

Ayshe Simsek,
Democratic Services
and Scrutiny Manager

020 8489 2929

ayshe.simsek@haringey.gov.uk

24 March 2025

To: All Members of the Full Council

Dear Member,

Full Council - Monday, 24th March, 2025

I attach a copy of the following reports for the above-mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda:

12. TO ANSWER QUESTIONS, IF ANY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE NOS. 9 & 10 (PAGES 1 - 8)

Response to Written Questions

13. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING MOTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE NO. 13 (PAGES 9 - 30)

Amendments to Motions G and H in accordance with CSO 15 .8b

Yours sincerely

Ayshe Simsek, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager

This page is intentionally left blank

Response to written councillor questions – 24 March 2025 Full Council meeting

1. Cllr Rossetti to Cllr Hakata

For years, when I asked about what was being done to address traffic, gridlock and speeding in my ward, I was told that Haringey would look at issues 'holistically' within the Alexandra North LTN. It has become clear during the last year that there will be no Alexandra North LTN, and during the Summer Haringey launched the Alexandra Travel and Transport Review to learn more. When will Haringey finally address with actions the issues that myself, past Councillors and residents have reported for years?

Response

The unfortunate truth is that almost every neighbourhood, every street in our borough is plagued by traffic issues. Congestion, speeding, dangerous driving, drivers idling and road rage incidents. They go back years, even decades in some places. And we are committed to addressing each and every one. I generally like to steer away from party political points at Full Council, but this one is unavoidable.

The unfortunate pact between the Tories and Lib Dems in 2010 which saw the latter become the lap dog enablers of the Tory gutting of the State, has left Local Government cut to the bone, with threadbare teams of talented officers valiantly working around the clock, not simply doing the essential work of maintaining crumbling infrastructure, but also designing, co-designing and implementing solutions that create the safer, greener and fairer neighbourhoods this Labour administration was elected to deliver.

We have never used these chronic challenges bestowed on us by ConDem ideological austerity as excuses for inaction and have, instead, ensured that we amplify our ambitions, accelerate change and keep on keeping on with a rolling programme of improvement to our traffic and transport network.

That is why we are taking an holistic neighbourhood approach with a matrix of interventions. A democratic, inclusive engagement that captures all voices, hears all needs, brings as many people along with us, so we do this with residents, not just for them. Far from forgetting Alexandra ward, we have been diligently working towards a solutions which will bring long-lasting change.

The Alexandra area transformation remains a cornerstone priority in our adopted Walking and Cycling Action Plan. We've evolved our approach—shifting from a simple LTN model to a comprehensive Traffic and Transport Review—directly responding to residents' expressed desire for solutions that go beyond mere traffic removal. They've called for meaningful infrastructure improvements that enhance their local environment and revolutionise travel options through sustainable alternatives: improved bus services, secure cycle storage, safer pedestrian crossings, and other vital community assets.

We recognise the complexity of challenges facing Alexandra's streets—issues that demand thoughtful co-design processes with those who navigate these spaces daily. This collaborative approach forms the foundation of our next steps as we work towards delivering tangible, lasting solutions to long-standing problems.

We are working at pace, across the entire borough, from our historic conservation areas to our most vibrant yet under-resourced communities, weaving a tapestry of improvements that honours every neighbourhood's unique character. The decimation of local government resources—courtesy of that unholy alliance between the Tories and the Lib Dems—presents formidable obstacles, yet our resolve remains unshaken.

While transformation cannot happen overnight, inaction simply isn't an option. The residents of Alexandra deserve better, as do all Haringey citizens. We are committed to creating streets where children can play safely, where air quality improves measurably, where active travel becomes the natural choice—not through dictation but through collaborative redesign of our shared urban spaces.

2. Cllr Emery to Cllr Chandwani

Last July I mentioned several serious traffic incidents in the same stretch of Archway Road, between the Boogaloo Pub and the Co-op, and asked the Cabinet Member what was being done to lobby TfL to reduce the speed limit on the road. I received the answer that the council is in continuous dialogue with TfL including monthly meetings regarding the TLRN, is lobbying TfL for a separate funding pot similar to those for CND and PBN, and is asking for a fully funded action plan to deal with collisions on the TLRN. Since then, there have been three more serious incidents on Archway Road. Have you received any further updates from TfL?

Response

Liaison between TfL and Haringey is ongoing and on Archway Road, TfL is currently undertaking a feasibility study aimed at addressing collisions and making the road safer for all users. We wait for this study to be concluded at which point we expect TfL will share further details with Haringey.

Response

3. Cllr Isilar-Gosling to Cllr Hakata

Residents are frustrated by the lack of progress on repairing the escalators at Highgate Tube station. We've heard from residents about the impact this breakdown is having, particularly on those with mobility challenges, parents with young children, and commuters navigating busy rush hours. What communication has the council had with TfL about the progress on fixing the escalators?

Response

I want to acknowledge the significant frustration being experienced by residents affected by the ongoing escalator issues at Highgate Tube station. These mechanical failures create invisible barriers in what should be accessible public infrastructure.

The human impact here is concerning and immediate—residents with mobility challenges facing impossible choices and parents struggling with pushchairs on steep alternative routes. These everyday journeys become tests of endurance rather than simple connections.

Our dialogue with TfL has been continuous and increasingly urgent. Their engineers initially identified a gearbox fault with an estimated repair timeline of 5-8 weeks. However, the technical complexity has expanded significantly, requiring a redesign of components and additional safety approvals—a process that has, regrettably, no definitive completion date at present.

I've personally escalated this matter, pressing TfL to consider the broader systemic implications of this single point of failure. What's become increasingly clear through this situation is how our transport networks—when designed without robust contingencies—can rapidly transform from enablers of mobility to barriers of exclusion.

I've advocated strongly for interim accessibility solutions while the repairs continue, challenging the notion that budgetary constraints should override basic accessibility rights. The pathway forward requires both technical resolution and fundamental reconsideration of how our transport systems respond to failure—not as isolated mechanical problems, but as community-wide accessibility challenges.

I remain committed to pressing for both immediate interim solutions and long-term systemic improvements that prioritise universal accessibility as a fundamental principle, not an optional feature, of our transport network.

4. Cllr Connor to Cllr Carlin

Overview and Scrutiny Committee have been asking for two years for the administration to provide quarterly budget updates to scrutiny panels. The cabinet member indicated at Budget Council that these reports should be made available, so will the administration commit to providing quarterly budget reports to all scrutiny panels - covering revenue, capital, risk and performance - beginning this financial year, and ensure that scrutiny officers are sufficiently resourced to support councillors in examining these reports?

Response

The Quarterly Monitoring Report is already reported quarterly to Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC). It will be for OSC to then determine any further detailed discussions for panels.

This year, the Director of Finance has started giving scrutiny committee members dedicated pre-briefings on the budget ahead of meetings. This is a 'page-turn' exercise to help increase transparency and support scrutiny members to perform their role.

5. Cllr da Costa to Cllr Carlin

In recent days, several people have contacted us regarding being sent a second home council tax surcharge bill for their primary/sole residence. In each of these cases residents have objected/appealed with supporting evidence, but all have received no response or acknowledgement from the council, and instead have received an escalation in threatening debt letters. What is being done to immediately rectify this situation?

Response

The second home council tax premium does not take effect until 1st April 2025 and when this question was raised, no residents had received a bill for 2025/26, so they certainly won't be receiving letters about a debt relating to this. We wrote to all residents recorded as having a second home on 30 January 2025 to ask that they inform us if the information we hold is out of date, with a deadline of 14 February 2025, in order that it could be applied in the new bills for 2025/26. All responses received have been processed so that only residents with second homes will receive bills with the premium applied.

Residents who are receiving bill reminders are more likely to be incurring the empty home premium, whereby properties left empty for more than 12 months incur double council tax. We have unfortunately had staffing capacity challenges that have meant our response times on correspondence are unacceptably low and we are now increasing staffing temporarily so that the backlog is eliminated by early September

2025. However, we do not pursue debt enforcement with residents who have unprocessed correspondence.

6. Cllr Barnes to Cllr Gordon

The council's economic/regen team recently engaged an external accessibility specialist to do a town centre review across four Haringey town centres. Can you confirm how the council will use the final reports and recommendations and what budget it has assigned to carrying out any improvements recommended as part of this consultancy work?

Response

Ensuring everyone can use and enjoy our town centres is an important issue for the Council. Reducing inequalities in the borough is a pillar of our Haringey Deal.

The High Streets Accessibility Study has been funded by the UK Shared Prosperity Fund. It reviewed four town centres, with two studies in Wood Green and Bruce Grove complete and the remaining two to be completed by the end of March 2025. So far, we have had recommendations on how to address accessibility needs across several areas, including public transport, pavements, cycling, parking, road crossings, planting and seating.

Once the review has been completed, our Inclusive Economy team will engage Haringey Council departments with responsibility for the delivery of capital projects on the recommendations from all of the studies. There is not a specific budget aligned to the delivery of these recommendations, but we expect them to help inform delivery decisions and to support business cases for specific accessibility action in future funding bids and to identify potential sources of funding for this work.

Wood Green and Bruce Grove were selected as priority study areas as recommendations should also complement the Shaping Wood Green and Shaping Tottenham programmes.

7. Cllr Cawley-Harrison to Cllr Carlin

Pink Zebra, who leased the council-owned commercial property at 42/44 Park Road in Crouch End stopped operating in August 2023, something the council was not aware of until I raised the issue last year. The council's lease with the business stated that they must be open to trade. Given this, is the council reviewing whether similar situations, where shops need to be brought back into use, may exist at other properties you own?

Response

LBH is the Landlord for multitude of commercial assets across the Borough. The Property Team seek to manage these assets in line with the principles of good property management (i.e. Income and arrears management, lease compliance and repairs) within the constraints of the resources available. Where the Team becomes aware of an Asset not being used as envisaged under the lease, we seek to engage with the occupier and take any appropriate action. It is notable that the commercial portfolio has a low vacancy rate. Less than 1% is being held void, with any other vacancies being subject to the letting cycle.

8. Cllr Mason To ask Cllr Zena Brabazon

The recent Children's Well Being and Schools Bill has highlighted concerns about Safeguarding with statutory guidance requested about sexual violence in our schools.

Could the Lead Cabinet Member inform us whether guidance and training is provided for teachers and support staff in all our schools on best practise in dealing with incidents of peer to peer sexual abuse and sexual violence.

Response

The local authority and Haringey Education Partnership (HEP) run network meetings for Designated Safeguarding Leads throughout the academic year. The agenda covers all safeguarding matters in relation to education settings and there are deep dives into particular aspects. The network focusses on sharing effective practice in the borough and nationally. There has been a recent deep dive into misogyny and a presentation on gender based violence with the sharing of the MOPAC toolkit to support schools in their work . <https://tender.org.uk/our-services/training/toolkit-training/>

9.Cllr M Blake to Cllr Dana Carlin

Haringey Statement of Accounts 2023-24 (28 February 2025) presents the findings of KPMG Auditors. <https://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2025-02/auditor-s-annual-report-2023-to-2024.pdf>

Under the report on the Council's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources, the auditors are required to report any significant weaknesses in the arrangements made by the Council to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources.

They reported on significant weaknesses and made recommendations against each of the following:

1. Cost setting and budgetary processes
2. Identifying and monitoring cost saving schemes
3. Improving economy efficiency and effectiveness in managing commercial property.

4. Improving economy efficiency and effectiveness in procurement;

Will Cllr Carlin confirm that work has begun in implementing recommendations in the above four areas with full progress reports to be made to the Cabinet and all relevant committees quarterly?

Response

Action plans have been created to improve VFM (Value for Money) in the organisation and will be further strengthened following the most recent recommendations presented by KPMG. Progress will be reported regularly to Audit Committee.

10.Cllr Lotte Collett to Cllr Mike Hakata

Energy-from-waste incinerators have been described as the dirtiest form of power generation in the UK. Currently plants in the UK are emitting approximately 12 million tonnes of carbon dioxide a year. Opponents suggest that incineration undermines recycling.

The LGA suggests that the inclusion of energy-from-waste incinerators in the Governments Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) could cost UK local authorities a total of £1.1bn a year. Current projections suggest that fees under the ETS will exceed the cost of landfill and the cost of waste export.

Given Haringey's commitment to the NLWA Edmonton Incinerator, what financial projections have been made for the Governments planned pollution charges under the UK Emission Trading Scheme?

Response

Let's get straight to the point: The Edmonton Energy Recovery Facility doesn't create waste—it processes what already exists. This fundamental distinction often gets lost in heated debates about incineration.

The seven North London boroughs within the NLWA partnership collectively generate approximately 600,000 tonnes of waste annually. This material reality doesn't disappear through wishful thinking or passionate speeches—it requires pragmatic infrastructure. If anyone has a solution beyond landfill or shipping our waste overseas to undisclosed destinations, I'm genuinely eager to hear it and would enthusiastically share such innovations with our board.

The waste challenge sits at a fascinating intersection of individual behaviour and systemic design. I'm a keen advocate for mandatory recycling precisely because individual behaviour change for the greater good remains notoriously difficult to achieve without structural frameworks.

NLWA is a publicly owned organisation, with the board made up of elected officials from the seven boroughs. As it happens, all Labour controlled authorities. This has meant that the demand for the highest environmental and social values has been a foundation of this project.

The Energy Recovery Facility represents world-class infrastructure incorporating the cleanest emissions control technology available in the UK. By integrating with a local heat network, it will achieve carbon efficiency significantly beyond older facilities—delivering tangible benefits to thousands of local residents through low-carbon heating while saving up to 215,000 tonnes of CO₂e annually compared to landfill alternatives.

The Edmonton EcoPark represents more than a single facility—it's a comprehensive ecosystem of solutions. The recently completed Resource Recovery Facility will process approximately 135,000 tonnes of recyclable waste annually. This represents the largest public sector investment in London's recycling infrastructure for decades.

The Climate Change Committee confirmed in its Sixth Carbon Budget that facilities like our ERF represent the optimal disposal route during the UK's transition to Net Zero. This position is further reinforced by independent think tank Policy Connect, whose 2020 report "No Time to Waste" concludes that ERFs with heat offtake represent the most advanced solution for managing non-recyclable waste in our journey toward a Net Zero economy.

The path forward requires addressing waste at its source—particularly fossil-based materials in packaging, textiles, and non-essential plastics. This is where carbon pricing mechanisms would be most effective, creating economic incentives that drive systemic change in production patterns. The NLWA and its members are actively lobbying government on this. Penalising local authorities for undertaking their statutory duty to dispose of residual waste, regardless of type and resident behaviour, only puts an additional squeeze on our already overly-stretched resources. I would urge all elected members who are concerned to bring this up with your MP. We agree with the ETS, but municipal waste should be exempt.

The challenge before us isn't simply technical but philosophical: how do we create infrastructure that manages today's waste reality while actively contributing to tomorrow's waste reduction? The Edmonton facility represents our best answer to this complex question—a solution that balances immediate environmental protection with long-term transformation of our material culture.

In the end, right now, it is up to us, as consumers to think about what we buy and what we throw away and how we throw it away.

Labour Amendment to IS Motion – Full Council, 24 March 2025

Investment of funds held by Haringey Council including with the Local Government Pension Scheme Ethical Pension Investments

Proposed by: ~~Cllr Lotte Collett~~ Leader, Independent Socialist Group Cllr Erdal Dogan, Labour Group

Seconded by: ~~Cllr Mary Mason~~, Independent Socialist Group Cllr Emine Ibrahim, Labour Group

This Council notes:

1. Haringey Council appreciates that while there is a general fiduciary duty which applies to both the Council investments and the pension fund there are legal and practical differences between the Councils' own investments and the status of the pension fund which is owned by and held on behalf of current and prospective recipients. That having been said any review of policy should include not investing in companies which violate standards set by the Council and ensuring the Council is both acting within its moral and ethical duties by using money it holds to the highest standards and using its influence to uphold these principles. At the outset, the Council notes that there is a distinction between funds controlled by the Council, which fall under the Executive, and funds controlled by the Haringey Local Government Pension Scheme, which fall under the responsibility of the Pensions Committee and Board (PCB) in accordance with the Council's Constitution. The PCB is a cross-party body of councillors, employee representatives, employer representatives, trade union representatives and independent advisors. This means that the Council, and Executive, do not play an active role in investments made by the Pension Fund, and are therefore not permitted to move to influence the Pension Fund's activities, as set out in legal and constitutional restrictions.
2. The standard which should be adhered to and subject such being on advice to being lawful is one of not using investments to gain from the sale of military weapons and/or parts including those used for surveillance and/or torture in wars either condemned by the United Nations, ICHR or the ICC. The standards to include the barring of investment in dangerous or harmful substances, environmentally harmful practices and the denial of human rights. The estimated value of the Haringey Pension Fund is £1.93bn.
3. It is correct and financially responsible that the PCB is self-autonomous and separate to the Council. This ensures effective, appropriate governance and depoliticises the financial management of scheme members' pensions.
4. The Chair of the PCB recently wrote to Government to urge that any decisions made in relation to the Local Government Pension Scheme are applied under an ethical

framework. The Chair urged that there should be requirements for the proposed 'megafunds' and pools to work closely with existing Administering Authorities to deliver ethical investment packages.

5. While the Executive must not and does not seek to intervene in the direction or policy of the PCB, it has asked the PCB to consider Environmental, Social and Governance issues as part of the development of their Responsible Investment Policy, which began last year and will conclude later this year, and will continue to monitor the development of this review.
6. A number of Pension Committees from other London Boroughs have previously stated a commitment to divest from companies involved in unethical practices, such as arms manufacturers, however they have been unable to do so in the immediate term because of the substantial and complex legal and financial obstacles involved. We will work with them to better understand these obstacles.
7. Separate to the Pension Fund the Council does have its own investments which are placed in line with the Treasury Management Statement (TMSS) that is approved by Full Council each year following review at Audit Committee. The TMSS includes the list of agreed counterparty (investment) types and investment limits.
8. In 2024/25, investments have been either with Money Market Funds or the Debt Management Office (DMO).
9. As reported to Audit Committee, at the end of December 2024, £20m was invested with two separate Money Market Funds and £44.5m with the Debt Management Office. The DMO is an Executive Agency of HM Treasury.
10. When investing in funds, the Council prioritises those that are to the UN Principles for Responsible Investment, the Net Zero Asset Managers Alliance and/or the UK Stewardship Code.
11. Haringey Council also notes The Economic Activity of Public Bodies (Overseas Matters) Bill 2022-2023, introduced by the previous Conservative Government, has not been carried forward by the current Government and therefore has never been of influence to us or any local council.

~~Haringey Council also notes The Economic Activity of Public Bodies (Overseas Matters) Bill 2022-2023 of which Clauses 1 and 2 would forbid public authorities to make procurement or investment decisions based on their own moral or political disapproval of policies or conduct by foreign authorities and Clause 4 forbidding public authorities to make statements about boycott and divestment campaigns and their decisions in this respect, has not been carried forward by the current Government. Subject always to its fiduciary duties to both the tax payers of Haringey and its pensioners (both current and future) Haringey Council now has the~~

~~freedom to take human rights and other ethical considerations into account when making financial decisions.~~

This Council believes that:

- ~~1. All forms of racism, including anti-Palestinian racism, antisemitism and Islamophobia have no place in Haringey and we condemn any attacks on Palestinian, Jewish, and Muslim people. Haringey is one of the most diverse boroughs in the UK, and home to Muslim, Jewish and Christian peoples, and those of no faith, many of whom have relatives and friends in the Holy Land.~~All forms of racism have no place in Haringey and we condemn any attacks on people based on their background or belief. Haringey is one of the most diverse boroughs in the UK. We know the events around the world cause great pain for many in Haringey. Our communities have arcs that reach across the world and what happens globally reverberates powerfully here. We feel the trauma of these horrors intimately. One life lost is one too many. We will continue to engage with all of our communities in Haringey, especially those who are impacted by international affairs.
- ~~2. Councils must avoid investing the funds they manage, including the Local Government Pension Scheme, in corporations that facilitate breaches of international law. This includes arms and tech companies producing weapons and military and surveillance technology most recently used by Israel in its attacks on Palestinians, and the banking and investment institutions which finance these arms companies. Council Calls on those undertaking the reviews to seek as far as is lawful and in compliance with its fiduciary duties to seek to comply with this call.~~Councils should avoid investing the funds they manage in corporations that facilitate breaches of international law. This includes arms and tech companies and the banking and investment institutions which finance these arms companies.

2. This Council resolves to:

This Council resolves to:

- ~~1. With regards to its own investments and within lawful limits to divest from companies which are in breach of these standards and further recommends the Pension Fund in undertaking its review to also look to take forward these resolutions should they consider after advice that to do so would be lawful and in accordance with their duties to the fund also takes forward these resolutions.~~With regard to the Council's investment portfolio (estimated at £64.5m at the end of Quarter 3), of the £20m in Money Market Funds we will explore ways of divesting from any funds exposed to businesses involved in unethical practices.
- ~~2. Incorporate these standards and review relevant policies, to include divestment and alternative investments.~~With regard to the Pension Fund, the PCB will continue its work to develop its Responsible Investment policy.

3. ~~Call on our representatives on all relevant bodies to divest from any funds administered, including Local Government Pension Funds which are at variance with this motion to include companies on the UN's list of businesses involved in activities in the Occupied Palestinian Territories and deemed complicit in human rights abuses.~~
Work with other London councils committed to divesting from specific unethical investments to develop a better understanding of the legal and financial implications the implications of their decisions.

Labour Amendment to IS Motion – Full Council, 24 March 2025

Ethical Pension Investments

Proposed by: Cllr Erdal Dogan, Labour Group

Seconded by: Cllr Emine Ibrahim, Labour Group

This Council notes:

1. At the outset, the Council notes that there is a distinction between funds controlled by the Council, which fall under the Executive, and funds controlled by the Haringey Local Government Pension Scheme, which fall under the responsibility of the Pensions Committee and Board (PCB) in accordance with the Council's Constitution. The PCB is a cross-party body of councillors, employee representatives, employer representatives, trade union representatives and independent advisors. This means that the Council, and Executive, do not play an active role in investments made by the Pension Fund, and are therefore not permitted to move to influence the Pension Fund's activities, as set out in legal and constitutional restrictions.
2. The estimated value of the Haringey Pension Fund is £1.93bn.
3. It is correct and financially responsible that the PCB is self-autonomous and separate to the Council. This ensures effective, appropriate governance and depoliticises the financial management of scheme members' pensions.
4. The Chair of the PCB recently wrote to Government to urge that any decisions made in relation to the Local Government Pension Scheme are applied under an ethical framework. The Chair urged that there should be requirements for the proposed 'megafunds' and pools to work closely with existing Administering Authorities to deliver ethical investment packages.
5. While the Executive must not and does not seek to intervene in the direction or policy of the PCB, it has asked the PCB to consider Environmental, Social and Governance issues as part of the development of their Responsible Investment Policy, which began last year and will conclude later this year, and will continue to monitor the development of this review.
6. A number of Pension Committees from other London Boroughs have previously stated a commitment to divest from companies involved in unethical practices, such as arms manufacturers, however they have been unable to do so in the immediate term because of the substantial and complex legal and financial obstacles involved. We will work with them to better understand these obstacles.
7. Separate to the Pension Fund the Council does have its own investments which are placed in line with the Treasury Management Statement (TMSS) that is approved by

Full Council each year following review at Audit Committee. The TMSS includes the list of agreed counterparty (investment) types and investment limits.

8. In 2024/25, investments have been either with Money Market Funds or the Debt Management Office (DMO).
9. As reported to Audit Committee, at the end of December 2024, £20m was invested with two separate Money Market Funds and £44.5m with the Debt Management Office. The DMO is an Executive Agency of HM Treasury.
10. When investing in funds, the Council prioritises those that are to the UN Principles for Responsible Investment, the Net Zero Asset Managers Alliance and/or the UK Stewardship Code.
11. Haringey Council also notes The Economic Activity of Public Bodies (Overseas Matters) Bill 2022-2023, introduced by the previous Conservative Government, has not been carried forward by the current Government and therefore has never been of influence to us or any local council.

This Council believes that:

1. All forms of racism have no place in Haringey and we condemn any attacks on people based on their background or belief. Haringey is one of the most diverse boroughs in the UK. We know the events around the world cause great pain for many in Haringey. Our communities have arcs that reach across the world and what happens globally reverberates powerfully here. We feel the trauma of these horrors intimately. One life lost is one too many. We will continue to engage with all of our communities in Haringey, especially those who are impacted by international affairs.
2. Councils should avoid investing the funds they manage in corporations that facilitate breaches of international law. This includes arms and tech companies and the banking and investment institutions which finance these arms companies. This Council resolves to:

This Council resolves to:

1. With regard to the Council's investment portfolio (estimated at £64.5m at the end of Quarter 3), of the £20m in Money Market Funds we will explore ways of divesting from any funds exposed to businesses involved in unethical practices.
2. With regard to the Pension Fund, the PCB will continue its work to develop its Responsible Investment policy.
3. Work with other London councils committed to divesting from specific unethical investments to develop a better understanding of the legal and financial implications the implications of their decisions.

This page is intentionally left blank

Labour Motion - Full Council 24 March 2025

Title: Fair funding for local government

Proposer: Cllr ~~Sarah Williams~~ Dawn Barnes

Seconder: Cllr ~~Matt White~~ Alessandra Rossetti

This Council notes –

~~14 years of austerity~~ Decades of hollowing out of local government capacity and chronic underfunding of public services have devastated local government budgets.

Haringey's core government funding has been cut in real terms by £143m, while our statutory responsibilities in areas such as housing, adult social care, children's services and public health have grown significantly.

Haringey is one of 30 councils, from across the political spectrum, that have applied for Exceptional Financial Support (EFS) for 2025-26, including 6 in London; and one of just 17 councils that have applied for EFS for 2024-25 (1 of 4 in London).

Despite trying national circumstances, the vast majority of councils have not been forced to resort to EFS.

London Councils estimates a collective funding gap of £500m for the financial year 2025/26.

Several other factors have put additional pressure on Haringey's finances:

- Haringey has an ageing population, with a 24% increase in the number of residents over the age of 65 since 2010.
- Haringey has experienced a sharp increase in the cost of and demand for our services. Our 2025/26 budget includes an additional:
 - £31m for adult social care;
 - £12m for temporary accommodation (an increase of 278%);
 - £6.5m for children's social care and SEND.
 - These services alone account for over 60% of our total budget.
- Most boroughs average band D for council tax, but Haringey's average is the lower value band C – which means our revenues are lower. Government funding to local councils does not take full account of this.
- The classification of inner and outer London boroughs has not been updated since the 1960s. This old analysis says that levels of need and cost are higher in inner London. Haringey is classed as an outer London borough, but we actually share the challenges of inner London.

- Haringey has depleted its reserves position over the past few years after failing to reach previous savings targets, meaning it has no usable reserves left available for 2025-26

~~Despite these challenges,~~ Haringey continues to deliver exceptional outcomes across ~~many~~ some of its services:

- 98% of our schools are rated 'Good' or 'Outstanding'.
- Our SEND services attained the highest possible rating from Ofsted and CQC.
- We are delivering an extensive house-building programme; 707 completed and on track to build 3,000 homes by 2031, after decades of failing to build sufficient council homes across the borough in the 54 years Labour has been running the council.
- The Haringey Support Fund has provided hardship funding to more than 4,000 residents.
- We care for 4,000 disabled people and older people and more than 5,000 children.
- More than 5,500 pot-holes have been fixed.
- Almost 2,000 street trees have been planted, many of which have been privately funded or sponsored by the residents and businesses of Haringey.

~~Haringey's March 2025 Budget protects the vast majority of frontline services while delivering significant investment to maintain our excellent local public services, investing—~~Despite harsh cuts across a number of services, some investment has been possible, including:

- £1.5m in eight parks across the Borough.
- £68m in SEND services.
- £35m in our council tax reduction scheme, supporting 23,000 low-income households.
- Th agreement of almost £70m on new council offices, despite an investment of £10m in recent years on our current office stock.

Despite the increased cost for delivering many services and a lack of government funding, which remains ongoing, part of Haringey's funding problem is self-inflicted. Poor decision-making, a lack of auditing and proper record keeping, and a failure to take overspending seriously has snowballed into today's crisis – as noted a number of times, including by the council's auditors who noted "significant weakness in arrangements

relating to the cost setting and budgetary processes to achieve financial sustainability over the short to medium term; in arrangements relating to the identification and monitoring of cost saving schemes; in arrangements relating to commercial property; and in arrangements relating to procurement, with the procurement team having limited visibility on contract management across the Council; and the monitoring of KPIs, with almost none at a higher level on spending decisions below £160k,” while the 2023 Buss Property report noted that the council had “no comprehensive audit trail to determine who authorised, decided or agreed anything.”

This Council believes –

Local councils are living hand to mouth. The number of local councils up and down the country, from across the political spectrum, experiencing financial difficulties is evidence of the deep-rooted issues with the local government funding formula, relying on outdated deprivation data and a flawed allocation formula levels of funding and current funding formula for local councils across the country, with the partial exception of inner London.

A fair funding model for local government will deliver preventative benefits and long-term savings at successive Budgets, ensuring local councils can continue delivering vital frontline services, particularly in areas such as mental health, youth services and anti-social behaviour.

Cuts to local government and public services are a false economy, which is being sustained by the current government. 14 years of crippling underfunding of vital frontline services, such as the Sure Start programme, has only increased need within communities – and with it demand and costs for local government.

Failing to tackle the problems in social care, which the government has so far shown no appetite for, will make reform of local government finances all but impossible. Without proper reform in this area, councils are unlikely to be able to gain a solid financial footing.

That Government has made reforming local authority funding a priority so far failed to grasp the nettle and carry out a proper review at local authority funding. The Local Authority Funding Reform consultation, which Haringey submitted to, as well as statements from Minister Jim McMahon, indicate an intention to support long-neglected local councils. The financial strain on councils such as Haringey means that this reform must -and it must come urgently.

This Council resolves to –

- Continue calling on the Government to urgently reform the local government funding landscape to ensure a fair distribution of resources, which more accurately reflects the needs of our residents and communities in Haringey.

- Follow-up on our recent letter to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, where we pressed for fair funding for local government and highlighted the increasing cost and need within Haringey and specific challenges we face as an outer London borough.
- Work with other outer London boroughs to call on the Government to rebalance the inadequate funding distribution and rectify the changes to the funding formula of particular detriment to our region.
- ~~Be far stricter in the delivery of our~~ savings efficiencies to reduce our budget shortfall, ~~ending the annual cycle of allowing savings targets to be missed and gaps filled with the use of balances, reserves and loans,~~ while minimising the impact on vital frontline services and our most vulnerable and deprived residents, ~~maintaining the strong track record of services we have developed despite acute funding challenges.~~
- ~~Perform a much deeper root and branch review, utilising independent experts and independent boards, on what the council spends on itself; notably the continuing bloated spend of half a million pounds on the leader's office and free refreshments for councillors~~
- ~~Continue to update Engage with~~ residents on the savings efficiencies we are delivering, ~~and invite residents to be involved in ways further efficiencies could be attained within the council without further impacts on council service delivery.~~

Labour Motion - Full Council 24 March 2025

Title: Fair funding for local government

Proposer: Cllr Dawn Barnes

Seconder: Cllr Alessandra Rossetti

This Council notes –

Decades of hollowing out of local government capacity and chronic underfunding of public services have devastated local government budgets.

Haringey's core government funding has been cut in real terms by £143m, while our statutory responsibilities in areas such as housing, adult social care, children's services and public health have grown significantly.

Haringey is one of 30 councils, from across the political spectrum, that have applied for Exceptional Financial Support (EFS) for 2025-26, including 6 in London; and one of just 17 councils that have applied for EFS for 2024-25 (1 of 4 in London).

Despite trying national circumstances, the vast majority of councils have not been forced to resort to EFS.

London Councils estimates a collective funding gap of £500m for the financial year 2025/26.

Several other factors have put additional pressure on Haringey's finances:

- Haringey has an ageing population, with a 24% increase in the number of residents over the age of 65 since 2010.
- Haringey has experienced a sharp increase in the cost of and demand for our services. Our 2025/26 budget includes an additional:
 - £31m for adult social care;
 - £12m for temporary accommodation (an increase of 278%);
 - £6.5m for children's social care and SEND.
 - These services alone account for over 60% of our total budget.
- Most boroughs average band D for council tax, but Haringey's average is the lower value band C – which means our revenues are lower. Government funding to local councils does not take full account of this.
- The classification of inner and outer London boroughs has not been updated since the 1960s. This old analysis says that levels of need and cost are higher in inner London. Haringey is classed as an outer London borough, but we actually share the challenges of inner London.
- Haringey has depleted its reserves position over the past few years after failing to reach previous savings targets, meaning it has no usable reserves left available for 2025-26

Haringey continues to deliver exceptional outcomes across some of its services:

- 98% of our schools are rated 'Good' or 'Outstanding'.
- Our SEND services attained the highest possible rating from Ofsted and CQC.
- We are delivering an extensive house-building programme; 707 completed and on track to build 3,000 homes by 2031, after decades of failing to build sufficient council homes across the borough in the 54 years Labour has been running the council.
- The Haringey Support Fund has provided hardship funding to more than 4,000 residents.
- We care for 4,000 disabled people and older people and more than 5,000 children.
- More than 5,500 pot-holes have been fixed.
- Almost 2,000 street trees have been planted, many of which have been privately funded or sponsored by the residents and businesses of Haringey.

Despite harsh cuts across a number of services, some investment has been possible, including:

- £1.5m in eight parks across the Borough.
- £68m in SEND services.
- £35m in our council tax reduction scheme, supporting 23,000 low-income households.
- The agreement of almost £70m on new council offices, despite an investment of £10m in recent years on our current office stock.

Despite the increased cost for delivering many services and a lack of government funding, which remains ongoing, part of Haringey's funding problem is self-inflicted. Poor decision-making, a lack of auditing and proper record keeping, and a failure to take overspending seriously has snowballed into today's crisis – as noted a number of times, including by the council's auditors who noted "significant weakness in arrangements relating to the cost setting and budgetary processes to achieve financial sustainability over the short to medium term; in arrangements relating to the identification and monitoring of cost saving schemes; in arrangements relating to commercial property; and in arrangements relating to procurement, with the procurement team having limited visibility on contract management across the Council; and the monitoring of KPIs, with almost none at a higher level on spending decisions below £160k," while the 2023 Buss Property report noted that the council had "no comprehensive audit trail to determine who authorised, decided or agreed anything."

This Council believes –

Local councils are living hand to mouth. The number of local councils up and down the country, from across the political spectrum, experiencing financial difficulties is evidence of the deep-rooted issues with the levels of funding and current funding formula for local councils across the country, with the partial exception of inner London.

A fair funding model for local government will deliver preventative benefits and long-term savings at successive Budgets, ensuring local councils can continue delivering vital frontline services, particularly in areas such as mental health, youth services and anti-social behaviour.

Cuts to local government and public services are a false economy, which is being sustained by the current government. 14 years of crippling underfunding of vital frontline services, such as the Sure Start programme, has only increased need within communities – and with it demand and costs for local government.

Failing to tackle the problems in social care, which the government has so far shown no appetite for, will make reform of local government finances all but impossible. Without proper reform in this area, councils are unlikely to be able to gain a solid financial footing.

That Government has so far failed to grasp the nettle and carry out a proper review at local authority funding. The financial strain on councils such as Haringey means that this reform must come urgently.

This Council resolves to –

- Continue calling on the Government to urgently reform the local government funding landscape to ensure a fair distribution of resources, which more accurately reflects the needs of our residents and communities in Haringey.
- Follow-up on our recent letter to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, where we pressed for fair funding for local government and highlighted the increasing cost and need within Haringey and specific challenges we face as an outer London borough.
- Work with other outer London boroughs to call on the Government to rebalance the inadequate funding distribution and rectify the changes to the funding formula of particular detriment to our region.
- Be far stricter in the delivery of our savings efficiencies to reduce our budget shortfall, ending the annual cycle of allowing savings targets to be missed and gaps filled with the use of balances, reserves and loans, while minimising the impact on vital frontline services and our most vulnerable and deprived residents.
- Perform a much deeper root and branch review, utilising independent experts and independent boards, on what the council spends on itself; notably the

continuing bloated spend of half a million pounds on the leader's office and free refreshments for councillors

- Engage with residents on the savings efficiencies we are delivering and invite residents to be involved in ways further efficiencies could be attained within the council without further impacts on council service delivery.

Labour Motion - Full Council 24 March 2025

Amendments to the Labour Motion - Full Council 24 March 2025

Proposer: Cllr Lotte Collett

Seconder: Cllr Mary Mason

To amend the 'Fair Funding for local government' motion as follows:

1. Amend the Title to add

 'to support local people'
2. To add the following paragraphs under 'Several other factors have put additional pressure on Haringey's finances:'
 - Haringey is the 4th highest Borough in London for people living in poverty
 - 2nd highest claiming out of work benefits
 - 3rd highest rate of child poverty in London

Homelessness

- 2,660 homeless families live in temporary accommodation, the 3rd highest in London¹
- 3,407 families are on the Housing Waiting List

Disability

- 28% of Households have at least one person with a serious disability
- 15,318 people receive PIP.
- The proposed changes to the Disability Benefits System will cost an estimated £1.5 for every £1 'saved' (Disability Policy Centre). An estimated financial cost in Haringey of £115m.

3. To add under the paragraph 'This Council resolves to (under paragraph ending 'of particular detriment to our region')

Work with other London Boroughs to press the Government not to make the proposed reductions to Disability Benefits including PIP, recognising the life enhancing changes the benefits have made to disabled people's lives.

Work closely with the voluntary and community sector in Haringey, helping to harness vibrant community responses particularly those led by and for people with disabilities and people living in poverty.

4. To add at end of the motion after 'delivering'

on cuts or savings in services and on the protection of support services for disadvantaged residents.

The whole amended motion to therefore read:

Title: Fair funding for local government to support local people

Proposer: Cllr Collett

Seconder: Cllr Mason

This Council notes –

14 years of austerity and chronic underfunding of public services have devastated local government budgets.

Haringey's core government funding has been cut in real terms by £143m, while our statutory responsibilities in areas such as housing, adult social care, children's services and public health have grown significantly.

Haringey is one of 30 councils, from across the political spectrum, that have applied for Exceptional Financial Support (EFS), including 6 in London.

London Councils estimates a collective funding gap of £500m for the financial year 2025/26.

Several other factors have put additional pressure on Haringey's finances:

- Haringey has an ageing population, with a 24% increase in the number of residents over the age of 65 since 2010.
- Haringey has experienced a sharp increase in the cost of and demand for our services. Our 2025/26 budget includes an additional:
 - £31m for adult social care;
 - £12m for temporary accommodation (an increase of 278%);
 - £6.5m for children's social care and SEND.
 - These services alone account for over 60% of our total budget.
- Most boroughs average band D for council tax, but Haringey's average is the lower value band C – which means our revenues are lower. Government funding to local councils does not take full account of this.
- The classification of inner and outer London boroughs has not been updated since the 1960s. This old analysis says that levels of need and cost are higher

in inner London. Haringey is classed as an outer London borough, but we actually share the challenges of inner London.

- Haringey is the 4th highest Borough in London for people living in poverty
 - 2nd highest claiming out of work benefits
 - 3rd highest rate of child poverty in London

Homelessness

- 2,660 homeless families live in temporary accommodation, the 3rd highest in London¹
- 3,407 families are on the Housing Waiting List

Disability

- 28% of Households have at least one person with a serious disability
- 15,318 people receive PIP.
- The proposed changes to the Disability Benefits System will cost Local Councils an estimated £1.5 for every £1 'saved' (Disability Policy Centre). An estimated financial cost to Haringey is £115m.

Despite these challenges, Haringey continues to deliver exceptional outcomes across many of its services:

- 98% of our schools are rated 'Good' or 'Outstanding'.
- Our SEND services attained the highest possible rating from Ofsted and CQC.
- We are delivering an extensive house-building programme; 707 completed and on track to build 3,000 homes by 2031.
- The Haringey Support Fund has provided hardship funding to more than 4,000 residents.
- We care for 4,000 disabled people and older people and more than 5,000 children.
- More than 5,500 pot-holes have been fixed.
- Almost 2,000 street trees have been planted.

Haringey's March 2025 Budget protects the vast majority of frontline services while delivering significant investment to maintain our excellent local public services, investing -

- £1.5m in eight parks across the Borough.
- £68m in SEND services.

- £35m in our council tax reduction scheme, supporting 23,000 low-income households.

This Council believes –

Local councils are living hand to mouth. The number of local councils up and down the country, from across the political spectrum, experiencing financial difficulties is evidence of the deep-rooted issues with the local government funding formula, relying on outdated deprivation data and a flawed allocation formula.

A fair funding model for local government will deliver preventative benefits and long-term savings at successive Budgets, ensuring local councils can continue delivering vital frontline services, particularly in areas such as mental health, youth services and anti-social behaviour.

Cuts to local government and public services are a false economy. 14 years of crippling underfunding of vital frontline services, such as the Sure Start programme, has only increased need within communities – and with it demand and costs for local government.

That Government has made reforming local authority funding a priority. The Local Authority Funding Reform consultation, which Haringey submitted to, as well as statements from Minister Jim McMahon, indicate an intention to support long-neglected local councils. The financial strain on councils such as Haringey mean that this reform must - and it must come urgently.

This Council resolves to –

Continue calling on the Government to urgently reform the local government funding landscape to ensure a fair distribution of resources, which more accurately reflects the needs of our residents and communities in Haringey.

- Follow-up on our recent letter to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, where we pressed for fair funding for local government and highlighted the increasing cost and need within Haringey and specific challenges we face as an outer London borough.

Work with other outer London boroughs to call on the Government to rebalance the inadequate funding distribution and rectify the changes to the funding formula of particular detriment to our region.

Work closely with the voluntary and community sector in Haringey, helping to harness vibrant community responses particularly those led by and for people with disabilities and people living in poverty.

Work with other London Boroughs to press the Government not to make the proposed reductions to Disability Benefits including PIP, recognising the life enhancing changes the benefits have made to disabled people's lives.

Deliver savings efficiencies to reduce our budget shortfall, while minimising the impact on vital frontline services and our most vulnerable and deprived residents, maintaining the strong track record of services we have developed despite acute funding challenges.

Continue to update residents on the savings efficiencies we are delivering on cuts or savings in services and on the protection of support services for disadvantaged residents.

.

This page is intentionally left blank