

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

Councillors Vanier, Strickland, Demirci, Waters, Goldberg, Morton, Arthur

Apologies Councillor Kober, Councillor McNamara, Nick Walkley

Also Present: Councillor Engert, Councillor Mark Blake, Councillor Ibrahim, Councillor Berryman

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTON BY
CAB33	FILMING AT MEETINGS The Deputy Leader referred to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted this information.	
CAB34	APOLOGIES Apologies for absence were received from the Leader of the Council, Claire Kober, Councillor McNamara, Cabinet Member for Environment, and the Chief Executive, Nick Walkley. Councillor Vanier chaired the meeting. Cllr Demirci left the meeting at 6.45pm and his apologies were noted for the remainder of the meeting.	
CAB35	URGENT BUSINESS There were no items of urgent business to consider.	
CAB36	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST Councillor Demirci declared a personal interest in item 11 by virtue of his membership of the North London Waste Authority and in relation to item 14 by virtue of his connection with Bounds Green ward.	Clerk
CAB37	NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH REPRESENTATIONS No representations were received.	
CAB38	MINUTES The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 16 th June 2015 were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.	Clerk
CAB39	DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS The Deputy Leader, Councillor Vanier invited Stephen Brice of the Pinkham Way Alliance to put forward his deputation, to the Cabinet, which was in	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

relation to item 11, The North London Waste Plan.

Mr Brice began the deputation by expressing the dissatisfaction of the Pinkham Way Alliance, to the inclusion of the Pinkham Way as a potential waste disposal site option in the North London Waste Plan. The Alliance felt that the attached report did not provide a balanced description of the Pinkham Way site and its biodiversity and open space value. Mr Brice asserted that the valuable advice from the biodiversity study had been ignored and the recommendation of the NPPF to avoid development on environmentally valuable Brownfield sites was also not given due consideration in the report.

The deputation advised that previous Council commitments to investigate the de- cultverting of the water course running under the site and also to complete an open space study had been reneged.

Mr Brice continued to contend that the Council were not being open with plans about his land and whether it could be used for employment / development purposes in the future.

The Alliance continued to express their frustration at the incomplete review of the Pinkham Way site and its subsequent inclusion in the attached North London Waste Plan.

The deputation asked Cabinet to either postpone approval of the draft waste plan, or to approve it subject to the removal of the Pinkham Way site, pending outcome of the site allocations review.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration responded to the issues raised by the deputation and emphasised that Pinkham Way was one of 6 sites put forward as an option for use as waste disposal. This was a draft plan which was putting forward the choice for public comment. This document still provided the opportunity for the PWA to continue making the case against the inclusion of the Pinkham Way site as a potential waste disposal site. The previous promise made by Councillor Strickland remained and any final decision on the Pinkham Way site would be subject to a report at Cabinet.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration advised that the biodiversity ecological and sync designation of the site would remain .He further assured the PWA that were currently no plans for use of this site being taken forward by the NLWA and Barnet Council.

Further to the consultation on the draft The North London Waste Plan, there will follow a statutory consultation and then further public examination of the NLWP by the Planning Inspector .Therefore, there was no final imminent decision on the choice of waste disposal sites in North London and further opportunities for the Pinkham Way Alliance to make their case for the deletion of the Pinkham Way option for waste disposal

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration welcomed further dialogue with the PWA in the ongoing development of the North London Waste Plan

Deputation 2 - UNISON objections to the recommendations of Agenda item 9, Facilities Management Framework.

The Deputy Leader invited Gerard McGrath representing UNISON to put forward his deputation.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

In summary, UNISON were opposed to the privatisation of services and believed that services run by the Council were better for both residents and staff. Therefore, they were in opposition to transfer of Facilities Management staff to the preferred operator Amey which they believed would ultimately not provide a better offer to staff.

In all outsourcing exercises there was an inherent risk to low paid staff and UNISON also contended that this saving associated, with the outsourcing, could be found by the Council through other means.

Gerard McGrath continued to set out concerns about:

- TUPE agreement lasting 1 year
- The risk for staff with the preferred operator ,Amey, making savings after this time and cutting posts
- Overall concerns about the reputation of the preferred operator, Amey, with staff/ trade unions
- The level of commitment from the preferred operator, Amey, to provide Apprenticeships
- No access for transferred employees to the Council's Pension Fund.

Mr McGrath asked Cabinet to reject the recommendations on the basis of the Trade Unions concerns about the preferred provider or to agree the recommendations subject to the preferred provider agreeing TUPE + .

The Deputy Leader, asked Cllr Strickland, Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration to respond to the deputation.

Councillor Strickland understood the concerns raised by UNISON and had previously responded to similar concerns by restarting the process and including an independent assessment of the options and criteria, in order to provide further assurance to staff and UNISON. Cllr Strickland continued to thank UNISON for their partnership working and seeking the best outcome for staff with this agreement. This work had been invaluable in reaching a solution and final report to Cabinet.

Although, Unison was not happy with the outcome, the scoring at page 41 demonstrated the open and transparent method used to assess the suitability of the providers. There was already an existing mix of different contracts for delivering Facilities Management in the Council and this not sustainable or provided value for money. So a new total Facilities Management option was needed.

The Council had worked hard to secure social value in the contract by ensuring staff terms and conditions continued, payment of the London Living wage, and commitment from the preferred provider to providing apprenticeships.

The Cabinet Member advised, that the Chief Operating Officer had indicated that she was happy to take up the Unions recommendation on Tupe+ with the preferred provider through their continuing negotiations. Following recent publicity about companies who have completed private investigations and gathered information into the form of a 'Black list ' of trade union active employees, the Cabinet Member was also happy to speak further with officers about Amey's alleged access to this 'Black list'.

Deputation 3 – 'Our Tottenham coming together as Haringey Community Centres Network to put forward concerns / objections to recommendations of the item 17, Community Buildings Review.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

Ms Sona Mahtani was invited to address the meeting and put forward representations in relation to the Community Buildings Review report at item 17.

Ms Mahtani explained that the deputation party had come together as a group of community organisations to express their united concerns about proposals contained in the Community Buildings Review. As a group they felt the voluntary sector in Haringey provided an unparalleled range of diverse services and facilities throughout the borough, based mainly on self funding and extensive volunteering, supporting savings for the Council and contributing to community cohesion and providing cultural, educational and social activities in the borough.

In considering the review of community buildings the group felt that it did not feel like a pivotal review and questioned the basis of the analysis on the services provided by community buildings which had guided the recommendations of the report.

The deputation further questioned the balance of the review and highlighted information to be considered alongside this such as:

- The evidence of the supportive role of community groups to residents in the borough.
- Community groups concerns about the rental changes short leases and community asset transfer and disposal of building which should be more explicit and known to members.
- External Grant funding income brought into the borough by community groups.

The deputation supported the objectives of the community strategy, which was set out at item 15, but felt that the measures to be taken forward by the community buildings review were at odds with this strategy.

The deputation continued to question the income objective set for community buildings and whether this would be achievable if the community centres fail.

They advocated taking a holistic approach to local changes and working together with the Council collectively to deliver more for less in times of need.

The deputation asked the Cabinet to not make any final decisions on the Community Buildings Review report and to continue to work for a solution which meets the Council and community group's joint objectives and enables residents to continue with the services they need.

The Deputy Leader invited questions from Cabinet Members and the following information/views were noted from the deputation party:

- Community Centre support will be required to deliver requirements of the Care Act
- Community Centres bring external funding to the borough including funding from the Big Lottery and London Councils
- Benefit of having a core funding from the Council helps attract other external funding
- Centres have crucial role in preventative work

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing good connection between the Council and voluntary sector • Community groups comprehended the need to make sure they were making the most out of their assets. Around 75% of income was generated by the centres themselves. • Some Community groups running from the Community Centres will find it difficult to find additional income to meet the significant rises in rent and will not be able to continue in the buildings. • Advocated working together with the Council on a community asset transfer policy, jointly, from the beginning of the process. • The shorter proposed leases will limit applications to the lottery <p>Councillor Strickland, Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration thanked the deputation, and was broadly in agreement with the holistic and integrated approach to provision which they were in favour of. He emphasised that the Community Buildings Review was setting out a new approach for the Council and Community Centre buildings working together and there would follow more detailed discussions in the coming weeks. The Cabinet further recognised the rich tapestry of services provided by the community groups in the borough.</p> <p>The new community leases were designed to have the clear notion of social value and will ensure that community buildings and the different community groups based there, do provide and deliver social value .There was flexibility in the lease length and the new terms will allow sub letting to maximise use of the buildings.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member further welcomed discussing how asset transfers can work with the community centres group.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration further assured the deputation that the recommendations of the report further make clear that this is a new approach with a new starting point and there will be continued detailed dialogue with Community Buildings organisations to understand individual needs. The changes to circular funded rent and peppercorn rent agreements will be phased in.</p>	
<p>CAB40</p>	<p>FINANCIAL BUDGET MONITORING PERIOD 2</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture introduced the report which contained a range of indicators relevant to the Council’s overall financial health. He further highlighted the need to make a potential £3.5m in year budget reduction as a result of the Government’s recent budget package and government reductions to the Public Health grant. Cabinet noted the overspend in Children’s and Adult services budget and the work being undertaken to reduce these overspends. There would be a further report back in October on the budget position relating to these service areas. The Cabinet Member would also be working with officers on improving Council tax collection rates to be line with London average performance indicators</p> <p>In response to Cllr Engert’s question on receiving a breakdown of the overspend in Children’s services and Adult Social Care, this was set out at section 5.2.8 and included the high level measures to mitigate against overspend. In particular, reducing the use of agency staff and better supporting clients to access benefits. Cllr Arthur was happy to meet with the Leader of the Opposition to further discuss the details of the measures if required.</p> <p>In response to Cllr Engert’s question about the required return of capital receipts relating to RTB and the cost of the refund to the Council; the criteria for</p>	<p>Cllr Arthur</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	<p>using the RTB receipts was difficult, for all Councils, to meet due to need to commit significant capital sums to match the income from RTB [30% income of the sale of the property would need to met with 70% top up by the Council] and at the moment the Council were striving to maximise use of the RTB receipts. . It was confirmed that if the Council had to return RTB receipts, then interest will be payable. Agreed that the AD for Finance provide the Opposition Leader with a full written response.</p> <p>In response to the question on business rate valuations, this was completed by central government and if the outcome was not acceptable the Council had the option of making a legal challenge.</p> <p>In further response to the question on the exposure of the Council to LOBO's [Lender option borrowing options], this was a commonly favoured financial mechanisms used by Councils .The Council did not have a large exposure to these forms of investments and the AD for Finance would write back to the Leader of the Opposition with a fuller response.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. To note the report and the progress being made against the Council's 2015/16 budget in respect of net revenue and capital expenditure; ii. To approve the budget changes (virements), and note the transfers to/ from reserves approved by the Chief Financial Officer, as set out in Appendix 1; iii. To note the potential use of the Strategic Risk Reserve to mitigate the Council's overall revenue position; and, iv. Maintain under review the key risks and issues identified in this report. <p>Alternative options considered</p> <p>This report proposes that the Cabinet considers the financial position for 2015/16 in line with existing procedures. However, for the first time it also includes enhanced financial information and comparisons, drawn from work undertaken by the Local Government Association (LGA) to give the Cabinet a more rounded view of the Council's financial position.</p> <p>A risk based approach to budget monitoring has been developed in order to manage the Council's finances at a time of economic and financial uncertainty including additional benchmarking information.</p> <p>Cabinet could choose to adopt a less rigorous regime and examine the financial position at a later stage. Projections could be marginally more accurate if a delayed approach was adopted, but there would be less time for robust development and consideration of management action and virements.</p> <p>Reasons for Decision</p> <p>Members' involvement in financial monitoring is an essential part of delivering the Council's priorities.</p> <p>The constitution requires Members to approve certain financial transactions such as virements according to approved limits.</p>	<p>AD Finance</p> <p>AD Finance</p> <p>AD Finance</p> <p>AD Finance</p>
<p>CAB41</p>	<p>FACILITIES MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK CONTRACT</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report which put forward a preferred delivery option for procuring both hard and soft</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	<p>Facilities Management services in a more efficient and cost effective way through a single contract with an external provider. The staff affected by the proposed change would be transferred to a new operator with their terms and conditions protected through the contract and will be paid at or above the London Living wage and the new contract will deliver apprenticeships to create new employment opportunities.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>i. That, subject to paragraph 3.2, to approve the award by way of a call off from the Tri-borough single supplier Framework Agreement to Amey Community Limited (“Amey”) of a Total Facilities Management services contract for a period of 5 years starting in November 2015 with an option to extend for up to a further 3 one-year periods making a potential total of 8 years, for the total estimated all-inclusive price of £29.724M as further detailed in the exempt part of this report.</p> <p>ii. That Cabinet delegate authority to the Chief Operating Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture to finalise the detailed payment mechanism, service levels, condition appraisal and other contract terms.</p> <p>Alternative Options considered</p> <p>Using the detailed work carried out by the Tri-borough authorities as part of their extensive procurement process we have applied that to Haringey’s criteria for determining the optimum delivery solution. To “do nothing” is not a viable option.</p> <p>The following criteria have been considered in reviewing the delivery model options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility and scalability - Council FM services that are capable of meeting changing service requirements, and economically sustainable as size of the estate reduces. • Financial savings - A delivery model with a focus on value for money that meets the pre-agreed, future planned and potential savings. • Quality of delivery and performance – Simple (ideally single) access to FM services, demonstrable performance of timing and works quality. Performance measured, managed and reported within the contract management and delivery model. • Risk transfer - Service and asset compliance risks and ownership clear, managed effectively in the most appropriate place. • Innovation - Best practice delivery, responsive to market developments and technological improvements, incentivised and shared investment. • Social and economic value - A service that reflects the makeup of Haringey and recognises the social and economic value of its workforce. • Customer perception - An effective, integrated customer interface including a seamless service provision through a 	<p>COO</p> <p>COO</p>
--	--	-----------------------

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

customer oriented helpdesk. Demonstrable evidence of customer satisfaction.

Following the Tri-borough feasibility evaluation a further options appraisal carried out by V4 Services Ltd also considered the alternative delivery models and concluded that an Integrated model such as TFM is the most appropriate to deliver the required outcomes for Haringey. The range of four models taken forward and considered for evaluation were; As-Is, Enhanced As-Is, bundled and Integrated

Table 1 below summarises the evaluation of each model to meet the required criteria.

Table 1- (Source: V4 Services Limited)

EXPECTED OUTCOME	As is	Enhanced as is	Bundled, single sourced	Integrated services
Flexibility and scalability	3	3	4	5
Financial savings	1	2	3	5
Quality of delivery and performance	2	3	3	4
Risk transfer	1	2	3	5
Innovation	1	2	4	4
Social and economic value	3	3	4	4
Customer perception	2	2	3	4
Total Score(out of 35)	13	17	24	31
Ranking	4	3	2	1

The integrated option, such as TFM, scored the highest number of points.

A summary of the positive and negative aspects of each option is highlighted in Table 2 below. The table demonstrates where an option has received either a high (4-5) or low (1-2) score.

Table 2 (Information source: V4 Services Ltd)

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

Delivery model	High scores 4 and 5	Low scores 1 and 2	Total score
1. As-is	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial savings Quality of delivery and performance Risk Transfer Innovation Customer perception 	13
2. Enhanced As-is	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial savings Risk Transfer Innovation Customer perception 	17
3. Bundled, single sourced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexibility and scalability Innovation Social and economic value 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	24
4. Integrated services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexibility and scalability Financial Savings Quality of delivery and performance Risk transfer Innovation Social and economic value Customer perception 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	31

Market research of the potential financial savings and cost for the services in scope for each option is highlighted in table 3 below.

Table 3 (Information source V4 Services Ltd)

Overall current annual cost of services in scope				£ 4,112,000
Option	Savings range (%)	Mid-Range (%)	Mid-Range Saving	Mid-Range Cost
AS-IS	0	0	0	£4,112,000
AS-Is enhanced	1-5	2.5	£102,800	£4,009,200
Bundled	5-10	7.5	£308,400	£3,803,600
Integrated	15-20	17.5	£719,600	£3,392,400

The analysis undertaken by V4 indicates the model delivering the greatest savings is the integrated services option, including TFM (The Tri-borough-Amey proposal delivers savings within the range of 15-20%)

The analysis undertaken by V4 found a clear trend of Local Authorities moving towards integrated/TFM delivery of FM services. It highlighted seven case examples of recently awarded TFM models in Camden (Amey), Brent,

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

Richmond, Lambeth, Kent, Essex, Oxford. Recent awards were based on a minimum 5 year initial term.

Summary- review of options

Option 1: As-is, mixed economy – a combination of in-house service provision and external contracts. Having evolved incrementally over time this is the operating model for FM that exists for the Council with in-house teams providing soft FM whilst cleaning, security, help desk, Hard FM (via a managing agent function) are provided through external suppliers.

Consideration: Discounted as it does not offer best value relative to the changing needs of the Council and the current market conditions and trends. This model would continue to deliver minimal savings only, mainly through staff reductions, and be limited in extent of innovation and risk transfer.

Option 2: Enhanced As-is – a combination of in-house service provision and external contracts remains, however with greater visibility and control of by the FM team of all spend and enforced compliance with corporate contracts. Enhanced quality and performance management across all areas of delivery. Estimated savings are in the range of 1-5%.

Consideration: Discounted as long as the preferred option ensures that the external provider is assured to adopt the London Living Wage (LLW) any advantages of in-house service provision would be negated. This model would require increased investment to achieve internal innovation and future savings. There is minimal scope for risk transfer or externally driven innovation.

Option 3: Bundled/Single services: a series of individual contracts for each separate service line (e.g. maintenance, security, cleaning, helpdesk provision etc) or bundling of similar sized contract. Such contracts are generally let for short periods of time (typically two to three, maximum five years) and offer the advantage of regular market appraisal but do not encourage innovation from the supplier. They incur increased procurement costs and do not facilitate a thinner client side operation. Estimated savings are in the range of 5-10%.

Consideration: Discounted as although it is considered that the adoption of a bundled/integrated model of FM service delivery could deliver the majority of the Council's requirements, changes in scale would be more difficult to action without affecting prices due to the lack of economy of scale in each bundle. Achieving consistent quality and savings would require greater management across the bundles. Risk transfer would be possible but limited due to the lower value of each bundle, similarly innovation would be limited to within the scope of the bundle rather than the totality of FM Services. The need for a larger client function would reduce potential savings.

Option 4: Integrated/Total Facilities Management (TFM): a 'one stop shop' outsourced solution for all facilities services. Innovation and self management of the account assist the Council in transforming the client model to that of an intelligent client function. As such the TFM provides an economic and flexible platform for the provision of FM services. Estimated savings are in the range of 15-20%.

Consideration: This option offers the best value relative to the changing needs of the Council. It meets all evaluation criteria.

Summary of TFM

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	<p>Implementing and promoting the TFM model offers greater benefits to the Council with least risk. This model maximises the opportunity for integrated innovative delivery and savings through a single provider. Risk can be transferred to and managed by the most appropriate partner across the whole FM service which provides greater cost certainty. This option offers considerable flexibility to accommodate changes in the size and scope of the managed estate. It is expected that the LBH estate will reduce in size significantly over the coming years and this option allows the Council to remove buildings and reduce its FM spend accordingly. Therefore Option 4, the Integrated/TFM model, is recommended.</p> <p>The Tri-borough FA provides a delivery option that fulfils the Council's requirements whilst providing a scope of services whereby new and innovative ways of working will be available to the Council during the life of the contract. The ability to call-off from this existing FA provides for a cost effective and time efficient procurement route to the Council.</p> <p>Alternative frameworks</p> <p>The Crown Commercial Services framework has been considered, however it is currently being re-procured and is unlikely to be available before November 2015. Following this a further period of mini competition tendering would be required.</p> <p>The new Scape Group framework has also been considered and is available from May 2015; this would require a further period of procurement to establish an indicative price. The benefits of this have not been fully established and there is no proven record or current users.</p> <p>Reasons for decision</p> <p>The Council's is required to ensure its buildings remain fit for purpose and are supported by value for money facilities services. Paragraphs 4.2 to 4.7 set out the delivery criteria and appraisal of options which confirms an Integrated Facilities Management framework best meets the Councils requirements. The recommended model will provide savings in line with the Councils medium term financial plan, whilst remaining flexible to meet the Council's changing needs.</p>	
<p>CAB42</p>	<p>HOUSING INVESTMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report which set out further decisions in relation to capital investment priorities both for the existing housing stock and for building new homes.</p> <p>The report highlighted Decent Homes funding for Wood Green and to the Noel Park estate to update homes with a Pod which were now out of date and becoming unusable.</p> <p>Agreed a written response be provided to Cllr Engert's question on the cost estimate connected with the potential RTB of Housing Association properties.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. To approve the priorities for Decent Homes investment in 2016/17 set out in paragraph 5.5. ii. To agree the approach to Decent Homes investment set out in this report, including where investment is deferred or delayed due to 	<p>AD Regenerat ion</p> <p>AD Regenerat ion</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	<p>possible regeneration or estate renewal considerations (paragraph 5.8); where investment needs are beyond the normal scope of works (paragraph 5.21); and the move to longer term programme planning described in appendix B.</p> <p>iii. To note the commitment of £12.7m from the approved HRA capital budget to Phase 1 of the new build programme including the Templeton scheme (paragraph 5.13).</p> <p>iv. To extend the Director of Regeneration, Planning & Development's existing Delegated authority for the approval of grant funding using Right to Buy receipts for the development of affordable housing by Registered Providers to now include all RPs developing in the borough up to the approval limit of £500,000, following consultation with the Assistant Director (Finance) (paragraph 5.16).</p> <p>v. To approve the immediate changes required to facilitate delivery of the current Housing Investment & Estate Renewal strategy by providing flexibility in site identification, appraisal and resident consultation in accordance with paragraph 5.23 of this report.</p> <p>Alternative Options Considered</p> <p>For Decent Homes investment, alternative priorities for the new schemes commencing in 2016/17 were available but discounted, in order that the number of homes achieving decency is maximised and that essential works commence for the Noel Park estate.</p> <p>For the second phase of new build investment, options for development sites and delivery methods have not yet been finalised and are not finally determined by this report. Any development will be based on further studies currently being carried out and decisions will be determined by the most advantageous mix of cost, risk, outcome and deliverability.</p> <p>Reason for Decision</p> <p>A decision is required to enable work on the Decent Homes and new build programmes to proceed. By deciding the priorities for and approach to the available budget, investment can proceed to ensure that the number of existing homes made decent and the number of new homes built is maximised.</p>	<p>AD Regenerat ion</p> <p>AD Regenerat ion</p> <p>Dir RPD</p> <p>AD Regenerat ion</p>
<p>CAB43</p>	<p>THE NORTH LONDON WASTE PLAN</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report, which all 7 North London boroughs would be seeking agreement to, and would confirm agreement to a consultation draft of the joint North London Waste Plan and two memorandums' of understanding. The first as a basis for joint working with North London Boroughs and the second, providing a framework for co-operation between London Legacy Development Corporation and the North London Boroughs.</p> <p>The Board of the NLWA had set out the sites for consultation and there would follow a further statutory consultation and public examination before the final waste disposal sites were agreed. Therefore, a commitment was being sought on taking the draft North London Waste Plan out to consultation, at this stage, and, as previously outlined in the deputation response, the Pinkham Way Alliance views were valued as part of this consultation.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

<p>In response, Councillor Engert question, it was noted that Pinkham Way had not been included in the open space study as it was not accessible and had been part of a separate unsuccessful exercise to designate this land as a village green. In the longer term there was a need for evidence to support or disprove this site as appropriate for the disposal of waste.</p> <p>In response to a further question, this site had been identified by TFL when considering potential around the North Circular as part of the strategic review of infrastructure and when considering the wider aspirations for growth in London. The Council had expressed no views about this site as part of this exercise and no views were included on the site from TFL on the Local Plan or Waste Plan.</p>	<p>AD Planning</p>
<p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. To approve the draft North London Waste Plan at Appendix A for public consultation, during a 6-8 week period currently scheduled for July to September 2015; ii. To enter into the MoU at Appendix B with the other North London Boroughs, being Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Islington and Waltham Forest, for the purpose of preparing the NLWP; iii. To enter into the MoU at Appendix C to provide a framework for co-operation between London Legacy Development Corporation and the North London Boroughs of Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest undertaking the North London Waste Plan; and iv. To delegate to the, Director Regeneration, Planning and Development in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, the power to agree any future MOUs related to the NLWP preparation and any minor, non-material changes made to the NLWP prior to public consultation. v. To agree the appointment of Alan Strickland, Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, to the NLWP Planning Members Group. 	<p>AD Planning</p> <p>AD Planning</p> <p>AD Planning</p> <p>AD Planning</p> <p>AD Planning</p>
<p>Alternative Options Considered</p> <p>In line with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 182) to ensure the NLWP is justified, a range of options have been tested to demonstrate that the North London Boroughs have considered reasonable alternatives and that the Plan follows the most appropriate strategy.</p> <p>The three growth scenarios represent different population and economic factors that will affect the quantity of waste generated from households, businesses and services. The growth assumption options are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A: No Growth • Option B: Growth • Option C: Minimised growth <p>All the evidence and projections anticipate substantial population and economic growth in London over the next few decades. The Options Appraisal report concludes that Growth Assumption Option B: Growth is the most appropriate strategy for the Draft NLWP as it will provide the most accurate modelling scenario to project future capacity gaps.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	<p>Growth Options A and C are not considered to be appropriate strategies as they do not represent the most credible estimate of growth in North London over the plan period.</p> <p>Reasons for Decision</p> <p>The seven North London Boroughs (Barnet, Enfield, Waltham Forest, Hackney, Islington, Haringey and Camden), as Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs), are required to prepare a Waste Local Plan. Article 28 of the European Union (EU) Waste Framework Directive states that all member states must prepare a Waste Management Plan.</p> <p>The main purpose is to ensure that there will be adequate provision of suitable land (sites and areas) to accommodate waste management facilities of the right type, in the right place and at the right time up to 2032 to manage waste generated in North London. The draft NLWP also provides policies against which planning applications for waste development will be assessed, safeguards existing waste sites and allocates sites and areas with potential to accommodate waste facilities in the future.</p>	
<p>CAB44</p>	<p>STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report which set out recommendations for agreeing a new Statement of Community Involvement. This was previously adopted in 2008 following public consultation and also updated in 2011 following an examination in public. The SCI now required updating to take into account new planning regulations and the Localism Act changes in 2012.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To approve the annexed draft revised Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) for an eight week public consultation from September to October 2015 to ensure that Haringey has an effective, flexible and up-to-date SCI pursuant to section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).</p> <p>Alternative Options considered</p> <p>The Council could choose not to review the SCI. However, the Council is required to adopt an up-to-date SCI, pursuant to section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), taking account of national, regional and local policy changes.</p> <p>Haringey’s draft Local Plan, which was consulted on during the spring 2015, will be assessed by a Planning Inspector at an Examination in Public against the Soundness Test set out in Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The NPPF states that a local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is “sound” – namely that it is:</p> <p>Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;</p>	<p>AD Planning</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	<p>Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;</p> <p>Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and</p> <p>Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.</p> <p>A justified Plan means one which is based on a robust and credible evidence base including evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area. The Haringey SCI provides the framework for assessing that the Local Plan is justified and therefore the Council needs to update its SCI to ensure the relevant practices and procedures for consultation and community participation are followed</p> <p>A number of changes have been made since the adoption of the previous SCI including the adoption in July 2014 of a revised Planning Protocol to ensure the highest standards of probity in the performance of its planning function, new regulations introduced in the consolidated Development Management Procedure Order 2015 with revised consultation requirements, the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Review of Community Engagement and the Council’s need to streamline and become more efficient which has led to a move to self-service and paperless systems.</p> <p>Not updating the SCI to take account of these local changes means the Development Management service would not be able to make the necessary budget savings associated with reducing the level of neighbour consultation letters and providing a better and more efficient self service</p> <p>Reasons for Decision</p> <p>Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires local planning authorities to prepare a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The SCI must set out how persons who appear to the authority to have an interest in matters relating to development in the area will be involved in the authority’s plan making and development management functions. Haringey’s SCI is out of date and therefore needs updating following a statutory consultation period.</p>	
<p>CAB45</p>	<p>YOUNG PEOPLE'S STRATEGY</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced the strategy which had previously been considered by Cabinet in draft form at their meeting in March. Since then, there had been considerable work with young people to develop the strategy, reflected at appendix 3, and to ensure it is aligned to the early help approach being taken forward by the Children’s Service. The document had also been made more accessible for young people and the Council will be working with partners to deliver the outcomes of the strategy.</p> <p>In response to Cllr Engert’s question, the Children’ Service will be developing delivery plans to underpin the strategy and will contain measures and deliverables for understanding if the aims and objectives of the strategy are being achieved.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	<p>The proposed expansion of Bounds Green Primary School is expected to support additional cohorts from September 2016. A do nothing option would not support local demand for additional pupil places.</p> <p>The feasibility report considered 3 design options, with emphasis on flexibility, programme, impact on the school and financial viability.</p> <p>Options 1 and 3 were discounted by stakeholders on the basis that the design and cost did not offer the most beneficial outcomes to meet the project objectives and success criteria.</p> <p>Option 2 was considered a preferred option and developed at RIBA Stage 2 and Stage 3.</p> <p>Reasons for Decision</p> <p>To award a contract which will enable the timely mobilisation and construction of works to Bounds Green Primary School which, aims to support the Councils requirement for additional school places from September 2016.</p>	
<p>CAB47</p>	<p>COMMUNITY STRATEGY</p> <p>The Deputy Leader introduced the strategy which was an opportunity to transform the way in which the Council work in partnership with residents and builds on the successful, innovative projects that are already underway and embedding new ways of working in everything the Council does.</p> <p>The purpose of the Community Strategy was to lay out how the Council and partners will engage more deeply with communities, to build the resilience, skills and capability of local residents and communities and to strengthen the joint ability to achieve the vision and outcomes set out in the Corporate Plan.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To approve the Community Strategy for wider public engagement focussing particularly on the principles and toolkit.</p> <p>Alternative Options Considered</p> <p>Much of the work set out in the Community Strategy is planned or underway currently – what the Strategy aims to do is to co-ordinate existing and strategically develop new activity. An option of not pursuing the Strategy was considered but the opportunity for an over-arching strategic framework for current and future activity would have been missed.</p> <p>Two important policy documents – the Voluntary Sector Commissioning Strategy and the Community Buildings Review are linked to the Strategy as ways in which the Council shapes and develops its relationship with local communities. The alternative would be to implement these policies without an over-arching strategy, this was not pursued because it was felt important to establish the broader principles and vision that lie behind their development.</p> <p>It is also the case that the Voluntary Sector Commissioning Strategy and Community Buildings Review only cover two specific ways in which the Council</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	<p>can work with communities – commissioning voluntary sector organisations and the provision of Community Buildings – two ways where the Council’s scope is increasingly limited by financial considerations. The Community Strategy plays an important complementary role in laying out a wider variety of ways in which the Council can work with communities, the positive steps the Council can take as a facilitator, enabler and capacity-builder to work with communities in a time of reducing budgets.</p> <p>Reasons for decision</p> <p>It is recommended that Cabinet approve the Community Strategy for wider community engagement on the principles and toolkit featured within the Strategy.</p> <p>Working with communities already features as a cross-cutting theme within the Corporate Plan 2015-18, and the strategic priorities within the Community Strategy also feature within the Corporate Plan.</p> <p>Approving the Community Strategy is the first step in embedding new ways of working with communities across the Council. A public consultation will enable an action plan to be created to embed the revised principles and toolkit across the Council – in terms of the commissioning process, specific capacity building projects, community leadership from Councillors, training of staff and business-as-usual functions.</p>	
<p>CAB48</p>	<p>VOLUNTARY SECTOR COMMISSIONING FRAMEWORK</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing introduced the Framework which complimented the Community Buildings review and community strategy by setting out a new relationship with the sector and the approach the Council will take to commissioning the VCS.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To approve the Voluntary and Community Sector Commissioning Framework as set out in Appendix 1.</p> <p>Alternative options considered</p> <p>The option of not setting out this new framework was considered and discarded, based on the need to reframe the Council’s relationship with the sector in light of the new Corporate Plan <i>Building a Stronger Haringey Together</i> and a need to be clear on the Council’s commissioning approach with the sector.</p> <p>Reasons for Decision</p> <p>The Voluntary and Community Sector Commissioning Framework is a key document linked to the Community Strategy and Community Buildings Review and sets out how we will work with and commission the sector directly in line with the approach set out in <i>Building a Stronger Haringey Together</i>.</p>	
<p>CAB49</p>	<p>COMMUNITY BUILDINGS REVIEW</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report, which set out the overarching principles and recommendations of the Community Buildings Review which had been undertaken corporately.

Councillor Strickland highlighted a change to Appendix B, item 20, Selby Trust, final recommendation and rationale, to now read *explore and agree use of the site in the medium term, including any options required for re-providing existing community uses, through a feasibility study to be developed collaboratively by the Trust and the Council.*

Clerk

This report included agreeing a community model lease to apply to all community buildings. This will mean, community groups managing and using the community buildings, meeting a social value checklist and criteria to ensure they are working for social outcomes and meeting the needs of residents.

The Cabinet Member indicated that cessation of circular funded rent and peppercorn rent which will be phased out in a managed way in light of the move to community model leases.

In response to Cllr Berryman's question on deleting strategic framework principle (e) at paragraph 6.4, to ensure that community buildings are not vulnerable to developers, noted that community buildings were ultimately owned by the Council so any disposal would be subject to Cabinet agreement. This clause was needed to ensure that there is an overriding right for the Council to buy and safeguard a site for regeneration purposes if the need in future arises but the grid at appendix B makes clear that there are no plans to use this clause to take over sites especially if they are delivering social values and outcomes for residents.

Councillor Blake was invited by the chair to ask a question, and he began by supporting the deputations request to pause the decision making on the Community Buildings Review to allow organisations to develop their RTB offer and compile a capital project.

Councillor Blake further spoke about an inherent inequality with the application of the peppercorn rent cessation as some groups would have longer to wait than others for the cessation to impact. The circular rent changes would have a short and medium term impact, so sooner than the changes to some clients on peppercorn rents.

In response to these questions/observations, the Cabinet Member reminded Members that this the review had started over 3 years ago and there had been good consideration of the likely impact of the changes going forward.

Community Matters, an independent charity, had also helped work on these proposals with community groups and the Council. Also the changes to rent requirements would be phased in. Asset transfer had been part of the discussion with community organisations and would continue.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration agreed that the inequality between organisations rent and lease terms were evident and the new approach taken forward by the review will be applicable at different times. However there was a need to start making changes somewhere. So as and when leases do expire there will be a robust fair criteria applied.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	<p>including education and housing.</p> <p>A 'do nothing' scenario was considered. However this approach was rejected as an option. As alluded to in the Cabinet Member introduction, effective, proactive asset management is essential in order to maximise on the Council's investments in order to support and underpin corporate priorities, particularly in terms of our ambitions for health, wellbeing and social and economic regeneration.</p> <p>Alternative options were also considered in relation to Circular Funded Rent. A 'do nothing' option was considered in which Circular Funded Rent (CFR) would continue to be paid to the limited number of organisations currently receiving it on an ongoing basis. This was rejected on the grounds of equity and transparency. A second option was to cease CFR with a period of notice and expect organisations to pay a market rent. This was considered to be likely to lead to significant instability in the sector given the additional financial costs to which organisations would become subject. The third and preferred option was to cease CFR in a phased way and to move towards payment of an agreed market rent over a period of 2 -3 years.</p> <p>Reasons for decision</p> <p>The proposed individual recommendations for each building in Section 7 Table 1 follow a rigorous and comprehensive assessment process and provide the Council with the best considered option in each case.</p> <p>The recommendation for the adoption of the proposed strategic framework and guiding principles will ensure that the Council opts for the best considered option with regard to the use of the community buildings currently defined and those for the use of the community in the future.</p> <p>The recommendation to cease Circular Funded Rent, moving proactively to the implementation of a Community Model Lease with the availability of a limited subsidy for a wider group of applicants contributes to the Commissioning Team budgetary target of £1.4m cashable savings.</p>	
<p>CAB50</p>	<p>HEALTH AND CARE INTEGRATION UPDATE</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing introduced the report which provided an update on the Health and social care integration programme. The report also focused on scoping and progress with greater detail around the Better Care Fund (BCF).</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. To note progress made to date ii. To approve the approach taken to aligning the Health and Care Integration Programme with the Council's approach to delivering its Priorities. iii. To note the strategic implications of the wider Health and Social Care Integration agenda and that officers will work with CCG colleagues to explore further opportunities for integration, including further opportunities for pooled budgets, in line with the Health and Care Integration programme. <p>Alternative options considered</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	<p>Do nothing with respect to aligning HACI and Priority 2 governance. Keeping the Priority 2 governance separate was considered but the efficiencies gained by streamlining governance were considered too great to delay.</p> <p>Reasons for Decision</p> <p>The proposed governance process provides clarity as to how the Council's Priority 2 and Health and Care Integration objectives will be governed and delivered.</p>											
	<p>AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR PROVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELLBEING PROMOTION INTERVENTIONS</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing introduced the report which detailed the outcome of an open tender process for the award of contracts to provide mental health and wellbeing promotion interventions to local people across the life course (from school age children to adults and older people).</p> <p>The Cabinet Member further drew the Cabinet's attention to paragraph 6.3, which outlined the potential to re-assess the budget position and identify sufficient funding before awarding these three year contracts, in light of the recent Government reductions to the Public Health budget.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>i. To agree the award of contracts to the successful tenderers in accordance with Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1(d), each for an initial term of 3 years with an option to extend for a period or periods of up to a further 2 years.</p> <p>The table below shows the successful tenderers for each lot:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="323 1330 1339 1872"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="323 1330 743 1402">Lot</th> <th data-bbox="743 1330 1339 1402">Successful Tenderer</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="323 1402 743 1585">Lot 1 – Promoting Resilience, Emotional and Mental Health and Wellbeing in Children and Young People in schools and post-16 settings</td> <td data-bbox="743 1402 1339 1585">Young Minds</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="323 1585 743 1673">Lot 2 – Mental Health First Aid Training Programme</td> <td data-bbox="743 1585 1339 1673">Mind in Haringey</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="323 1673 743 1792">Lot 3 – Community approach to Mental Health and Wellbeing Improvement</td> <td data-bbox="743 1673 1339 1792">Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="323 1792 743 1872">Lot 4 – Time Banking and/or Time Credit Scheme</td> <td data-bbox="743 1792 1339 1872">Spice Innovations Limited</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Alternative options considered</p> <p>Public mental health prevention initiatives require specialist skills and expertise not currently available in-house and therefore it was not considered suitable or feasible to deliver alternative provision within existing in-house resources.</p>	Lot	Successful Tenderer	Lot 1 – Promoting Resilience, Emotional and Mental Health and Wellbeing in Children and Young People in schools and post-16 settings	Young Minds	Lot 2 – Mental Health First Aid Training Programme	Mind in Haringey	Lot 3 – Community approach to Mental Health and Wellbeing Improvement	Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust	Lot 4 – Time Banking and/or Time Credit Scheme	Spice Innovations Limited	<p>Dir PH</p>
Lot	Successful Tenderer											
Lot 1 – Promoting Resilience, Emotional and Mental Health and Wellbeing in Children and Young People in schools and post-16 settings	Young Minds											
Lot 2 – Mental Health First Aid Training Programme	Mind in Haringey											
Lot 3 – Community approach to Mental Health and Wellbeing Improvement	Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust											
Lot 4 – Time Banking and/or Time Credit Scheme	Spice Innovations Limited											

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	<p>The tendering of these services is part of Public Health's wider commissioning plan and part of the Corporate Plan Priority 2 delivery plan. Failure to provide these interventions would impact on the Corporate Plan delivery and efficiency savings in longer term.</p> <p>Reasons for decision</p> <p>The recommendations as outlined in 3.1 and 3.2 are based on those providers who scored the highest MEAT scores and therefore would offer the best value to Council in terms of quality and price. The quality component of this tender was 55% and the price 45%.</p> <p>As a result of the procurement exercise, which was carried out in accordance with the Procurement Code of Practice, it is now recommended that the successful tenderers being awarded contract(s) as outlined in 3.1 and 3.2 in accordance with CSO 9.07.1(d).</p>	
CAB51	<p>MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To note the minutes of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8th June 2015 Cabinet Member Signing • 15 June 2015 Leader's Decision • 29th June 2015 Leader's Decision • 30th June Cabinet Member Signing • 30th June Cabinet Member Signing • 1 July Cabinet Member Signing 	
CAB52	<p>SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To note the delegated decisions taken by officers in June.</p>	
CAB53	<p>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>None</p>	
CAB54	<p>EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as the items below contained exempt information, as defined under paragraph 3 part 1 and schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.</p>	
CAB55	<p>FACILITIES MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK CONTRACT</p> <p>As per item 9.</p>	
CAB56	<p>BOUNDS GREEN PRIMARY SCHOOL EXPANSION</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 14 JULY 2015**

	As per item 15.	
CAB57	AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR PROVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH AND WELLBEING PROMOTION INTERVENTIONS As per item 20.	
CAB58	NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS None	

Councillor Bernice Vanier

Chair