcements about the devolution of business rate income to local Councils, the Council were wanting to see more equalisation and will endeavour to maximise the opportunities provided by devolution of this budget.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member set out the measures being taken forward to deal with the overspending areas in the budget. This would include carefully exploring the overspending areas according to Council Priority to understand whether: the overall savings trajectory is likely to be met, whether savings will be met next year, or if the savings plans in place need more acceleration. The Cabinet Member would be leading a series of Star Chamber meetings with head of budgets to take this analysis forward.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture would also be bringing forward an Budget Monitoring report to the November Cabinet to keep Cabinet fully abreast of the impact of actions, changes being made to the budget, and progress to reduce the overspend. It was important to note that, due to the sensible reserves budgeting policy, the Council were in a better position to meet the anticipated increased demands for services. However there would continue to be more focus on bringing the overspend down.</p> <p>Cllr Engert questioned the ongoing required Adult and Children's services budget savings, and the risk of depleting reserves, if these savings cannot be met. The Cabinet Member explained that there had been a lot of work to explore the issues in these two services including: if there were legitimate</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

issues with meeting timelines for savings targets, the impact of the financial models being used by the service areas, considering social care packages in place.

Overall, the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture would be considering the Council's savings trajectory for the next year and how it will be achieved and also having conversations with Cabinet Members on their priority areas.

There was a separate risk reserves in place and the Council were required by its external auditors to have £15 to £20m in reserves.

The Leader provided a further context to the budget pressures being seen, by explaining that virtually all London boroughs were experiencing a demand pressures for Adults and housing service. The Council had been criticised for previously boosting reserves but service changes would take time to deliver and the increased reserves provided the support to make the transformational service changes needed whilst dealing with peaks in service demand.

The Cabinet and Liberal Democrat Group further placed on record their thanks and appreciation to Kevin Bartle, The Assistant Director for finance, who was leaving the Council in November. Mr Bartle was commented to be an exemplary local government servant, providing expertise and support to all Councillors.

RESOLVED

- i. To note the report and the progress being made against the Council's 2015/16 budget in respect of net revenue and capital expenditure;
- ii. To approve the budget changes (virements) as set out in Appendix 1;
- iii. To note the use of the Strategic Risk Reserve to mitigate the Council's overall revenue position as set out in Section 7 to the report;
- iv. To note the range of strategies to bring the current year's budget into balance, including challenge meetings (Star Chamber) as described at paragraph 16.2 to this report; and,
- v. To maintain under review the key risks and issues identified in this report alongside the adequacy of the Council's reserves.

**AD
Finance**

Alternative options considered

The report proposed that the Cabinet considers the financial position for 2015/16 in line with existing procedures. However, it also includes enhanced financial information to give the Cabinet a more rounded view of the Council's financial position.

A risk based approach to budget monitoring has been developed in order to manage the Council's finances at a time of economic and financial uncertainty including additional benchmarking information.

Cabinet could choose to adopt a less rigorous regime and examine the financial position at a later stage. Projections could be marginally more accurate if a delayed approach was adopted, but there would be less time for robust development and consideration of management action and virements

Reasons for Decisions

Members' involvement in financial monitoring is an essential part of delivering the Council's priorities.

The constitution requires Members to approve certain financial transactions

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

	such as virements according to approved limits.	
<p>CAB90</p>	<p>LETTINGS AGENCY - UPDATE ON PROGRESS</p> <p>The Leader introduced the report which set out on progress being made to establish the private sector lettings agency, Move 51Degrees North. This was a subsidiary of Homes for Haringey and has been set up to offer an effective, good quality and affordable alternative landlords and tenants in the private rented market. This initiative was a direct commission for Homes for Haringey by the Council, to support key priorities in the drive to improve Housing within this Borough.</p> <p>This was a key manifesto commitment which would enable the Council to intervene in this unregulated sector and ensure a good private housing service with better fees and better standards of accommodation.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To note the report</p> <p>Alternative Options considered. This was an information report with no decision attached.</p> <p>Reasons for Decision Not applicable</p>	
<p>CAB91</p>	<p>FORMER GREENFIELDS SCHOOL, COPPETTS ROAD AND LCCCP SITE 54/56 MUSWELL HILL, LONDON N10</p> <p>The Leader of the Council introduced the report which set out the sale of the former Greenfields School site to the Peter Rigby Trust, founder of The London Centre for Children with Cerebral Palsy, in return for the long lease site at 54/56 Muswell Hill .The Trust were currently leasing the use of the Greenfields school site on a short term lease but wanted to stay on site permanently as the site was, ideal from an educational point of view, for the children attending. The site was also designated for Educational use. The acquisition of the long term lease of 54/56 Muswell Hill in turn provided an opportunity for the Council to acquire a site in the heart of Muswell Hill which will provide 6 affordable housing units and ground floor accommodation which will be available for use by the Council and the community.</p> <p>In response to Cllr Engert's questions it was noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That it was too early to set out decisions on how the Council will consult with the community on the use of the ground floor at 54-56 Muswell Hill as so far, understandably, the Council activity had been focused on acquiring the long term lease of 54-56 Muswell Hill and releasing the Greenfield site was at the edge of the borough boundary. • The decision on fitting out the ground floor of 54-56 Muswell Hill depended on the outcome of the evaluation of the associated budgets and assessing whether there are also external funding opportunities available to support the fit out. The budget decision on this will likely come forward to Cabinet in due course 	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

	<p>It was further agreed that Cllr Engert be provided with a fuller version of the ground floor map, included at appendix B, setting out the precise square footage available to the Council for the community space.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. To declare the Greenfield Site shown edged red on the plan attached (Appendix A) surplus to requirements. ii. To authorise an option to dispose of the Greenfield Site to The Peter Rigby Trust for a sum as set out in Part B of this report and based on the Heads of Terms attached (Appendix C). iii. To agree to the acquisition of PRT Property shown edged red on the attached plan in Appendix B from the Peter Rigby Trust based on a 999 year lease for a sum as set out in Part B of this report and based on the Heads of Terms attached at Appendix C. iv. To agree to the conversion of the upper floors of the PRT Property immediately on completion of the acquisition subject to planning into 6 one bed flats available for shared ownership affordable housing and that the ground floor will be available for Council use. v. To note the expected cost of the fit out of the proposed 6 one bed flats set out in 6.25 to be funded from existing budgets. vi. To note that the fit out costs of the ground floor are as set out in 6.25, and agree that this funding be identified as part of the ongoing capital strategy work. <p>Alternative options considered</p> <p>Not to sell Coppetts Road and not to purchase the long lease</p> <p>The option of not selling the Council site in Coppetts Road to the Peter Rigby Trust will result in the opportunity for the long lease available with the PRT Property not being available to the Council. Therefore the affordable Housing and ground floor D1 use would not be available.</p> <p>Reasons for decision</p> <p>The decision will provide a continued Educational use at Coppetts Road and the Council will acquire a site in central Muswell Hill which will provide 6 affordable Housing units and a Council and community building on the ground floor supporting the Council's Housing and community strategy.</p>	<p>AD Property and Capital Projects</p> <p>Dir PRD</p> <p>Dir PRD</p> <p>Dir PRD</p> <p>Dir PRD</p>
<p>CAB92</p>	<p>ICT RESOURCE PLAN</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture introduced the report which sought approval to procure a specialist organisation as the Council's partner for the provision of additional skilled IT staff. This partner would provide the additional resources required to deliver the technology elements of the Council's transformation programmes that are being delivered in the Council over the next 12-18 months.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

	<p>In response to Cllr Engert’s question, it was clarified that the proposed arrangement would provide the Council with the flexibility to call on required expert and specialist IT staff when needed, at a lower cost, and at a lower staffing daily rate compared to the use of contracts to access this support.</p> <p>RESOLVED To approve the IT Staffing Resource Plan outlined, including procurement of a specialist IT resourcing partner with a total contract value not exceeding £1.70m.</p> <p>Alternative options considered</p> <p>Do nothing, i.e. use the existing IT teams to deliver the transformation and priority work.</p> <p>The current level of resources will not be able to meet the current timelines set by the priority outcome and transformation programmes.</p> <p>Buy in contractors piecemeal from the marketplace as and when each specific requirement occurs.</p> <p>Buying in contractors from agencies on a piecemeal basis will not be cost effective or efficient. Our requirements will need flexibility where contractors may come in for a few days at the beginning of a project and then 3 days per week for a period (for instance). Contractors are normally hired for minimum periods of 3 months, anything less than this and there would be a significant premium to pay as you would need to pay a retainer.</p> <p>Reason for decision</p> <p>A decision is required as the size of the requested contract is over delegated authority limits for officers</p>	<p>Chief Operating Officer</p>
<p>CAB93</p>	<p>HARINGEY'S LOCAL PLAN</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Planning introduced the report which set out progression of these 4 important planning documents: Alterations to Strategic Policies, Development Management DPD, Site Allocations DPD, and Tottenham Area Action Plan to the next stage of Plan preparation.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Planning explained the role of each of these documents for the Council, and as the Local Planning Authority, to proactively manage development needs and change in the Borough, ensuring it is directed to where it is best accommodated and being able to resist inappropriate poorly located schemes. This included:</p> <p>The Alterations to the Strategic Policies reiterated the Council's commitment to delivering more housing to meet local needs but targeting this to areas that would benefit significantly from substantial inward investment including better transport services, improved environmental quality, and new jobs.</p> <p>This spatial strategy allowed the Council to recognise and protect its valued local open spaces, the residential amenity and heritage that add to the</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

character of our neighbourhoods, and making the best of employment sites for continued employment uses.

The role of all the other draft planning documents was to give effect to this agreed spatial strategy.

The Cabinet Member for Planning reported that, since the consultation period closed in March 2015, the Planning Policy team had sifted through some 600 letters and emails and 6 petitions containing over 6,000 comments. The petitions included one for Lynton Rd with 126 signatures, one for Pinkham Way with 1154 signatures, and 4 separate petitions on Lordship Rec/ Broadwater Farm totalling 395 signatures). In addition officers had undertaken meetings and discussions with a range of interested parties on a range of subjects and sites.

The reports included in the agenda pack contained the updated Local Plan documents, along with the Consultation Reports with the comments received and responses to these.

The spatial strategy was updated to reflect Haringey's increased housing target is contained at Appendix A on pages 119 to 214.

The "Development Management DPD" at Appendix C, included a "design charter" for all new development (page 223) and important policies to cover the protection of family homes (page 257), open spaces (Pages 264-269), shops (pages 304-312) and community facilities (Pages 314 -318).

The "Site Allocations DPD" (pages 351 to 573) included designations for key sites such as Alexandra Palace and the Highgate Bowl, and the opportunities in Wood Green, Hornsey and Green Lanes, which translated into allocations for some 7,500 new homes and 75,000m² of new employment floor-space.

Elsewhere within the "Tottenham Area Action Plan" at Appendix G contained detailed site by site development requirements covering the new opportunities in one of London's Housing Zones – as well as reflecting the distinctive heritage, character and economy across Tottenham.

The Cabinet Member for Planning provided an overview of the tone and feeling regarding the consultation process on the last set of documents. There were a range of comments about the content and the way in which the Council had engaged with communities, members and developers as part of that process. In some cases communities felt that the Council had not engaged with them effectively. In a number of cases, feedback suggested that some of the bold allocations that were promoted should not be progressed. The changes to the plan, set out on pages 7-50 of the report pack illustrated how, having regard to local views, the Council had responded.

The Cabinet Member for Planning felt that, taking forward the learning from feedback received about the consultation and engagement processes, the Council were committed to also trying harder to reach out and secure views from more of the community on the "soundness" of these proposals and improving the readability of these documents. The Cabinet Member for Planning had recently hosted a community forum to discuss our Statement of Community Involvement on 14th September. There would be a continuing programme of engagement around these documents to help answer some of the earlier criticisms associated with the earlier round of consultation last spring.

The Cabinet Member for Planning linked the Corporate Plan ambitions for

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

better homes for everyone, new jobs and improved opportunity for all, a safer and a healthier borough being reflected in an updated Local Plan. He indicated that the document had an important part to play in realising that ambition – by helping the council plan for infrastructure, seizing opportunities from development to secure positive economic and housing outcomes or by protecting and preserving important spaces, buildings and places. Despite the challenges of accommodating London's Growth, The Cabinet Member for Planning advocated that the Plan meets the objectives for growth, employment and Housing –and the 4 appendices attached should now proceed to Full Council for approval.

In response to the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture's question on management of the tension in supporting economic as well as Housing growth in Haringey, it was noted that local authorities were facing big challenges to deliver employment and housing and were looking at ways in which sites can have both housing and employment use. Brownfield land in the borough was limited and choices were required to be made regarding how the borough best use the land available. The Council had further endeavoured to safeguard employment land and the Brownfield site at Pinkham way

The Leader referred to the recently approved Growth Strategy of the Council which would not limit the Council to dormitory businesses but put forward a new approach for how employment sites may exist in the borough, attracting local jobs and locations allowing access to higher skills.

The Council would not automatically favour residential sites to employment sites as this was short sighted as employment was a key component of growth.

RESOLVED

To note the comments of the Regulatory Committee at Paragraph at 6.7; and

To note the comments received to consultation on the preferred option draft Local Plan documents (the draft Schedule of Alterations to the Strategic Policies DPD; the draft Development Management Policies DPD; the draft Site Allocations DPD; and the draft Tottenham Area Action Plan DPD) and the Council's proposed response to these as set out in the Consultation Statements at Appendices B, D, F and H respectively of this report.

That Cabinet recommend to Full Council that it approve the following:

- I. The Schedule of Alterations to Haringey's Local Plan: Strategic Policies: Pre-submission version;
- II. The draft Development Management DPD: Pre-submission version;
- III. The draft Site Allocations DPD: Pre-submission version; and
- IV. The draft Tottenham Area Action Plan: Pre-submission version

(attached at Appendices A, C, E and G respectively), for publication and submission to the Secretary of State for independent Examination in Public.

Alternative options considered

**AD
Planning**

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

The Council could choose not to review the Local Plan: Strategic Policies, which was only adopted in March 2013. However, since that date, further alterations have been made to the London Plan which significantly increases Haringey's strategic housing requirement. As a result, the Council's current spatial strategy for the borough makes insufficient provision to manage this new level of growth. As the new regional policy is adopted and forms part of the Borough Local Plan, the fact that Haringey's spatial strategy is not up-to-date will not prevent development coming forward to meet and exceed the new housing target. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly states, at paragraph 14, that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, the Council will grant proposals permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise, or the development does not accord with the NPPF.

The NPPF and evidence underpinning the further alterations to the London Plan, and to the Local plan also, demonstrate a need to revisit the housing assumptions within the Strategic Policies DPD (2013), especially if the other supporting local plan documents are to be progressed further. Not undertaking the alterations would render a number of the existing Strategic Policies out-of-date, and significantly compromise the ability of the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, to make planning decisions based on local strategic circumstances. Accordingly, not reviewing the document is not a viable alternative.

The Development Management DPD, the Sites Allocations DPD, and the Tottenham AAP, will significantly improve the Council's ability to manage and promote high quality sustainable development (and resist unsustainable development) across the borough, so not producing these documents is not considered to be an appropriate or viable alternative.

For the four development plan documents, the current stage of plan-preparation represents a formal statutory stage in line with previously agreed programme of work contained within the Local Development Scheme. The Council has therefore determined that it wishes to prepare these Development Plan Documents. The Development Plan Documents have been prepared in accordance with the relevant planning regulations.

Reasons for decision

These four planning policy documents are to form part of Haringey's Local Plan. Without them it will be challenging for the Council to deliver the borough wide aspirations and corporate objectives we have to manage change and growth for the benefit of existing and future residents and businesses. It would also become increasingly challenging to influence and determine development proposals which fail to deliver sustainable development outcomes in Haringey. These local plan documents will be more up to date and consistent with the London Plan 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework than the current version of the Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013) and Haringey's saved UDP policies.

Publication and the submission of the Local Plan documents to the Secretary of State for Examination in Public is a statutory requirement in the process of preparing and adopting the Local Plan. It is equally important that the Council give consideration to the comments received and show how these have been taken into account and, where appropriate and justifiable, addressed through changes to the documents.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

	<p>This will enable the pre-submission versions of the four documents to be reported to Full Council for its consideration and approval, in accordance with the timetable set out in the Council's adopted Local Development Scheme.</p>	
	<p>MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES</p> <p>RESOLVED To note the minutes of the following:</p> <p>Cabinet Member Signing 7th September 2015 Cabinet Member Signing 18th September Cabinet Member Signing 22nd September Cabinet Member Signing 1st October Cabinet Member Signing 1st October Cabinet Members Signing on 5th October Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee 6 July 2015</p>	
	<p>SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS</p> <p>RESOLVED To note the directors actions taken in September.</p>	
	<p>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>None</p>	
	<p>EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>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</p>	
	<p>FORMER GREENFIELDS SCHOOL, COPPETTS ROAD AND LCCCP SITE 54/56 MUSWELL HILL, LONDON N10 As per item 91.</p>	
	<p>EXEMPT MINUTES</p> <p>The exempt part of the minutes for the 15th September 2015 was agreed as an accurate record.</p>	
	<p>NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>None</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2015**

Councillor Claire Kober
Chair