

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

Councillors

Kober (Chair), Arthur, Demirci, Goldberg, McNamara, Morton, Strickland and Waters, Vanier

Apologies None

Also Present: Councillor Morris, Councillor Connor, Councillor Elliott, Councillor Bull[Part of the meeting],Councillor Carter[part of the meeting]

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
CAB803	<p>APOLOGIES</p> <p>There were no apologies received.</p>	
CAB804	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>No items of urgent business were put forward.</p>	
CAB805	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Councillor McNamara, Cabinet Member for Environment, declared a personal interest by virtue of his Membership of the NUT.</p> <p>Councillor Demirci, Cabinet Member for Planning, declared a personal interest by virtue of his Membership of UNISON.</p>	
CAB806	<p>NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH REPRESENTATIONS</p> <p>No representations were received.</p>	
CAB807	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 20th January were approved as a correct record of the meeting.</p>	
CAB808	<p>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS</p> <p>The Leader was handed a petition in relation to the proposed closure of the Haven day-care centre. In accordance with committee standing order 31.1 this was recorded as received and a response due at the next ordinary meeting of</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

the Cabinet in March.

There had been a total of seven deputations received, six in relation to agenda item 7[Corporate Planning 2015-18] and one in relation to agenda item 11[423 West Green Road, Red House].

Unison – Deputation 1

The Leader invited UNISON spokesperson Chris Taylor to address the Cabinet. Chris Taylor put forward his deputation on behalf of the joint trade unions and set out the reasons for Cabinet not taking forward the proposed budget reductions contained in the Corporate Planning report. He asked the Cabinet to consider the impact of the budget reductions on vulnerable adults, on day care centres, support to families, young people and stressed that the savings would impact most on the vulnerable and marginalised.

The Unions asked how communities could recover from these reductions with decreased numbers of council staff providing local services. The Unions felt that there was an alternative; the council could set a one year budget and give regard to a potential change in government which may provide a change in budget allocations to local authorities. Alternatives put forward, were cutting spend on consultants, making further use of the council's reserves and discontinuing partnership working with private organisations.

Councillor Kober, the Leader of the Council, responded to the issues raised and made clear that no one in the council wanted to be in this position of needing to make £70m budget savings. It was important to keep in mind that the council had already made £117m in cuts over the last 4 years through making efficiencies and protecting Frontline services but options were limited now in how the £70m budget savings could be achieved. It was important to remember that the coalition government had promised to complete the budget reductions in 4 years but this had not happened and local government was continuing to face the brunt of decreased funding.

In response to the option of setting a one year budget as opposed to a three year budget, there were no signs that the government funding situation would change in the next year. All the major parties were signed up to continuing to reduce the budget deficit .Labour had indicated that they would change the funding formulae for the New Homes Bonus and this had been analysed as benefiting Northern metropolitan towns and reducing funding for London boroughs.

It was important to have a clear and open three year budget for consultation and engagement with staff, residents and partners instead of one year budget where the council would be forced to salami slice services year on year.

In response to avoiding the budget reductions, the council could not set an illegal budget as there was provision in the law for the section 151 officer to step in and compile a budget on behalf of the council and this would mean not having any say in the budget choices made which would be to the detriment of

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

all residents.

Deputation 2 - Opposition to closure of day care centres

The Leader invited the second deputation spokesperson Marianne Swannell, vice president of the National Autistic Society, to address the Cabinet. Marianne Swannell, spoke against the proposed cuts in day care centres providing support for people with severe learning difficulties and spoke about the specialist work of the Roundways Project which provided well trained staff with significant expertise in working with Autism clients. She underlined that the gathered expertise of the staff, made this service a success. Marianne Swannell described her own personal family story of how lack of early and continuing expert support for autism can lead to devastating crisis points and actually cost the state more through required hospital treatment. She opposed the proposition of supported living arrangements for young people with disabilities and felt that, although there were some young people that could be supported to live independently, there were others with complex needs that could not be supported to live independently. Marianne Swannell reiterated the Roundways project should not close and Cabinet were asked to reject these proposals.

The Leader asked Cabinet Members to put forward their questions to the deputation party.

Understanding was sought on what, in particular, the deputation party felt was of value and the difference made by the Roundways centre. In response it was noted that the expertise and support provided by the staff made a difference to the clients. The centre had well trained established staff which was imperative for helping with complex, lifelong disabilities such as Autism. At the Roundways Project clients had personalised plans with a rota in place to help manage more complex clients and because staff were established they had the confidence of clients which was also important aspect of support for this social and communicative disorder.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing thanked the deputation party for coming to the meeting and he appreciated the time made by carers to attend meetings of the council. Councillor Morton explained that the budget process was challenging but it was important to be clear on the process. He recognised that people will have different needs and acknowledged that some people with disabilities can live supported in the community and others cannot. In looking at the budget there was a need to deliver as many Adult services in a sustainable way as possible. He had visited the Roundways and 4 day care centres and met with residential providers. He had listened to the views in the consultation and subsequently Cabinet had withdrawn the £5.7m in proposed savings relating to Adult services care packages. The model of adult and social care integration was integral part of how the services went forward and the council would be looking to work with Adult Service users to find out what works well for them in the services being provided and how the transition period can be as comfortable as possible. There were difficult decisions to make on the provision of day care centres but the council was

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

pursuing the need to provide fair and sustainable services.

Deputation 3 – Opposition to the closure of the Haven

Heather Martin - co-ordinator, relatives support group at the Haynes Day Centre and representatives for carers at the Grange and Haven came forward with the third deputation. Heather Martin put forward the importance of day care centres for dementia sufferers and was concerned about the proposed pooling of dementia services and re- provision at the Grange and Haynes centre. Heather Martin felt that there was a lack of understanding about the care provided by the day care centres and the important part they played in keeping dementia sufferers as mobile and less isolated as possible. The centres have good client /worker ratios, prevent social isolation, and have experienced dedicated staff .With the increase in dementia sufferers and with more responsibility falling on families, day care centres are a vital source for the community.

Heather Martin further referred to the initial consultation undertaken on pooling demand for dementia services and the re-provision of services which was yet to be fully set out. The deputation urged the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing to take no pooling action and test this initiative with dementia users.

In response to a Cabinet Member question, the deputation party felt that the Adult home care package was a supplement and could not replace the specialist help provided by a day-care centre.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing responded to the deputation and explained that the council considered intervention and their statutory responsibilities at the heart of their budget plans. It was important for carers to also receive support and the local authorities would be looking into the areas that might need support, and use of respite provision. After the pre budget consultation there would still be an opportunity to feed into the budget process and the council would be looking at all the options available and looking at what is required for dementia sufferers , completing a full equalities impact assessment, where required, and working out how best to work with the expertise required.

Deputation 4 – opposition to the reductions in the Children’s disabilities budget

Ibrahim and Zac of the Mpower young participation group came forward as the 4th deputation to talk on behalf of disabled young people using the Markfield centre.

The project they attended had been running for over 10 years and was based at the Markfield Centre and helping young people with both physical and behavioural disabilities .Zac had wanted to address the Cabinet as he was worried about the local services for disabled young people being cut. He felt that the £1.5m proposed saving in Children’s Services budget was too much.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

Zac highlighted some of the most important things that the funding for the centres is spent on such as short breaks, respite care, after school clubs for young disabled people and short holidays.

Zac spoke about the importance of helping young people earlier with their physical and behavioural disabilities as these stops their problems getting worse.

Ibrahim spoke about the help with independence that the Markfield project provides such as support in getting to places. Also when young people know the staff well they can feel safe and cared for. Ibrahim advised that there is good support from workers at Markfield that help the young people feel safe and enable the young people to make friends and feel independent of carers. Ibrahim had seen a lot of after school clubs and activities cut and did not want the Markfield project to be cut as the project makes young people feel valued, want to do more and achieve things.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families thanked Zac and Ibrahim for coming to the meeting and was impressed with the effort put into the presentation. Cllr Waters reiterated that the Cabinet does value children with disabilities and do understand the need to provide a sensitive and safe environment for disabled young people / children and also the need to provide respite care for parents and carers. The spend in the Children's Service had not been finalised as yet and the Cabinet Member for Children and Families would visit the Markfield project.

Deputation 5 – Opposition to reduction of 8 Children's Centres

The Children's Centres Alliance was invited to address the Cabinet. They opposed the proposed £1.3million of cut to Children's Centres and appealed to the Cabinet to withdraw these proposals. The content of the cuts included:

- Loss of 22 staff
- Loss of 8 centres with families having to travel longer distances to go to centres
- Loss of vital services [the alliance disputed that the children's centres were not fully made use of]
- Reduced support for families

The Children's Centre Alliance disputed how the council can achieve increased outreach work with fewer buildings and staff. They pointed to the significant work of Children's Centres as set out in the document 'a day in the life of a child'. They described an oversubscription of places and contended that there were nurseries in the most deprived areas of the borough. The Alliance further asked why the children's centres were proposed for reduction because if a Labour government got into power they may reverse this situation with additional funding for centres.

The Leader responded and spoke about the services provided by the Children's Centre. Not all the Children's Centre settings provided child care and some were better used than others. There was a need to provide more services

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

to children in the community but with less expenditure on buildings and this would be through outreach services and making sure more families make use of services.

The Alliance further disputed how the outreach could be achieved with less centres and reduced staff.

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Social Inclusion, and Sustainability spoke to the deputation and reiterated the importance given to Children Centres and sure start which was one of the best innovations for early intervention. Councillor Goldberg spoke about meeting the needs of all children and the Cabinet was clear that there was a need to invest in early help to deter problems, help achieve outcomes and support families. There was a need to recognise that the current structure of the Children's Centres could be excluding those most in need. The council needed to meet the demands of these families too.

In response to this, the Alliance spoke about the importance of early years and how they were supporting families in the middle or at the edge of requiring social support. They further felt that families making use of the centres and not perceived as coming from poor backgrounds should not be stigmatised as they may also be facing financial difficulties and rely on the support of childcare places.

When discussing how to define children in need and know how much reach the Children's Centres have, the Leader explained that reach numbers would include a parent that had attend a session once. Therefore, It would be important to establish the reach and the depth of Children's Centres relationship with families going forward.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families responded in full to the deputation and acknowledged that the Children's Centres do a lot of work for children in the borough and this was recognised. However, the council needed to make savings in the best way possible and ensure that services to vulnerable children were maintained whilst not stigmatising families. The council would be aiming for a universal offer and targeting services at those children that most need it and therefore children's centres were still part of the early help offer. There was a need to: better signpost information about services in the community for families, provide a locality for 0-19 year's support. In taking forward the budget proposals in relation to children's centres and child care subsidy, officers would be having detailed conversations with Children's Centre clusters to get the best solution possible within the budget envelope allocated and welcomed the Children's Centres Alliance working with the council to find the best possible solutions for children in the borough.

Deputation 6 – Opposition to Children's Centre closures – Triangle Parents Forum

Julia Jarvis Knell of the Triangle Parents Forum addressed the Cabinet, echoed the statements of the Children's Centres Alliance and put forward the personal

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

	<p>views of parents using the Triangle Children’s Centre. The parents were concerned about the impact of the savings on the centre where there was hard working dedicated staff looking after their children. The parents were just beginning to hear about the proposed savings and were concerned about the impact on the centre. They highlighted the benefits of children’s centre in the community in helping parents be able to work and felt that families would be forced to leave areas if they could not get affordable childcare. The parents wanted to be a part of the negotiation process on working out what the savings will mean and how they will be implemented.</p> <p>Councillor Waters, Cabinet Member for Children and Families responded on the next stages of the budget recommendations. So far ,there had been consultation on the headline budget reductions concerning Children’s Services and therefore it was too early to set out how the savings will be fully implemented . The Cabinet Member for Children and Families took into consideration that there were Children’s Centre representatives with ideas on how to run the centres. There would be further meetings with the Clusters and the Triangle Parents Forum were welcome to participate in this dialogue. These were informal discussions at the moment but there would be proposals on the future of Children’s centres submitted to Cabinet in June when there would follow a formal consultation process.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Children and Families recognised that childcare in London was expensive, there were 500 children in Children centres. This was a small proportion in relation to the overall number of children aged 0-4 in the borough. It was important to ensure that the subsidised rate better benefitted vulnerable children.</p> <p>The Leader thanked all the deputation parties for coming to the meeting and putting forward their representations in relation to the budget.</p>	
<p>CAB809</p>	<p>CORPORATE PLANNING 2015-18</p> <p>The Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Leader which provided a summary of the budget consultation feedback, sought agreement to the corporate plan and endorsement to the enclosed medium term financial strategy and its constituent elements going forward to Full Council on the 23rd February for approval.</p> <p>In introducing the report, the Leader thanked the deputation parties for coming forward with their representations and to all the responders’ of the budget consultation. The Leader acknowledged and understood the concerns put forward and emphasised that no one in the Council wanted to be in the situation of making £70m savings. Government economic plans required local authorities to make deeper and harder cuts leading to some invidious and tough choices.</p> <p>In response to calls for setting a one year budget the Leader re- affirmed that all the political parties were committed to reducing the budget deficit and this meant continuing reductions for local authorities .The Leader and Cabinet felt</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

it was important to fully engage on the challenges facing the borough with residents, staff and partners and this could only be done by setting a three year budget.

The budget process was a continuing process and the consultation undertaken had already seen an impact with the withdrawal of the savings proposal to reduce the care packages budget by £5.7m.

It was important to note that the Council had already saved £117m over the last 4 years, a 60% reduction of real terms of the budget. In response to the assertion on spend on consultants the Council, much of the spending was on needed agency social workers and the council had to invest to deliver further savings.

In terms of the suggested option of increasing Council tax, in Haringey this tax was already high and increasing it would disproportionately affect the lower paid. Also the Council received a financial incentive from the government to freeze the Council tax and therefore increasing it would require both a referendum and mean a loss of the financial incentive.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture continued to reinforce the importance of the consultation exercise undertaken and developing plans with residents for continual engagement. He further spoke about: having difficult decisions to make, the strategy for reserves, and emphasised the importance of remaining positive about the future despite the savings being made. This meant continuing to strive for service improvements, and considering the positive steps being taken on protecting libraries, freezing Council tax, investing in a housing licensing scheme, investing in regeneration, building more homes, keeping roads safe. The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture concluded by promising that the Cabinet would strive to spend the remaining budget £240m budget wisely and negate impact of the savings.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing spoke about the budget challenge facing adult social care services and how equality and fairness was at the centre of provision going forward. There would be a strong concentration on providing a smooth transition process where provision was changing for people and ensuring the reduced resources were shared equally and fairly with as much integrated services as possible.

The Council were aiming to work closely with carers and there was £20k of funding set aside for additional advocacy services; ensuring Adult carers have a strong voice in the system. This was also a requirement under the new Care Act.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing made clear that reablement will not mean all elderly or disabled people living independently as there was a small proportion of people that need a carer based setting.

There had been meetings with the voluntary and community sector and the

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

feedback indicated that the Council and voluntary sector partners can work together to deliver on prevention and improve on the lives of people in Haringey. There were opportunities to align the Adults provision needed in the borough.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families further took part in the introduction, and clarified that the Council were not seeking to close Bruce Grove Youth Centre but considering how to better and potentially differently to deliver services from the centre as a commissioner.

There was a Young People Strategy being devised which would encompass services to all young people in the borough, and the Council would be looking for positive youth engagement in the strategy which would deal with all different types of youth activities from employment, education to preventing risky behaviour.

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Social Inclusion and Sustainability continued to highlight the high level of funding withdrawn from local government and how important it was to continue to work hard for the residents of the borough and not be reactionary. This would mean focusing on the areas where local government can make a difference and deliver more outcomes. Councillor Goldberg spoke about early intervention and the challenge for all partners together to do better in this area and to build on the growth and opportunity available in London through the implementation of the economic growth strategy

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration concluded the presentation by advising that the Council were working hard to get as much investment as possible into the borough to make a difference to resident's lives. The Council would continue with their new build programme including building new Council homes, better supporting single homeless people, making bids to the new housing zone to help with access to homes and jobs in Tottenham .

The Leader invited Councillor Morris and Councillor Connor to put forward their questions to the Cabinet.

In response to a question about the pilot completed with Age UK and Living Under One Sun, on helping people with learning disabilities live without isolation in the community and the perceived small number rating this pilot as a success had , the findings had still exceeded expectations and the Adults services would be looking to develop neighbourhood commitments for helping disabled people with isolation issues. There would be a further consultation and the plans would be worked up with users and interested parties.

In response to the question on experience of other Councils development of a social enterprise model for providing disabled day care services, these models had already been developed and used by Rochdale, Thurrock and Redbridge councils'.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

<p>x. That the housing rent increase, of on average, £2.36 (2.2%), as set out in paragraphs 14.5 and 14.6 be approved.</p>	<p>AD Finance</p>
<p>xi. To propose a Dedicated Schools Budget for 2015/16 of £236.477m as set out in Annex 5</p>	<p>AD Finance</p>
<p>xii. That the change to the value of the Secondary Schools lump sum element within Haringey Schools Funding Formula, endorsed by the Schools Forum and set out in paragraph 17.12 be approved;</p>	<p>AD Finance</p>
<p>xiii. That the responses made to the Overview and Scrutiny committee recommendations following their consideration of the draft budget proposals contained within the MTFs 2015-2018 (Annex 6) be approved;</p>	<p>AD Finance</p>
<p>xiv. To note that this report will be considered by the Council at its meeting on 23 February 2015 to inform their decisions on the 2015/16 budget and the associated Council Tax for that year;</p>	<p>AD Finance</p>
<p>xv. To delegate to the Chief Financial Officer any minor adjustments, individually up to £250k, that may be necessary to finalise the 2015/16 budget as a result of the final Local Government Finance Settlement being announced by the government and / final grant figures notified by other bodies. This would impact on the recommendations set out above.</p>	<p>AD Finance</p>
<p>Alternative options considered: There is a need to identify £69m of savings from the Council's budget over the next three years. This is in addition to savings of £117 million identified over the previous three years. As we approach the 2015 General Election, it is clear that all of the major national political parties remain committed to reducing the deficit and that the public sector will need to bear its share of the funding reductions needed to achieve this aim.</p>	
<p>Key principles which have informed our overall approach are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That our focus should be on outcomes, not services, to ensure the Council's budget is most effectively spent, on the things that really matter to residents; • We must have a long term view on delivery of outcomes and resources, both budget and staff, to ensure the most effective approach and best value for money. • Residents should be at the heart of all our plans. 	
<p>Alternative options considered included a traditional corporate plan, not clearly related to budget; a budget focussed in detail on only 2015/16 and publishing simple proposals for consultation with staff on budget proposals rather than a joined up approach setting out a three year strategy. However, the scale of change required mean that this approach would risk a</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

	<p>misalignment between the priorities set out in the corporate plan and the budget, and therefore poor value for money and risk to the achievement of objectives.</p> <p>The Administration made a clear commitment to freezing Council Tax for the duration of the current electoral term in their 2014 manifesto. Consideration has also been given to increasing the Council Tax to contribute to the estimated budget shortfall. If a rise in Council Tax above 2% were proposed, this would require a referendum. Additionally, given that any increase would result in the loss of Council Tax Freeze Grant the benefit of raising Council Tax against the loss of that grant is not considered worthwhile.</p> <p>A 2% Council Tax rise, which is the maximum that could be implemented without requiring a referendum, would generate c£1.6m additional income but would result in the loss of c£1m CT freeze grant, resulting in only a net £0.6m benefit. In addition, over one third of respondents to the consultation also said that they either strongly supported or supported a Council tax freeze. This brings in to question the worth of such an increase and therefore the proposal is not being taken forward.</p> <p>Reasons for Decision</p> <p>The Council has a legal duty to set a balanced budget. This report sets out the strategic financial issues for the three year financial planning period to 2017/18, and updates on the process for setting the Council’s 2015/16 Budget.</p>	
<p>CAB810</p>	<p>PLANNING SERVICE REVIEW OF PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE SERVICES AND OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES AND ASSOCIATED CHARGES</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Planning introduced the report and explained that The Regulatory Committee considered a report on 15 January 2015 setting out details of the review of and proposed changes to the Council’s pre-application planning advice services to align with priorities set out in the Corporate Plan and Development Management Improvement Plan and new proposed charges for Building Control services. The Committee supported the proposed charges and changes to the service.</p> <p>Cabinet noted that the scope, quality and value of the pre-application advice service has been reviewed in the context of Government Planning Practice Guidance 2014 and best practice. It is intended to introduce a more tailored, customer focussed service approach including the provision of advice at the feasibility stage of householder proposals and to make improvements in the information and signposting provided on the Council website. The new service offer aims to reduce the costs experienced by householders in not getting it right first time, improve the quality of planning applications coming forward and the likelihood of success for both householders and commercial businesses. Proposals have been developed for a new charging regime for the redesigned pre-application service following a benchmarking exercise with other authorities. New charges aim to recover the cost of providing the advice, with an exemption for micro businesses and a discount to small and medium businesses. Subject to Cabinet approval, the new charges would come into</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

	<p>effect on 1 April.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>i. That the charges as set out in “Supporting high quality development in Haringey – Our pre-application advice services” set out at Appendix 2 for use by the Planning Service with effect from 1 April 2015 be adopted.</p> <p>ii. That the Building Control charges set out Tables 6, 7, 8 and 9 set out at Appendix 1 for use by the Building Control Service with effect from 1 April 2015; be adopted and</p> <p>iii. That Cabinet reviews annually the fees and charges set out therein.</p> <p>Alternative options considered</p> <p><i>Do nothing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Planning service could continue to provide free Duty Planning advice to householders and keep fees for commercial applicants at the current level. • However, the Planning service is committed to making £75,000 in savings, as set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy in 2015/16. This saving cannot be accommodated within the service budget without a reduction in officer resources, which would lead to a reduction in capacity for non statutory services including planning advice. . • While the Planning service is committed to providing the best advice to customers that it possibly can, the existing walk in service does not allow officers a chance to carry out background research on the property, or take account of other supporting materials from the client which could enhance the service customers get. • A recent ‘Deep Dive’ session with the Council’s Corporate Delivery Unit has identified that the Planning service faces pressures on officer workloads as caseloads per officer have risen significantly every year. Applicants who are refused planning permission the first time around are allowed to re-submit applications for free a second time. This ‘failure-demand’ also increases the case loads of officers and the pressures on the service, and stress for applicants. • To enable the planning service to meet its commitments to make 	<p>AD Planning</p> <p>AD Planning</p> <p>AD Planning</p>
--	---	--

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

	<p>£75,000 of savings, the planning service would have to reduce its budget elsewhere. This would increase the pressures on the service and put at risk the performance of the planning department, comparative to other boroughs.</p> <p><i>Do something else</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The option outlined could be reconfigured with an alternative charging regime. The current regime has had regard to the emergent corporate plan priorities and London wide benchmarking. Whilst it would be possible to provide an alternative charging regime to secure associated cost recovery, the current regime is considered to strike an appropriate balance across the development sector. <p>Reasons for Decision</p> <p>The Corporate Plan promotes a confident, new vision for Haringey including a more collaborative and constructive relationship with our service users and residents. The changes to the Planning Advice Service have been prompted by a fundamental reappraisal of our users needs, coupled with a reappraisal of the costs in delivering the planning service (and the avoidable elements of costs that will help improve value for money). The proposals reflect our commitment to supporting pre-application discussions. The last significant review of the pre-application advice service was undertaken in 2008 and on 18 March 2008 the Cabinet agreed to the introduction of a more formalised service and associated charging regime for Pre-application planning advice and the introduction of the use of Planning Performance Agreements for major proposals. These proposals will bring the charges and the service offer “up to date” and help realise the shared objective within the corporate plan to support high quality housing and growth across the Borough.</p>	
<p>CAB811</p>	<p>REVIEW OF FEES AND CHARGES 2015-16</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture introduced the report which set out a general increase in fees and charges of 2.3% and indicated services where an alternative approach has been proposed, where also reasonable.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) That a general increase of 2.3% be applied to Fees and Charges levied by the Council with effect from 1 April 2015; (ii) That the approach for those services set out in this report where a different rate other than the general increase is proposed be approved; (iii) That final decisions on (i) and (ii) above be delegated to the respective Assistant Directors in respect of their services following completion and consideration of equality impact assessments where this is appropriate; and, 	<p>AD Finance</p> <p>AD Finance</p> <p>AD Finance</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

	<p>(iv) That the estimated additional income arising from the increases in Fees and Charges as set out in this report amounting to c£240k be reflected within the Council’s 2015-16 budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy documents.</p> <p>Alternative options considered This report proposes 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 inflationary increases have been considered and reflected in this report.</p> <p>Reason for Decision It is a requirement to review Fees and Charges annually. The financial position that the Council finds itself in supports 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.</p>	<p>AD Finance</p>
<p>CAB812</p>	<p>DEVELOPMENT VEHICLE FEASIBILITY STUDY AND BUSINESS CASE</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report which set out the procedural requirements to tender for a feasibility study and business case for a Haringey development vehicle.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>i. That the proposal to tender for an external consultant to (a) refine the feasibility work commenced by Turnberry and develop a business case for the preferred option; and (b) support the Council through the procurement of one or more joint venture partners[if that approach is recommended and subsequently approved by Cabinet] be approved.</p> <p>ii. That the additional budget provision of £400,000 be allocated from the earmarked Urban Renewal Reserve to fund the project.</p> <p>Alternative options considered The work proposed here – to develop a business case for the establishment of a development vehicle – is intended to weigh up the case for establishing a single vehicle against the alternative options, including alternative joint venture approaches and more traditional approaches, as well as assessing the various options for pursuing a single vehicle-based approach. The alternatives to the work proposed here would be either to terminate the Council’s work on assessing those options, or to adopt and pursue one of them without further analysis and proceed direct to procurement of the vehicle itself, with risks both to optimising the delivery of our objectives and value for money.</p> <p>As set out in paragraph 1.2, termination of Council’s work to assess options for</p>	<p>AD Regener ation</p> <p>AD Regener ation</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

	<p>a development vehicle would significantly hamper delivery of its ambitions (as set out in the draft corporate plan for 2015-18) for building new homes and securing its wider regeneration objectives, including in relation to the Tottenham regeneration programme; the emerging Wood Green Investment Framework; housing estate renewal and the Council’s own commercial portfolio. While the Council has access to the land required to achieve its desired outcomes, it can neither access sufficient capital funding through its general fund or housing revenue account (partly because of constraints imposed on borrowing), nor draw on sufficient in-house commercial and development expertise. Only through a partnership arrangement such as the proposed vehicle could the Council marry its land assets with the necessary investment and expertise, while retaining a stake and a degree of influence over the pace and nature of development that would not be possible with more traditional land deals or development agreements.</p> <p>Reasons for Decision</p> <p>The option of establishing a joint venture development vehicle as a way of pursuing housing development and regeneration on the Council’s land has potentially significant implications in governance and financial terms for the Council itself, and could have a major material impact on places and people across a number of wards, hence this is considered a key decision for approval by Cabinet.</p>	
<p>CAB813</p>	<p>THE RED HOUSE, 423 WEST GREEN ROAD N15</p> <p>Joanna Fone, represented the Derby Hall Christian Assembly, who had not been successful in the bidding process for acquiring the freehold interest in the Red House[423 West Green Road].Ms Fone put forward objections to the recommendations on procedural grounds. She contended that Derby Hall Christian Assembly had not been allowed the same opportunity as Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability to provide two different bids and had been penalised for working within the set perimeters which included plans for an expanded church. It was claimed that the hall had a covenant on the parking land making the award of special purchaser to Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability invalid and if this deal proceeded they would complain to the Local Government Ombudsman.</p> <p>The deputation further contested the designation of Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability as special purchaser as their landholding was not adjacent to the Red House, 423 West Green Road.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration responded to the deputation and advised that both Derby Hall Christian Assembly and Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability had equal treatment in the negotiation process and both bids been subject to detailed analysis by specialist officers and there had been an objection to the scheme from Derby Hall Christian assembly by Transport planners a set out in the report. The Cabinet Member and officers were happy to meet with the Derby Hall Christian Assembly to further discuss the process.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

	<p>The Cabinet Member continued to introduce the report which reconfirmed the disposal of the Red House, 423 West Green roads and designated a special purchaser for the site.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the original decision by Cabinet on 12 February 2013 that the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 is surplus to requirements be re-confirmed. ii. That the Assistant Director of Property & Capital Projects be authorised to dispose of the Council’s freehold interest in the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 for best consideration reasonably obtainable to Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability. iii. That In the event that Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability is unable to proceed with the acquisition, officers engage with Derby Hall Christian Assembly/Aitch in an attempt to agree a holistic policy compliant scheme. iv. That In the event that Derby Hall Christian Assembly/Aitch are unable to present a holistic policy compliant scheme and proceed to an acquisition, that the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 is offered for sale on the open market for best consideration reasonably obtainable. <p>Alternative Options Retention of the property as is:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Property Review previously deemed, following cross service consultation, that no future Council operational or strategic requirements have been identified for the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, and N15. • Retention for wider area regeneration:- • The Red House is not in a designated regeneration area and a disposal that brings forward a new mixed use development scheme will help improve the local area. <p>Reasons for Decision This report recommends that Members re-confirm the original decision by Cabinet on 12 February 2013 that the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 is surplus to requirements.</p> <p>Members are asked to note that a caution exists on the Red House which will result in redemption sum being paid in the region of £600,000 from the eventual capital receipt.</p> <p>As the Red House is not suitable for long-term retention following changes in service delivery, this report consequently recommends a disposal to the special purchasers Magic Homes & Leonard Cheshire Disability as their proposed</p>	<p>AD Property &Capital Projects</p> <p>AD Property &Capital Projects</p> <p>AD Property &Capital Projects</p> <p>AD Property &Capital Projects</p>
--	--	---

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

	<p>scheme is policy compliant, which will assist in generating a capital receipt to sustain the capital programme.</p>	
<p>CAB814</p>	<p>LAND REAR OF 1-11 THE DRIVE, N11</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report which set out the Council’s intentions to dispose of the Council’s freehold interest in the land rear of 1-11 The Drive for best consideration as reasonably obtainable. Cabinet noted that that this land has long been used by the residents as extensions to their gardens. The site has been declared surplus to requirements and available for disposal. A sale to the residents will generate a capital receipt which will be used to support the Council’s capital programme whilst also allowing residents the continued use of the land.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the Assistant Director of Property & Capital Projects be authorised to dispose of the Council’s freehold interest in the land rear of 1-11 The Drive for best consideration reasonably obtainable. ii. That the owners of No.’s 1-11 The Drive be given first refusal to collectively acquire the site as one lot (rather than as individual plots). iii. That in the event the residents are unable to proceed with a collective acquisition, the site to be offered for sale on the open market for best consideration reasonably obtainable iv. That should the site not receive a satisfactory offer when offered for sale on the open market, that the subject land is retained for the Council’s New Build Programme. <p>Alternative Options Considered</p> <p>Continue to lease individual plots on a non secure basis to the adjoining properties – EXEMPT (This is information is contained within Part B of the report).</p> <p>Dispose of individual plots to the adjoining properties for the market value – the sale of individual plots is not supported as some residents may opt not to buy with the Council left with inaccessible small parcels of land.</p> <p>Dispose of the land as one lot (rather than in single plots) to the adjoining properties collectively restricting it’s the use to garden land – such a restriction would artificially suppress the value of the land thereby failing to demonstrate best consideration for the Council. This option is therefore not supported.</p> <p>Reasons for Decision</p> <p>This report confirms that following cross service consultation, the subject land</p>	<p>AD Property &Capital Projects</p> <p>AD Property &Capital Projects</p> <p>AD Property &Capital Projects</p> <p>AD Property &Capital Projects</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2015**

	is surplus to requirements and on the Council's disposal's list. The report consequently recommends that the residents of 1-11 The Drive, N11 are given first option to acquire the subject land for best consideration.	
CAB815	SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS RESOLVED That the significant and delegated actions taken by officers in January be noted.	
CAB816	NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS None	
CAB817	EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC 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, and schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.	
CAB818	THE RED HOUSE, 423 WEST GREEN ROAD N15 As per item 11.	
CAB819	LAND REAR OF 1-11 THE DRIVE, N11 As per item 12.	
CAB820	NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS	

Meeting ended 9.10pm

Councillor Claire Kober
Chair