

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON Tuesday, 9th February, 2016**

## **PRESENT:**

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

### **185. 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 .

### **186. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor McNamara.

### **187. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business received.

### **188. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Waters declared a personal interest in report item 10, Fees and Charges 2016/17, by virtue of being an allotment holder.

### **189. NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH REPRESENTATIONS**

No representations were received.

### **190. MINUTES**

Cllr Engert commented that she had not received a response to the previous action under Item 171 in relation to the air quality apprentice. The Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development agreed to chase a response.

The minutes of the meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2016 were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

### **191. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

None.

## **192. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

There were no deputations, questions or petitions put forward to the meeting.

## **193. THE COUNCIL'S BUDGET FOR 2016/17**

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture introduced the report which set out the latest position in respect of the Council's Finances with the aim of finalising the budget proposals from Cabinet for the year 2016/17 or consideration and approval by the Council on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2016. The budget report had not changed significantly from the last iteration considered at Cabinet on the 19<sup>th</sup> January. Following the final finance settlement being received by the Council this week, the budget estimations were unchanged. The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture highlighted the public consultation results for adding a 2% precept to Council Tax to specifically fund Adult Social Care. The results reflected strong support for this decision and the Cabinet report recommended to Full Council approval of this 2% precept. There were 27% of responders asking for this additional funding to be directed to Day Care Centres. In response to this, the Council recognised the value of the Centres, but as set out in the report, the social care precept did not change the budget pressures in Adult's Service and therefore the report was proposing that the income from the precept would be directed to support care packages for young people with complex needs, Learning Difficulties and older people.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture drew Cabinet's attention to the increased tax base and the intention to place this additional funding into a risk reserve. This was also done last year and had helped offset overspend in Adult and Children's Services.

Councillor Wright, Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee was invited the by the Leader to address the meeting and highlight the Scrutiny budget recommendations that were contained at Appendix 6 of the Cabinet report.

Councillor Wright welcomed the proposed acceptance of the Scrutiny recommendations. He reported that Overview and Scrutiny had noted that the 3 year budget assumptions were holding up and this was a tribute to officer's good work.

Councillor Wright referred to the Overview and Scrutiny discussion on Day-Care Centres contained at page 32 and the difficulties with the pressures in the Adults budget. He recognised the huge pressures going forward on Adult's budget.

Overview and Scrutiny recommended maintaining a high level risk register to monitor the budget situation in Adults Services, keeping adequate levels of reserves and welcomed the £1.7m additional funding for Adult care shown in this report. The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny felt it would be important, in the next budget year, to keep a close eye on all the savings targets and make sure that they were proceeding according to plan. The Scrutiny Panels would also keep this under review, over the coming year, through the budget monitoring reports.

Overview and Scrutiny also agreed it was important for the Council to maximise income from all sources.

In response to Councillor Engert's question on a revised Capital Strategy coming forward to Cabinet, it was noted that a 10 year Capital Strategy would come forward to Cabinet in June 2016 and then also go forward to Full Council in July 2016.

Agreed that Councillor Engert is provided with a written response to her question on the reasons for the £1.1m increase in PFI cost for 2015/16 shown at appendix 3, page 41.

Agreed that Councillor Engert is provided with an itemised list of expenditure for the Capital Programme in 2015/16.

Councillor Morton, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, welcomed the recommendation for implementing a 2% Council Tax precept specifically for funding Adult Social Care but highlighted the nationwide underfunding issue for Adult Social Care. The Council would ensure that this additional funding was made effective use of.

The Leader of the Council asked Cabinet to agree the recommendations at section 3.

**RESOLVED:**

1. To approve, subject to any agreed amendments, the proposals set out in the report at appendix 1, including the 2% precept on Council Tax towards funding Adult Social Care pressures and submit them for consideration by the full Council at their meeting on 22nd February 2016 as Cabinet's 2016/17 budget proposals;
2. To propose approval to the Council of the 2016/17 General Fund revenue budget as set out in Appendix 1 of the report, including specifically a General Fund budget requirement of £255.627m but subject to the final decisions of the levying and precepting bodies and the final local government finance settlement;
3. To propose approval to the Council of the 2016/17 Housing Revenue Account budget as set out in Appendix 2 of the report;
4. To confirm and propose approval to the Council of the 2016/17 General Fund capital programme detailed in Appendix 3 of the report;
5. To confirm and propose approval to the Council of the 2016/17 Housing Revenue Account (HRA) capital programme detailed in Appendix 4 of the report;
6. To approve the changes to the rent levels for General Needs Homes for Haringey tenants reflecting the expected regulations requiring a 1% rent reduction in 2016/17 and subsequent years'. This will reduce the average weekly rent from £106.62 to £105.55 as set out in paragraph 9.4 and Table 2;
7. To approve the changes to the rent levels for Sheltered/ Supported Housing tenants reflecting the expected, 1 year only, exemption from the government's rent reduction

policy. This will increase the average weekly rent from £94.49 to £95.34 as set out in paragraph 9.8 and Table 3;

8. To approve the changes to service charges for leaseholders set out in Table 4;
9. To approve that rents for decanted properties are set at the appropriate Local Housing Allowance rate as set out in paragraph 9.14 and 9.15 of the report;
10. To note the recommendation of the Chief Operating Officer (S151 officer) that any additional resources, including those generated from the improved tax base identified in this report, should be initially held in a risk reserve to support the statutory review of the adequacy of reserves in the context of the 2015/16 overspend position;
11. To propose to the Council the indicative Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB) for 2016/17 of £242.685m as set out in Appendix 5;
12. To approve the proposed changes to the Haringey Formula for Financing Schools as recommended by the Haringey Schools Forum and set out in paragraphs 8.13 – 8.14 of the report for the secondary lump sum factor and, for the deprivation factor, option 2 set out in paragraph 8.19 of the report;
13. To approve the responses made to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommendations following their consideration of the draft budget proposals and as set out in Appendix 6;
14. To note that this report will be considered by the Council at its meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2016 to inform their decisions on the 2016/17 budget and the associated Council Tax for that year; and
15. To delegate to the S151 officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture, the power to make further changes to the 2016/17 budget proposals consequent on the publication of the final local government finance settlement or other subsequent changes up to a maximum limit of £1.0m.

### **Reasons for decision**

In February 2015, and following extensive consultation, the Council approved its Corporate Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) covering the period 2015 - 18. The Corporate Plan set out the Council's priorities, the MTFS outlined the overall financial strategy and the Workforce Plan outlined the workforce strategy for achieving those priorities.

As a result of the significant reductions to the Council's funding from central government grants, the MTFS required around £70m of approved saving proposals to deliver a balanced budget position in each of the three years' covered by the MTFS (2015 – 18).

Following the publication, on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2015, of the Provisional Local Government Finance settlement, Cabinet reviewed the impact of the settlement on the 2016/17 budget set out in the approved MTFS.

Taking all relevant factors into account, including in particular the outcomes from statutory consultation with business rate payers, further public consultation, the recommendations from

the Overview and Scrutiny committee meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2016 and any other subsequent changes, the report set out Cabinet's final budget proposals which, if approved, will be sent for consideration at the Full Council budget setting meeting scheduled for 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2016.

The final budget report to the Council on 22<sup>nd</sup> February would also additionally include a number of requirements consequent on the proposals set out in this report and in particular:

1. The formal Budget Resolution required in accordance with the LGFA 1992 as amended by the Localism Act 2011, which sets the Council tax for the forthcoming financial year;
2. The Precept of the Greater London Authority (GLA) for 2016/17 in accordance with S40 of the LGFA 1992 which must be added to the Haringey Council element of the Council tax to give a total Council tax for each category (band) of dwelling in the Council's area;
3. The formal assessment of the relevant basic amount of Council tax against the principles established by the Secretary of State for the purpose of determining whether any Council tax increase is 'excessive' and therefore is subject to referendum.
4. Approval of the Cash Limits for 2016/17;
5. The S151 Officers evaluation of the adequacy of the Council's reserves and the robustness of the estimates including the council's reserves policy;
6. Approval of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) which has been formulated by the Corporate Committee and subject to the scrutiny review process

#### **Alternative options considered**

The Cabinet has considered or are asked to consider the following alternative options:

1. The Overview and Scrutiny committee met on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2016 and the formal recommendations from that meeting have been reviewed by the Cabinet Member for Resources. Cabinet are asked to further consider the recommendations and approve the proposed responses set out in Appendix 6 of the report.
2. The outcomes from all of the consultation activities and our consideration of all of the comments are summarised in this report.
3. The Cabinet have considered the extent to which further resources could be generated from an increase in the Council tax above the proposed 2% precept for Adult Social Care and, taking into account the impact on Council tax payers, the Cabinet is not proposing any further increase above the Adult Social Care precept of 2% set out in this report.

## **194. FEES AND CHARGES**

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture introduced this yearly report which identifies any proposed increase to fees and charges. The appendices detailed the increases being taken forward.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture also drew Cabinet's attention to the proposed Spurs Day Resident Permit charge of £20.00, included at Appendix 2, page 96 of the report pack, and proposed its withdrawal from the report. This increase was put forward as part of the MTFS last year but following a further analysis by officers this year; there was an overestimation in the income to be received from this charge and it was not now an appropriate charge to take forward.

Councillor Engert referred to appendix 10a which set out the fees and charges increases to parks and leisure based activities and questioned how these increases would support the Council's aim for reducing obesity.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture referred to paragraph 8.3.6 of the report relating to swimming charges, which gave details of the new higher quality swimming services being provided, the increase in teacher numbers and the increased number users of these facilities. He also referred to the refurbished facilities at Tottenham Green and Park Road Pools. This higher cost would require support with increased fees. The Council had to balance the increased use of services whilst recognising the strain on council budget when setting fees and the approach taken was appropriate.

## **RESOLVED**

1. Taking into account the findings of equalities assessments as set out in section 8 of the report and available in full at Appendix A, to agree the proposed fees and charges to be levied by the Council with effect from 1 April 2016, unless otherwise stated, and as detailed in the appendices;
2. To delegate approval for any necessary changes to allotment charges to the Cabinet Member for Environment following the Priority 3 review, as detailed in paragraph 8.33 of the report
3. To note that it is anticipated that the proposed changes to fees and charges will allow the achievement of 2016-17 income budget, as opposed to delivering further additional income as in previous years.
4. To delete the Spurs Day Resident Permit charge of £20. 00, included at Appendix 2, page 96 of the report pack.

### **Reasons for Decision**

There was a requirement to review fees and charges annually. The financial position of the Council supported the view that levels of fees and charges should be maximised taking into account all relevant factors including the effect on service users and any consequent demand for services.

### **Alternative options considered**

This report summarised the conclusions after consideration of a range of alternative approaches dependent on particular services and relevant factors. As such a range of alternative options ranging from no increase to differentiated rates of increases have been considered and reflected in this report.

## **195. REPORT TO AGREE THE ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2017/18**

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced the report which set out the proposed admission arrangements for the school year 2017/18 in respect of the borough's community and voluntary controlled schools. These arrangements are consulted upon annually. The most recent consultation included a proposal to restrict the sibling priority for primary schools to those children living within 0.5 miles of the school if the family were to move home between admission of the first child to the school and any subsequent children. This proposal had been included to allay concerns from residents that families were moving away from the local area but that younger siblings were still attending those schools and thereby preventing local children going to their local school.

Following the statutory consultation, which was carried out between 13 November 2015 and 31 December 2015, nearly 240 responses were received on the sibling priority proposal and the Cabinet Member advised that the responses were approximately 56% in favour and 44% against. The Cabinet Member further advised that an Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA) was undertaken following the consultation and that the EQIA showed that there would be a disproportionate impact on certain protected characteristics and would effect people who would be moving for reasons other than out of choice. Attempts to maintain the proposal whilst managing the impact had proven unsuccessful due to the complications and the computerised nature of the application process for primary schools.

The Cabinet Member advised that, in addition, the demand for primary schools had levelled out this year and that there was still reception places available for N10 and N8 postcodes; hence the need to protect primary school places for people living locally had decreased. As a result, the report recommended that the Council would not proceed with amending the sibling priority criterion.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the Council were aware that there were a number of claims of people moving to the area and getting their first child into the school and then moving away from the area whilst their younger children continue to attend that school. The Council would also be taking other steps to ensure that siblings did not gain an unfair priority and there would be an anonymous whistle blowing provision on the Council's website to investigate claims. The Cabinet Member stated that the Council would follow up on claims made through the whistle blowing website page and would take action.

The Leader stated that EQIA's were conducted precisely to understand the unintended consequences of a decision and that this felt like the right decision to be taking in circumstances where a significant number of people could potentially be disadvantaged.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To agree the recommendation set out in this report not to proceed with a change to the sibling criterion for the borough's primary community and VC schools;
2. To determine the Council's admission arrangements for the academic year 2017/18 as set out in Appendices 1- 6 of the report. These appendices include a retention of the existing sibling criterion for primary community and voluntary controlled (VC) schools for the academic year 2017/18 (Appendix 2 of the report);
3. To determine that the co-ordinated schemes for Reception and Year 7 admissions remain unchanged from 2016/17;

4. To agree the in-year fair access protocol (IYFAP) as set out in Appendix 5 of the report to come into force from 1 March 2016
5. To agree that the determined arrangements for all maintained primary and secondary schools in the borough are published on Haringey's website by 15 March 2016 with an explanation of the right of parents, under the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Co-ordination of Admission Arrangements) Regulations 2012, to object to the Schools Adjudicator in specified circumstances<sup>1</sup>.

### **Reasons for decision**

The School Admissions Code 2014 requires all admission authorities to determine admission arrangements every year, even if they had not changed from previous years and thus a consultation is not required. Regulation 17 of the School Admissions Regulations 2012 also required admission authorities to determine admission arrangements by 28 February in the determination year.

In addition, the Regulations required the admission authority (in this case the local authority) to publish on its website by 15 March in the determining year the determined arrangements of all maintained primary and secondary school and academies in the borough, advising the right to object to the Schools Adjudicator, where it was considered that the arrangement did not comply with the mandatory provisions of the School Admissions code 2014.

Haringey consulted on its admission arrangements annually irrespective of whether or not there was a proposed change to the arrangements. This was to ensure transparency and openness on the contents of the admission arrangements and to allow parent/carers and other stakeholders to make representations which can then be considered as part of the determination of the arrangements.

This year the Council consulted on one material change to the admission arrangements for the borough's primary community and voluntary controlled (VC) schools. This change is to the sibling over subscription criterion with the change seeking to limit admission of sibling(s) to any oversubscribed school if the home address changes between admission of the first child and subsequent child (ren) and that change is to a distance further than 0.5 miles when measuring home to school distance. This change would only apply where the first child is on roll at the school on or after 1 September 2017.

The proposed change to the criterion was to seek to ensure that local places are available for local families and to guard against any parent or carer that may seek to rent a home close to a school on a short term basis in an attempt secure a school place at that school, thereafter returning to their permanent address which is some distance from the school, and so limiting the number of places available to local children in future years when the sibling(s) of that first child are admitted under the current sibling criterion.

In beginning the consultation the Council was aware of the risk that the change might bring i.e. That it *may* impact on those families where a change of address is outside of their control (e.g. if they are in temporary accommodation or are being evicted by a landlord) or due to an unforeseen change in circumstances necessitating a house move e.g. the breakdown of a relationship. The Council was also aware that it could also potentially influence a family's decision to move home for other more personal reasons such as a preference for a smaller or larger home. An equalities impact assessment (EqIA) is included at Appendix 8 of the report

---



and has ascertained that the proposed change will be likely to have an impact on protected group of race and sets out whether there are steps that can be taken to mitigate against such an impact.

### **Alternative options considered**

Consultation on the proposed change to the sibling criterion arises as a result of views from parents and carers in the borough that local places should, as far as possible, be retained for families that continue to live locally to a school after their first child has been admitted on roll at that school. We have heard a number of concerns over several years from families who have told us that they have been unable to access a local school under the distance criterion because a proportion of its roll is filled with children of families who no longer live locally but who have benefited from the sibling criteria which prioritises admission for their second and any subsequent children.

So as to seek wider views on whether a change to the sibling criterion should be made a decision was taken in October 2015 (via a Cabinet Member signing) to consult on a change that would ensure some retention of local places for local families by limiting admission of siblings when the family no longer lives in the area local to the school. We undertook to consider representations received through this consultation and to balance these alongside other material considerations, including the findings of an Equalities Impact Assessment and the continued supply of and demand for school places across the borough and any other measures we could enhance or introduce that would support the offer of places to families whose only or main residence is a local one.

While there are other ways admission arrangements can influence the allocation of school places set out in the Schools Admissions Code 2014 (e.g. designated catchment areas or identified feeder schools) no alternative criterion were being considered at the time of the consultation or when writing this report.

There is a statutory requirement on all admission authorities to determine their admission arrangements each year and for those arrangements to be consulted on if there is a proposed change or at least once every 7 years if there has been no change in that period.

## **196. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR, CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014 – REQUEST TO COMMENCE PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER CONSULTATION - ST ANN'S AND TOTTENHAM GREEN WARD**

The Cabinet Member for Communities introduced the report which sought approval for a consultation on a Public Space Protection Order to tackle anti-social behaviour that was being perpetrated in the vicinity of; and resulting from, groups of men gathering and seeking illegal and unregulated work outside Wickes in Seven Sisters Road N15.

The Cabinet Member commented that this issue had been a problem for a number of years and that a variety of agencies had targeted resources and used a variety of measures to disperse and discourage these groups. This would be the first instance of the Council seeking to use a Public Spaces Protection Order, to prevent anti-social behaviour from taking place in public Spaces.

The Leader welcomed the report and also welcomed the different approach being taken to resolve what had been a longstanding issue for local residents.

### **RESOLVED**

That Cabinet, approves for consultation the draft Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) as contained in Appendix 2 of the report. The consultation will commence in accordance with section 72 of the Antisocial Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, with consultation to run for a period of eight weeks.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Council and its partners have undertaken various measures and activities to tackle the Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) issues that blight residents' lives. These issues are all associated with the men who gather at Wickes. Due to the limited success of various measures and activities undertaken, it is considered by officers, that an effective deterrent will be the use of the new tools and powers available under the Antisocial Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

The legislation allows for the use of penalties such as Fixed Penalty Notices and prosecution. It is proposed that, in order to support the legislation, targeted and sustained enforcement will be used from partners including: Haringey police, Police Partnership Team officers, immigration, British Transport police, Tactical Enforcement, Neighbourhood Action Team officers and ASBAT. It must be noted that there will be a financial cost should the authority wish to gate off an area blighted by ASB, and should the authority prosecute any of the perpetrators.

### **Alternative options considered**

Not to pursue any PSPO. Given community feedback over many years, and the ASB being caused, this option is not considered appropriate.

## **197. TOTTENHAM HALE DELIVERY [DISTRICT CENTRE FRAMEWORK]**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report which set out a number of proposals in relation to the regeneration of Tottenham Hale. Cabinet noted that the District Centre Framework (DCF) was a masterplan demonstrating how the Council would fulfil its ambitions to deliver 5000 new homes and 4000 new jobs. The District Centre Framework also showed how Tottenham Hale would be transformed into a town centre with a range of new commercial, retail, leisure and entertainment uses.

The Cabinet Member advised that a whole range of consultations, both formally and through informal workshops had been undertaken with local residents to ensure that the reports presented to Cabinet reflected the views of the local community. The Cabinet Member further advised that the aim was to deliver a holistic programme of regeneration to the area and to that effect, there were a number of sub-strategies that sat under the District Centre Framework; such as a Meanwhile Plan, a Green Spaces Strategy and a Test Project approach to ensure that innovative projects and new initiatives were brought to the area.

The Cabinet Member thanked officers for their continuing hard work to bring this significant report forward following work with residents over the last two years.

In response to Cllr Engert's question as to why it was proposed to delegate authority to approve the final versions of a number of key documents to officers, and not the Cabinet Member, it was noted the decisions would be taken with the Cabinet Member's knowledge and information. A pragmatic approach was being taken to delegate final amendments to officers following Cabinet approval.

In response to Cllr Engert's question as to how the local communities' concerns about issues such as a lack of GP's and community infrastructure would be addressed as developments came forward, the report set out that the District Centre Framework was clearly linked to the Area Action Plan and the key principles of the DCF were embedded within the Area Action Plan for the area. These principles were backed up with hard Planning policy.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To adopt the Tottenham Hale District Centre Framework as the council's delivery framework for Tottenham Hale for the reasons set out in paragraphs 4.3 – 4.9 of the report, and which can also be found in full in appendix 3 of the report.
2. To note the draft delivery strategies listed below and grant delegated authority to the Tottenham Programme Director, in consultation with the Assistant Director for Environmental Services and Community Safety and Assistant Director of Planning, to approve the final version as the council's delivery strategy for Streets and Spaces and Green and Open Spaces:
  - i. Tottenham Hale Streets and Spaces Strategy for the reasons set out in paragraphs 4.10-4.15 of the report and which can also be found in full in appendix 5 hereto.
  - ii. Tottenham Hale Green and Open Spaces Strategy for the reasons set out in paragraphs 4.16 and 4.19 of the report and which can be found in full in appendix 4 hereto
3. To note the following capital projects which already have Housing Zone funding in place to be taken forward in consultation with internal and external stakeholders (set out in Table 1) and agree that these projects should be added to the capital programme:
  - i. GL2 Hale Village Bridge/ Central Bridge
  - ii. GL1 - Hale Wharf Bridge and PB1 Pymmes Brook Bridge
  - iii. PR3 - Ferry Lane/ Forest Road
4. To note the following capital projects which already have funding from other sources in place to be taken forward in consultation with internal and external stakeholders (set out in Table 2) and agree that these projects should be added to the capital programme:
  - i. Chesnut Road (Phase 1)
  - ii. Broad Lane Pocket Parks
5. To note the intention to continue to develop proposals, including a masterplan and/or a business case for capital investment, for the following projects in consultation with internal and external stakeholders (set out in Table 3):
  - i. The Paddock
  - ii. Down Lane Park
  - iii. Park View Road Underpass
6. To note the Test Project approach set out in paragraphs 4.28 – 4.33 of the report and appendix 6 of the report.

## **Reasons for decision**

The adoption of the Tottenham Hale District Centre Framework (DCF), Streets and Spaces Strategy and Green and Open Spaces Strategy, the Test Project approach, along with the

endorsement of the first tranche of projects to be delivered by Cabinet will be a significant milestone in the regeneration of Tottenham Hale. These decisions will signal the end of the strategy development stage and the start of the delivery stage.

The reasons for adopting the DCF and supporting strategies:

### **District Centre Framework (DCF)**

The London Plan and Haringey's Local Plan set out ambitious targets for home and job growth in Tottenham Hale. The AAP proposes designating Tottenham Hale as a District Centre. The DCF is a delivery framework for Tottenham Hale and shows how the outputs in the AAP can be translated on the ground and the heart of Tottenham Hale could begin to take shape. At its heart, this includes consideration of the elements that make up a sustainable place, including the social, community, economic and physical infrastructure needed to support the level of growth envisaged.

The process of preparing the DCF has been important in that it has been used to test key principles in the AAP – in terms of place making (the ingredients that make up a successful place), urban capacity and viability. The DCF shows what the district centre could look like by describing the structure of Tottenham Hale (its streets and spaces), the form and function of its buildings, the nature of green and open spaces and the location of key community infrastructure.

The strategy is to transform the heart of Tottenham Hale, currently an area dominated by surface car parking and out of town retailing, into a safe, open and attractive series of streets and spaces for people, flanked by shops, cafes and community facilities. The DCF is based on the following five themes:

1. **A Revitalised Heart:** A place with a range of shops and leisure options where people enjoy spending time.
2. **An Affordable 21st Century Neighbourhood Of Choice:** A mix of affordable and market homes to rent and buy. The social and community infrastructure to support a growing community.
3. **A Well Connected Centre:** Well-connected and accessible spaces, promoting walking and cycling.
4. **A Network Of Green And Open Spaces:** High quality, green and open spaces, which are well managed/maintained, clean and safe.
5. **A Working Centre:** A good place to start up and grow businesses and create jobs. A mix of job types at varying skill levels.

Through the AAP policy AAP3 and in line with the commitments provided through the Housing Zone the council has committed to a 'portfolio based approach to sites', The implications of this policy approach is explored in the DCF document having regard to potential site development scenarios within the Local Plan documents (and based upon current circumstances). The council will work collaboratively with landowners through the planning system to coordinate the provision of housing tenure and types. This means that each site will be considered in terms of its specific characteristics and suitability for different housing types and tenures and balanced against proposals for other sites in Tottenham Hale, with the council playing a key role in managing the distribution across the area. For example, some sites may be more appropriate for family or smaller units, while others may suit particular tenure types.

In parallel with the preparation of the AAP, the Council is also preparing a Development Management DPD. Two policies are proposed which are of particular relevance. The first

policy (DM55) concerns regeneration and masterplanning and requires applicants to demonstrate that proposals will neither prejudice future development nor frustrate delivery of the site allocations or wider area outcomes. The second Policy (DM56) is related as it supports land assembly to achieve comprehensive and co-ordinated development. The Policy confirms that the Council will use compulsory purchase powers where necessary, and where certain requirements are met.

The DCF has been prepared specifically to provide clarity and a framework for the implementation of the sites identified in the AAP, ensuring coordinated delivery of the strategic outcomes sought for the area. The DCF also sets out high level time scales for the delivery of key identified sites. The DCF forms part of the evidence base for the AAP, helping to demonstrate deliverability and providing more detail on implementation.

Preparation of the DCF has been informed by an extensive and bespoke programme of stakeholder consultation and community engagement (Appendix 1). This process has placed great emphasis on engaging with key landowners and the wider community to ensure all are aware of the vision for change in the Tottenham Hale area and the opportunities open to local people and businesses to become involved with and benefit from the investment being earmarked for the area.

Adopting the DCF as the council's delivery framework would support the policies in the existing and emerging Local Plan, including the "Haringey Development Charter" (Policy DM1) and express the Council's clear commitment to the community and developers about the quality of development that the council would like to see in Tottenham Hale. The DCF can then be used by the council to help steer design and investment decisions in a direction that allows a good quality of design and the delivery of a built environment which celebrates Tottenham Hale's unique assets. This is the reason for the recommendation in section 3.1.

### **Streets and Spaces Strategy**

A key challenge in delivering a successful new district centre in a dense urban environment will be to ensure that the streets and spaces successfully connect Tottenham Hale's neighbourhoods to each other and provide attractive, safe routes across the area. It is of critical importance that these spaces are well designed with a character reflecting what is distinctive and of value in Tottenham Hale today and built with good quality materials.

The Streets and Spaces Strategy describes a vision and sets a quality benchmark for the public realm including pedestrian streets, roads, cycle network and public spaces in the district centre. It will be used to guide council led highway improvements in Tottenham Hale and also public realm around new developments delivered by developers.

A key part of the Streets and Spaces Strategy is the Ashley Road North-South link, a new part pedestrianised street linking Ashley Road and the retail park. The street will connect a number of different development sites under different land ownership. In order to ensure that the street has the same character and uses the same materials throughout we propose to develop a design guide with partners.

Preparation of the Streets and Spaces Strategy is being informed by an ongoing programme of stakeholder consultation and community engagement (sections 6.9 – 6.14). The next steps are to develop the capital funding strategy for the projects which have been identified and work with Environmental Services and Community Safety to develop a sustainable solution to management and maintenance of the new and improved streets and spaces (sections 6.18 – 6.20).

This report is recommending that Cabinet note the communication drafts of the Streets and Spaces Strategy and give delegated authority to the Tottenham Programme Director, in consultation with the Assistant Director of Environmental Services and Community Safety and Assistant Director of Planning to approve the final version of this strategy.

### **Green and Open Spaces Strategy**

Another key element to the success of the district centre is the access to and quality of the green and open spaces. In the context of significant new development, it is clear that our existing open spaces will need investment. In some cases this is building on significant existing momentum. In others, this is about building the case for investment. The Lea Valley is currently difficult to access from most of Tottenham Hale.

The Green and Open Spaces Strategy sets out a vision for a network of high quality green spaces across Tottenham Hale and a series of new and improved links across the railway line and various watercourses making it easier to access the Lea Valley. The Strategy identifies how the All London Green Grid / Haringey's Green Grid will be realised in Tottenham Hale.

Well planned, designed and managed green infrastructure can lead to a more successful and productive community that is environmentally, socially and economically sustainable. Investing in Tottenham Hales green infrastructure will help ensure that everyone's quality of life improves in the area as the transformation takes place. The DCF and delivery strategies will help the council to meet its priorities in the Haringey's Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2015-2018 including (1) reducing obesity (2) increasing healthy life expectancy and (3) improving mental health and wellbeing.

Preparation of the Green and Open Spaces Strategy is being informed by an ongoing programme of stakeholder consultation and community engagement (sections 6.9 – 6.14). The next steps for this strategy are to develop the capital funding strategy for the projects which have been identified and work with Environmental Services and Community Safety and Assistant Director of Planning to develop a sustainable solution to management and maintenance of the new and improved green and open spaces (sections 6.18 – 6.20).

This report is recommending that Cabinet give delegated authority to the Tottenham Programme Director, in consultation with the Assistant Director of Environmental Services and Community Safety to approve the final version of this strategy.

### **Capital projects to be delivered in a first phase**

In July 2014 Cabinet agreed to the submission of the Tottenham Housing Zone bid and gave delegated authority for officers to enter into Housing Zone grant agreements with the GLA. Tottenham Hale was designated a Housing Zone by the Mayor of London in February 2015. In August 2015 officers (under the above delegated authority) agreed to the Council entering into an Overarching Borough Agreement with the GLA for a series of investments totalling approximately £44m to help deliver homes and jobs, improve the local environment and links to the Lea Valley Park.

Through development of the Green and Open Spaces Strategy and Streets and Spaces Strategy we have identified a long list of projects to be delivered over a ten year horizon to support the significant homes and job growth anticipated in the area.

Of this long list of projects the council initially will be taking forward a shortlist of nine projects. These projects, summarised in Tables 1, 2 and 3, have been selected because:

1. The projects have capital funding already in place through the Housing Zone and these projects are already included in the Overarching Borough Agreement for the Housing Zone
2. The projects have capital funding already in place through other funding sources and they help to meet the aspirations set out in the DCF and supporting strategies
3. The projects have been identified as being a priority for stakeholders and the council is recommending that further design work and a delivery strategy is progressed.

Each project is at a slightly different stage and next steps will depend on the size of the project, the partners involved and how the project is funded. All of the projects will need to go through the appropriate approval processes before progressing to delivery stage. It may be that some of these projects do not proceed to delivery stage if they do not successfully pass each relevant project gateway.

### Capital projects with funding secured through the Housing Zone

Project	Brief description of project	Target Completion Date
Central Bridge	New pedestrian footbridge over railway line linking to Hale Village <i>Preferred delivery route through Network Rail</i>	2018/19
Hale Wharf Bridge	New pedestrian footbridge over canal to Hale Wharf <i>Preferred delivery route through private sector</i>	2017/18
Pymmes Brook Bridge 1	New pedestrian footbridge over Pymmes Brook linking to canal tow path <i>Probable delivery by LB Haringey</i>	2016/17
Ferry Lane/ Forest Road	Capital investment to Ferry Lane to improve cycleway and amenity for pedestrians <i>Preferred delivery route partnership between LB Haringey and LB Waltham Forest</i>	2016/17

Table 1: Capital projects with funding secured through the Housing Zone

The Tottenham Programme Delivery Board oversees and drives forward the delivery of the Tottenham Regeneration Programme at an operational level with LBH, GLA, TfL and the Met Police. This Programme Delivery Board will decide whether Housing Zone funded projects should be progressed to delivery stage. All Haringey capital projects will also be approved by the Haringey Capital Board to maintain a strategic overview of delivery and financial forecasting/spend.

### Other capital projects with funding secured through other sources

Project	Brief description of project	Target Completion Date
Chesnut Road (Phase 1)	Public realm improvements including landscaping and new play areas <i>Funding: S106, LB Haringey</i>	2016/17
Broad Lane Pocket Parks	Enhancements to two pocket parks on Broad Lane <i>Funding: Transport for London / GLA</i>	2016/17

Table 2: Capital projects with funding secured through other sources

Funding has already been secured for these two projects and it is proposed that they proceed to delivery in 2016/17. Both projects will undergo a period of community and stakeholder engagement to agree the scope and develop the design and to confirm the delivery route.

**Other projects to be progressed in phase 1**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Brief description of project</b>	<b>Target Completion Date</b>
The Paddock	Capital investment in Paddock and agreement of a sustainable management strategy. Dependent on business case and securing of necessary funding.	2018/19
Down Lane Park	Capital investment in park including improved facilities and more planting	Delivery in phases
Park View Road Underpass	Public realm improvements including lighting and signage	2016/17

Table 3: Other projects to be progressed in phase 1

These projects are an important part of the Green and Open Spaces Strategy and have been identified as a priority by stakeholders. Officers will undertake further work to develop the business case for each of the above projects. Progress will be subject to satisfactory business case and funding being in place and securing the necessary approvals.

**Reasons for supporting the Test Project approach**

The approach: The Test Project approach is based on the principle of testing community and/or business ideas for new projects. It can be thought of as planting a seed from which larger projects may grow, but acknowledging up front that some may feel or may be heavily changed through the testing phase. It is similar to the *beta* phase in the testing of web or IT projects. It is an evolution of, and includes, the use of *Meanwhile* activities, which are now a common-place part of most regeneration projects and further afield.

The Council has noted the experience of *Meanwhile* projects elsewhere in London and recognises their potential in making the most of assets that are in transition, whether that's spaces or buildings. However, in looking at the characteristics of Tottenham Hale and in mapping the neighbourhood's civic networks, the Council is proposing a broader version of *Meanwhile* which is not just about temporary spaces, but which helps to support temporary/*beta* projects which have the potential to grow into larger and sustainable projects. The full approach is set out in the Test Project report.

Consultation: The Test Project report has identified a number of small scale projects that could be set up in Tottenham Hale in the next few years. Some are based on ideas that have worked elsewhere, amended to take into account Tottenham's local characteristics, while others have come from dialogue with the local community. Ideas range from a 'Made in Tottenham' brand which would help link up local manufacturers/producers and retailers (both near and far), to ideas to establish a Village Green in the Lea Valley.

How it would work: The Test Project approach will work with local stakeholders to test ideas for projects which build on Tottenham Hale's strengths. A test project will need to bring together partners with a common purpose. The projects may have social, economic, environmental or cultural objectives. We will work to help partners to secure funding and/or



resources (e.g. in a temporary space if it's a physical project) in order to test the idea for a limited time. If the project has demonstrated it is successful and sustainable, we will work with partners to take it to the next level where it can operate independently.

Current core funding is limited to an allocation of £50,000 per annum within the agreed Tottenham Regeneration Programme budget.

We are asking Cabinet to note the Test Project approach as a commitment to support community and business led activities to ensure that the existing communities in Tottenham Hale are supported throughout this period of significant transition and change.

### **Alternative options considered**

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 Masterplan SPD, Strategic Regeneration Framework, and Physical Development Framework). These plans include the development of a new mixed-use urban centre, or district centre.

In deciding whether or not to commission a District Centre Framework the following other options were considered:

1. Do nothing: allow sites to come forward for development that accord with the policies of the AAP, and allowing for infrastructure to be delivered in parts by different sites as they come forward
2. District Centre Framework: To develop a non statutory masterplan backed up by a suite of delivery strategies, in dialogue with delivery partners, which can be used to guide development but which is not adopted planning policy
3. Supplementary Planning Document: Developing a comprehensive Council-led masterplan setting out in policy the principles for development in Tottenham Hale

The first option was discounted because if the Council relied solely on the AAP there would be a risk that the planning policies alone would not capture the proactive programme of investment promoted by the Council which sits outside planning policy documents such as the AAP. Lack of delivery clarity over what the council expects in relation to the design of the streets and spaces in between the buildings and the level of investment in the green and open spaces and infrastructure would make it difficult for the council to secure the quality and level of aspiration set out in the SRF.

The third option was discounted it was felt that it the planning policy position for Tottenham Hale would be sufficiently set out in Tottenham AAP and it was not necessary to produce a further policy document. The benefits of the District Centre Framework were that it could be a delivery orientated document, an adaptable and flexible framework which could respond quickly to changes areas the regeneration programme moved forward, rather than a static, inflexible document.

## **198. APPROPRIATION OF LAND AT THE OLYMPIA TRADING ESTATE FOR PLANNING PURPOSES**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report which detailed the issues behind the Council seeking to appropriate the Olympia Trading Estate on behalf of the developer. This would enable the developer to benefit from the protection afforded by Section 237 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) which would have the effect of

converting the rights of the property owner (including rights to light) to compensation, but prevented a property owner injecting a development scheme. The Council sought to use these powers in support of the wider regeneration of the area.

In response to Cllr Engert's question on why it was not clear which powers the Council had used to acquire the land and whether the council's action could therefore be subject to legal challenge, The Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development advised that the report recognised that the land was already held for planning purposes but officers were unable to ensure that the correct provisions were used previously. Part of the reason that the report was brought to Cabinet was to refresh the appropriation under the correct legislation to ensure that the land was appropriated in the correct way.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To appropriate the Olympia Trading Estate (outlined red in the plan attached as Appendix A of the report) for planning purposes pursuant to section 232 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the Act"). This is on the basis that the appropriation (and subsequent disposal) will facilitate the carrying out of development/redevelopment or improvement on or in relation to the land and that the development/redevelopment or improvement will promote or improve the economic, social or environmental well being of the area.
2. That the resolution under 3.1(i) and the disposal of the Olympia Trading Estate under Section 233 of the Act are intended to attract the application not only of Section 237 but also of any replacement whether Clause 137 of the Housing and Planning Bill (as enacted) or otherwise. This is to override any easements or rights which could adversely impact on the proposed development and/or redevelopment of the Olympia Trading Estate and the subsequent beneficial use.

## **Reasons for decision**

The Council wishes to support and facilitate the delivery of a new Housing scheme at Clarendon Road as it will bring significant public benefits, act as a catalyst for wider regenerative change and will deliver the objectives for the Wood Green Area Action plan and Investment Framework.

If the Council were to not agree these recommendations, the proposed development scheme will be at risk of injunction and will be delayed and put at risk.

## **Alternative options considered**

The alternative option to consider would be not to appropriate the site at the Olympia Trading Estate for planning purposes. This would put the site at risk of being injunctioned and therefore put the development at risk and delay the building of the scheme.

## **199. PROVISION OF INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICES**

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture introduced the report which sought approval for an extension of the Council's contract with the London Borough of Croydon, through their Audit Services Framework Agreement, to provide the internal Audit service for the Council for an estimated value of £510k.

## **RESOLVED**

1. That approval be granted for an extension from 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2018 of the Council's existing contract with the London Borough of Croydon to provide, by means of their Audit Services Framework Agreement, audit resources to deliver the Internal Audit service for the Council for an estimated value of £510k.

### **Reasons for decision**

A one year contract extension from 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016 was approved under delegated authority in December 2014; a one year extension was agreed in order to assess the continuing effectiveness of the contract. New management arrangements have been put in place by Mazars to deliver the service and the contract has satisfied the statutory and performance criteria required; therefore it is recommended that the option to extend for the remaining 2 year period available under the Croydon framework contract is taken up.

An extension of the contract for 12 months was approved in December 2014 by the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance. However, given the value of the extension now proposed for the remaining two years of the framework, approval for the extension is required at Cabinet level in accordance with CSO 10.02.2.

The framework contract with Croydon Council represents good value for money for Haringey in terms of service provision and costs; and therefore the extension to the existing contract is recommended.

### **Alternative options considered**

#### **Option 1 – Full Open Tender**

The potential contract values involved for this length of contract would require a full re-tender following European procurement legislation unless an acceptable alternative procurement route is used e.g. an appropriate framework agreement. Haringey alone undertaking a tendering procedure under EU rules is not recommended, as recent assessments of the current market confirmed that taking an independent procurement route in this way would be resource-intensive and unlikely to achieve better results in terms of value for money than the other options available.

#### **Option 2 – Alternative Framework contract**

There is another framework agreement established by a London authority in 2014/15 for the provision of internal audit services and other local authorities are included in the list of organisations eligible to use the framework. The framework is delivered by another private sector contractor, but the daily rates quoted are substantially higher than those currently paid by the Council under the London Borough of Croydon framework contract.

#### **Option 3 – In-house Provision/Shared Service with another authority**

Haringey Council has no in-house internal audit resources. The experience of other London councils has proved that it is highly unlikely that an in-house resource could be recruited and retained to deliver the Council's internal audit service. All London boroughs have outsourced their internal audit service to some extent and none are looking to bring this service fully back in-house due to the ongoing costs of recruitment, retention and training. Some London authorities have adopted a 'shared service' model for the provision of their audit services, joining audit resources to provide greater resilience for their in-house service. However this has always, to date, been in conjunction with a private sector provider to supplement the in-

house resources. Haringey does not have any in-house internal audit resources, so this option has not been considered to date.

It is proposed to review these options above during the two year extension as different service delivery models and options evolve. It may be more economically advantageous in the future to consider a different approach, but at the present time, this would not represent good value for money for the Council.

**200. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

**RESOLVED**

To note the delegated decisions taken by Directors in January 2016.

**201. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**202. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED**

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as the items contained exempt information, as defined under Schedule 12, Paragraph 3 of the Local Government Act 1972.

**203. PROVISION OF INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICES**

As per item CAB 199.

**204. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS**

None