

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

Councillors Present: Councillor Claire Kober (Chair), Councillor Lorna Reith (Vice-Chair), Councillor John Bevan, Councillor Nilgun Canver, Councillor Dilek Dogus, Councillor Joe Goldberg, Councillor Alan Strickland and Councillor Bernice Vanier

Also Present: Councillor Katherine Reece, Councillor Richard Wilson.

| MINUTE NO. | SUBJECT/DECISION | ACTION BY |
|------------|--|-----------|
| CAB85. | <p>APOLOGIES</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p> | |
| CAB86. | <p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>There were no new items of Urgent Business. The following reports were accepted as late items:</p> <p><u>Item 7 – Financial Planning 2012/13 to 2014/15</u> <u>Item 13 – Options for the Future Use of Larkspur Close</u></p> | |
| CAB87. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest made.</p> | |
| CAB88. | <p>MINUTES</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 November 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.</p> | HLDMS |
| CAB89. | <p>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS</p> <p>Deputations were received from the following with respect to Item 14 – Proposed Closure of Alexandra Road Crisis Unit:</p> <p>Mr Chris Taylor of Unison Ms Jill Carter of the Save Alexandra Road Crisis Unit Group</p> <p><i>(A third deputation had been accepted from Mr Malcolm Hunt however he did not attend the meeting).</i></p> | |
| CAB90. | <p>RESPONSE TO THE SCRUTINY REVIEW ON THE CLUSTERING OF BETTING SHOPS</p> <p>Cabinet received a report that presented the proposed responses to recommendations arising from the Scrutiny Review on the Clustering of Betting Shops.</p> | |

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| | <p>It was noted that at present the Gambling Act (2005) did not allow the Licensing Authority to take into consideration whether there were already a significant number of betting shops in any one area or their cumulative impact when determining licensing applications.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for the Environment expressed her thanks to the Members that had sat on the panel and commended the proposed recommendations and actions set out in the report.</p> <p>It was noted that the Council recognised the concerns of residents with respect to this and had lobbied the Government and mounted a legal challenge contending that the Council should be able to take the impact of the clustering of betting shops into account when granting a licences, however, this had been unsuccessful. The Council would continue to lobby for change in this area.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the scrutiny report and recommendations and proposed actions set out in Appendix 1 of the report be agreed.</p> | |
| <p>CAB91.</p> | <p>FINANCIAL PLANNING 2012/13 – 2014/15</p> <p>Cabinet considered a report that presented a proposed budget package for 2012/13 and later years. The report also included an overview of the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP), which covered the three years to March 2015, including a revised assessment of the General Fund, Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and the Capital Programme.</p> <p>It was noted that the proposals included funding from the Capital Programme to enable Alexandra Palace to develop a long term strategy and regeneration and development programme. This was considered essential in order to form a long term approach that would help reduce the financial support that the Council had a statutory obligation to provide.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">i. That the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the chosen three themes of the draft revenue proposals, agreed at the Cabinet meeting held on 4 October 2011, (set out in paragraphs 7.9 and 7.12 and Appendix 7 of the report) be noted.ii. That the consultation responses received to date on the draft revenue proposals, agreed at Cabinet on 4 October 2011, (set out in paragraphs 7.1 to 7.8 and Appendix 8 of the report) be noted.iii. That the implications for the Council of the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2012/13 (set out in paragraphs | |

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|----------------------|---|-----|
| | <p>xiii. That draft proposals, to be recommended to the Council at its meeting in February 2012 for the Council's MTFP 2012-15 (as set out in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of the report) be approved.</p> <p>xiv. That it be noted that savings still had to be identified to deliver a balanced budget for 2013/14.</p> | DCR |
| <p>CAB92.</p> | <p>TOTTENHAM REGENERATION PROGRAMME - PROGRESS UPDATE, NEXT STEPS AND GOVERNANCE</p> <p>Cabinet considered a report that provided an update with respect to progress and key activities that had been undertaken as part of the Tottenham Regeneration Programme (TRP), which had been formed following the disturbances in August. The report also sought endorsement of the proposed governance arrangements to oversee the programme.</p> <p>It was noted that there had been engagement with the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board (sHWB) and that flowing from this contact with colleagues from across the health sector had been established. This approach would ensure that there was synergy between the emerging Health and Wellbeing Strategy (HWS), the work being undertaken by Public Health and the regeneration programme.</p> <p>Cabinet was advised that the Mayor would be coming to Tottenham in January to announce the level of funding that Tottenham would receive from his office. Plans for the use of additional funding for Tottenham would be centred around tangible outcomes that would benefit the local community. Costs attached to the running of the programme would be minimised.</p> <p>Thanks was expressed to officers that had worked both on the frontline in the wake of the disturbances and officers who had subsequently on the regeneration programme.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That progress made since the disturbances in restoring community and business confidence be noted. ii. That the broad principles underpinning the development of the Regeneration Strategy for Tottenham be endorsed. iii. That the governance framework outlined in Appendix 1 of the report, to oversee the development of the strategy and the delivery of the regeneration programme for Tottenham, be endorsed. | |
| <p>CAB93.</p> | <p>NEW RIVER VILLAGE SECTION 106 COMMITMENT OF FUNDS</p> <p>Cabinet considered a report that sought the approval of proposals for the use of funding amounting to £1,000,000 secured through the Section</p> | |

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|-------|--|-------|----------------------------|-------|--|------|-------------------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------|---------------|------------|--|
| | <p>106 agreement attached to the New River Village development.</p> <p>It was clarified that the original Section 106 Agreement had been consulted upon with residents and the priorities for this had been set after taking this into consideration. The headline terms agreed within the original Section 106 Agreement provided the flexibility for the Council to determine how allocations for social infrastructure should be used.</p> <p>It was noted that a sum of £1m was being spent directly in the Hornsey area.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>i. That £1m of funding from the Section 106 agreement in and around the Heartlands Regeneration area, as set out in point ii) below and Map 1 appended to the report and; a further £9m for the local area and wider Council priorities from the Section 106 agreements attached to Coronation Sidings and Clarendon Square, as set out in section 9 of the report be approved.</p> <p>ii. That the commitment of the unallocated New River Village Social Infrastructure Fund of £1m on the following schemes, in accordance with the Section 106 agreement summarised within paragraphs 5.2-5.7 of the report, be approved:</p> <table data-bbox="379 1122 1248 1344"> <tr> <td>Alexandra Park Club (existing spend)</td> <td>£250k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Heartlands High School(existing spend)</td> <td>£250k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>East/West Green Link (new)</td> <td>£220k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hornsey Churchyard Historic Park and Gardens</td> <td>£60k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hornsey Street Lighting (new)</td> <td>£120k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estate Improvements (new)</td> <td>£100k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total:</td> <td>£1m</td> </tr> </table> <p>iii. That the relevant amendments to the current 2011/12 capital programme and the 2012/13 proposed capital programme be approved.</p> | Alexandra Park Club (existing spend) | £250k | Heartlands High School(existing spend) | £250k | East/West Green Link (new) | £220k | Hornsey Churchyard Historic Park and Gardens | £60k | Hornsey Street Lighting (new) | £120k | Estate Improvements (new) | £100k | Total: | £1m | <p>DPS</p> <p>DPS</p> <p>DPS / DCR</p> |
| Alexandra Park Club (existing spend) | £250k | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Heartlands High School(existing spend) | £250k | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| East/West Green Link (new) | £220k | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hornsey Churchyard Historic Park and Gardens | £60k | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hornsey Street Lighting (new) | £120k | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Estate Improvements (new) | £100k | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total: | £1m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>CAB94.</p> | <p>HARINGEY'S LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2010/11</p> <p>Cabinet considered a report that presented the Local Development Framework (LDF) Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for approval prior to publication.</p> <p>It was noted that where the report referred to recycling rates these were incorrect and that this should be corrected. It was also requested that consideration was given to carrying out design assessments against the Building for Life (BfL) criteria for all new housing developments and that scores below fourteen points should be not be accepted.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That, subject to the amendment of figures quoted in the report with respect to recycling rates, the Annual Monitoring Report be noted and approved. ii. That the aims of the Council's current Borough Plan (UDP 2006-2016) are, overall, being delivered and that the planning outcomes for 2012/11 are generally positive be noted. iii. That delegated power be given to the Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Social Inclusion and the Director of Place and Sustainability to approve any subsequent minor amendments relating to output/outcome detail of the AMR prior to its publication. | <p>DPS</p> <p>DPS</p> |
| <p>CAB95.</p> | <p>TOWN CENTRE AND SHOPPING FRONTAGE VITALITY AND VIABILITY - PROGRESS REPORT</p> <p>Cabinet considered a report that sought approval to develop new planning policies to respond to emerging issues which may have an impact on the sustainability of the Borough's town centres and shopping parades.</p> <p>The proposals related to take away food outlets and their proximity to schools, youth facilities and parks and the creation of a new town centres policy to promote a stronger variety and more sustainable mix of uses.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That it be approved that the proposed policies in Appendix 1 of the report were taken into account in the planning decision making process and used for the purposes of the plan making process and included in the emerging Development Management Policy document for consultation in 2012 with informal consultation starting in January 2012 (the consultation would be in the form of information provided on the Council's website and emails and letters to those on the planning consultation database). ii. That the risks associated with the use of informal policies to support planning decisions, as set out in paragraph 7.1 of the report, be noted. | <p>DPS</p> |
| <p>CAB96.</p> | <p>DOG CONTROL ORDERS</p> <p>Cabinet considered a report that sought agreement to carry out a formal consultation on dog control orders covering dog exclusion, dogs on leads, dogs on lead direction and dog fouling.</p> <p>The proposals set out in the report responded to concern expressed by local residents groups and Police Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) with regard to the number of dogs that were not properly controlled by their owners when in public areas such as parks and play areas.</p> | |

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|--------|--|-----|
| | <p>It was confirmed that during the consultation period any areas not listed within the report, which were highlighted, would be considered and included if appropriate.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That plans for formal consultation on dog control orders covering dog exclusion, dogs on lead direction and dog fouling, as set out in paragraph 5.6 of the report, be approved.</p> | DPS |
| CAB97. | <p>OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE USE OF LARKSPUR CLOSE</p> <p>Cabinet considered a report that set out options for the future use of Larkspur Close.</p> <p>It was noted that Cabinet had previously agreed that four sheltered housing schemes (Campbell Court, Protheroe House, Stokley Court and Larkspur Close) would be reviewed in order to ensure that they were fit for purpose and able to provide the most effective service possible.</p> <p>Work to the other sheltered housing schemes had been completed with Campbell Court being retained as a sheltered housing scheme; Stokley Court being re designated as a Community Good Neighbour Scheme and, subject to consultation and the redevelopment of the site being financially viable, Protheroe House being closed and redeveloped as an Extra Care Scheme.</p> <p>It was requested that further information was supplied to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Carbon Reduction with regard to the capital implications of the project.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the following be noted: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Although the sheltered housing scheme in Larkspur Close compared very poorly with modern standards of housing for older people and cannot be brought up to an appropriate standard, there is a strong community spirit at Larkspur Close and it is valued by its residents; b. The high level of investment that would be required in Larkspur Close if it was retained as a sheltered housing scheme or re-designated as a Community Good Neighbour Scheme; c. The interest that Hornsey Housing Trust had expressed in acquiring Larkspur Close, continuing to operate it as a sheltered housing scheme, and investing in the improvements required to bring the homes up to the Decent Homes standard; d. The outcome of the Equalities Impact Assessment that had | DPS |

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| | <p>been carried out to assess the impact of re-designating Larkspur Close as a Community Good Neighbour Scheme and moving some of the residents to alternative sheltered housing schemes;</p> <p>ii. That the following agreed:</p> <p>a) That the merits and viability of Hornsey Housing Trust's proposal should be evaluated by Officers and that, if the Director of Adult and Housing Services (in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing) is satisfied that it is in the Council's interests to dispose of Larkspur Close in this way, expressions of interest are sought from registered providers that wish to acquire Larkspur Close and continue to operate it as a sheltered housing scheme;</p> <p>b) That, subject to formal consultation with the tenants of Larkspur Close on the future of their homes (and there being no registered provider that was able to put forward a viable and acceptable proposal for continuing to operate Larkspur Close as a sheltered housing scheme), Larkspur Close will be re-designated as a Community Good Neighbour Scheme;</p> <p>c) That, with immediate effect and until further notice, properties that become vacant at Larkspur Close will be re-let only to those applicants on the Supported Housing Register who have been assessed as requiring accommodation in a Community Good Neighbour Scheme; and</p> <p>d) That, on completion of the formal consultation with tenants and the assessment of proposals from Hornsey Housing Trust and/or other registered providers, Cabinet would receive a further report and confirm the date on which Larkspur Close will be either re-designated as a Community Good Neighbour Scheme or transferred to a registered provider that is able to continue operating it as sheltered housing; and</p> <p>e) That, until a decision is made on its future ownership, Larkspur Close should be excluded from the Decent Homes programme.</p> | <p>DAHS</p> <p>DAHS</p> <p>DAHS</p> <p>DAHS</p> <p>DAHS</p> |
| <p>CAB98.</p> | <p>PROPOSED CLOSURE OF ALEXANDRA ROAD CRISIS UNIT</p> <p>Cabinet received a report that provided details with regard to the outcome of consultation with respect to the future of Alexandra Road Crisis Unit (ARCU). The report also sought to provide Cabinet with sufficient information to enable it to make an informed decision with regard to the future of the service.</p> <p>Prior to consideration of the report deputations from Mr Chris Taylor of</p> | |

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

Unison and Ms Jill Carter, representing the Save Alexandra Road Crisis Unit Action Group were taken.

Mr Taylor

Mr Taylor noted that Unison opposed the closure of ARCU and considered that it provided an essential service which would not be met if the unit were to close.

It was contended that senior members of NHS Haringey staff had been contacted in an attempt to arrange a meeting with Unison; however this request had been refused. When concerns had been expressed in writing it had taken two months to obtain a response. Mr Taylor considered that this was unacceptable given the impact that the closure of the unit would have upon staff and service users.

Mr Taylor contended that the argument that the closure of the unit was part of a broader package of changes designed to respond to the Council's commitment to deliver personalised care and greater control was misleading.

In conclusion Mr Taylor argued that the consultation carried out had not been adequate and requested that Cabinet delay its decision until officers had addressed the concerns that Unison had raised.

In response to concerns raised by Mr Taylor with regard to the adequacy of the consultation process, particularly with regard to effective engagement with the relatively small number of services users, Cabinet was advised that nine face to face meetings had been held between services users' and staff from the Council and six of these had also been attended by staff from NHS Haringey.

There had also been separate meetings with staff where their questions had been taken.

In response to the points raised by Mr Taylor the Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Services, Councillor Dogus, noted that she considered that the consultation process had been extensive. She advised that the Council would provide support to staff working at the unit and as part of this a workforce planning session was being undertaken to identify as many redeployment opportunities as possible for those staff potentially affected by this proposal.

Councillor Dogus advised that the Cabinet understood the value placed on the services delivered by the unit by service users, however; given the budgetary pressures facing the Local Authority, Cabinet had no alternative but to consider the difficult decision to close the unit. It had become necessary to consider this option following NHS Haringey's decision to cease its funding of the unit.

It was clarified that new service models being considered by the Mental Health Trust (MHT), including the creation of Recovery Houses, had no

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

bearing on the decision being made with regard to ARCU. The unit was a service provided by NHS Haringey and the Council and separate to services operated by the MHT. The possibility of a Recovery House being created in no way influenced the proposals put forward in the report.

Ms Carter

Ms Carter noted that she represented a group of service users and professionals that opposed the closure of ARCU.

It was noted that the unit provided a safety net for many people and that it was a highly valued service amongst its users. It was contended that the closure of the unit would leave a group of vulnerable people without a service that they regarded as essential without providing a suitable alternative. It was also contended that the expertise of staff working at the unit would form a significant loss to service users. The unit was also based in a very accessible location and its closure would result in service users having to travel greater distances to access care.

The out of hours telephone service that the unit provided would also be a significant loss to service users and this combined with the closure of other services in the areas meant that there was no longer a comparable service available.

Ms Carter also raised concern that the Arbous Crisis Centre was currently not taking any referrals and sought assurance that the alternative providers listed in report were checked to ensure that they were in fact able to take referrals (officers subsequently noted this and there was agreement that the list should be checked).

In response to Ms Carter's deputation Councillor Dogus reiterated that whilst Cabinet understood and appreciated that people valued the services provided by the unit it had to consider its closure as it was only partly funded by the Local Authority.

With regard to concerns raised around the loss of capacity in the Borough to treat people that currently used the type of services provided by the unit, it was noted that there were a significant number of residential care homes close to the Borough boundary and that the Council currently commissioned all residential mental health care from outside the Borough.

It was noted that the telephone crisis helpline would continue to be offered through Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust as this was in line with its role and function and formed part of its current service offer. In addition the Council also operated an out of hours emergency duty social work service on a twenty-four hour basis throughout the year.

It was noted that in addition to a significant reduction in its core funding the Council had also lost other key funding streams in including the Area Based Grant. Therefore, regrettably, the Council was not in a position to find additional funding to retain ARCU.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| | <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the closure of Alexandra Road Crisis Unit be agreed, producing a net saving of £138k per annum from 2012/13. ii. That the proposed date of closure would be by spring 2012 and all current services users would receive a review of their needs well before this date and alternative care would be identified; all people needing such a service would continue to receive one from the appropriate service provider. iii. That Cabinet Members confirm their decision in principle, taken on 21 December 2010, to close the service, having taken into account the outcome of the consultation process as detailed in section 8 of the report, including the outcome of consultation with trade unions and staff (set out in appendix 5) and the Equalities Impact Assessment (set out in appendix1). | <p>DAHS DAHS DAHS</p> |
| <p>CAB99.</p> | <p>HARINGEY'S VOLUNTARY SECTOR STRATEGY 2011-2016 AND VOLUNTARY SECTOR COMMISSIONING AND FUNDING FRAMEWORK</p> <p>Cabinet considered a report that sought approval of the Voluntary Sector Strategy 2011-16 and the Voluntary Sector Commissioning and Funding Framework.</p> <p>It was noted that there had been extensive consultation with voluntary and community sector organisations including the Haringey Association of Voluntary Community Sector Organisations (HAVCO) and that this had informed the development of the strategy.</p> <p>In response to a question with regard to the impact of withdrawing core funding it was noted that only a very small number of organisations received this. The financial constraints placed upon the Council meant that moving to a model where services were commissioned in line with Council's core priorities was essential.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the Voluntary Sector Strategy 2011-2016 and the Funding Framework be agreed, having take into account the outcome of the attached Equalities Impact Assessment (Appendix 4 of the report), which included a detailed summary of the consultation. ii. That it be agreed that the process of rolling out the framework would begin from January 2012. iii. That it be noted that Directorates across the Council were expected to have due regard to the Funding Framework when working with the voluntary sector. | <p>DAHS DAHS DAHS</p> |
| <p>CAB100.</p> | <p>CHILDCARE SUFFICIENCY ASSESSMENT AND ACTION PLAN</p> | |

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| | <p>Cabinet considered a report that presented the key findings of the Council's 2011 Childcare Sufficiency Assessment (CSA). The report also sought agreement to the key priorities to be addressed within the subsequent CSA Action Plan 2011-14 and related childcare priorities.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Children's Services advised that a detailed briefing note could be supplied to the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the funding for free childcare take up.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the key findings from the 2011 Childcare Sufficiency Assessment be noted. ii. That the key priorities to be addressed within the subsequent CSA Action Plan 2011-14 be agreed. iii. That the related childcare priorities be noted and agreed. | <p>DCS</p> <p>DCS</p> <p>DCS</p> <p>DCS</p> |
| <p>CAB101.</p> | <p>PROPOSALS TO EXPAND WELBOURNE PRIMARY, BELMONT INFANTS AND LANCASTERIAN PRIMARY SCHOOLS FROM TWO FORM TO THREE FORMS OF ENTRY</p> <p>Cabinet considered a report that presented responses that had been received to consultation on the proposed expansions. The report also sought agreement to proceed with the issuing of statutory notices on each school with regard to the intention to expand from them from two to three forms of entry.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the feedback from the first round of stakeholder consultation be noted. ii. That the analysis of other factors influencing the provision of and demand for school places in Haringey be noted. iii. That it be noted that there would not be sufficient school places to meet projected need if additional reception places were not created in the Borough. iv. That it be noted that the provision of sixty additional school places from September 2012, as a result of the DfE's approval of E-ACT's proposal to provide a primary free school in the Borough might impact on the need to provide additional school places (as detailed in paragraphs 5.13 – 5.16 of the report). v. That the recommendation that statutory notices be published with regard to the proposed expansions of Belmont Infant and Junior schools, Lancasterian Primary School and Welbourne Primary school be agreed. (While the report recommended the publication of statutory notices on all three primary schools, it might be | <p>DCS</p> |

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>appropriate, once the location of the free school provision for 2012 was established, to publish a further statutory notice(s) withdrawing the intention to expand one or more of the above primary schools. The publication of statutory notices would mark the commencement of a further four week consultation period with stakeholders and would take place in January 2012).</p> <p>vi. That it be agreed that the preliminary design work as required for potential expansions be carried out concurrently with the consultation on statutory notices, such design work to ensure that, in the event that any of the expansions go ahead, the project(s) could be delivered within the required timescale. It is recommended that only RIBA stages A, B and C would be undertaken until there was certainty with regard to which schools would be expanded. Detailed design would be the subject of in depth consultation with the school(s) if the expansion(s) went ahead.</p> | DCS |
| <p>CAB102. DISPOSAL OF COUNCIL PROPERTY</p> | <p>Cabinet considered a report that sought approval to dispose of the Council's freehold interest in 63 Lawrence Road, the car park and yard and the adjoining land to the rear of the site, for the best consideration that could reasonably be achieved in pursuance of the Council's regeneration objectives, as outlined in the Planning Brief adopted in 2007.</p> <p>Further exempt information pertaining to the report was considered under Item 23.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>i. That it be agreed to divest 63 Lawrence Road from the commercial portfolio and declare it along with the apportioned area of the car park and yard and the adjoining land to the rear of the site as surplus to requirements.</p> <p>ii. That the Head of Corporate Property, in consultation with the relevant officers and Members, be authorised to dispose of the Council's freehold interest in 63 Lawrence Road (Site A), the car park and yard (Sites C and D) and the adjoining land (Site B) for the best consideration that could reasonably be obtained, ensuring that the development of the site contributed to the aims of the planning brief and recent planning statement (October 7 2011) and helped secure the overall regeneration of the Lawrence Road area.</p> <p>iii. That the site should be offered, in the first instance, to Newlon Housing Trust as they were at an advanced stage of negotiation with the private landowners of 45, 47 and 49 Lawrence Road.</p> <p>iv. That in the event that terms could not be agreed with Newlon</p> | <p>DCR</p> <p>DCR</p> <p>DCR</p> <p>DCR</p> |

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

| | | |
|----------------|--|--|
| | Housing Trust the Council should consider other disposal options with the adjoining private landowners in pursuance of its regeneration objectives for the wider Lawrence Road area. | |
| CAB103. | MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES RESOLVED: That the minutes of the following bodies be noted: a. Children’s Safeguarding Practice and Policy Advisory Committee on 3 November 2011 b. Cabinet Procurement Committee on 17 November 2011 | |
| CAB104. | DELEGATED DECISIONS AND SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS Cabinet received a report that outlined delegated decisions and significant actions taken by Directors since the previous Cabinet meeting on 8 November 2011. RESOLVED: That the report be noted. | |
| CAB105. | NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS There were no new items of Urgent Business. | |
| CAB106. | EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC RESOLVED: That the press and members of the public present be excluded for the remainder of the meeting in order to consider exempt information pertaining to Item 23. | |
| CAB107. | DISPOSAL OF COUNCIL PROPERTY As set out under minute CAB102. | |
| CAB108. | NEW EXEMPT ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS There were no new items of exempt Urgent Business. | |

The meeting closed at 8.20pm.

COUNCILLOR CLAIRE KOBER

.....

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2011**

Chair