

# **MINUTES OF MEETING Cabinet HELD ON Tuesday, 16th January, 2024, 6.30pm – 7.32pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Peray Ahmet (Chair), Mike Hakata, Emily Arkell, Zena Brabazon, Dana Carlin, Seema Chandwani, Ruth Gordon, Adam Jogee and Sarah Williams**

**ALSO ATTENDING: Cllr da Costa online**

### **55. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair referred to the filming at meetings notice and attendees noted this information.

### **56. APOLOGIES**

There were apologies for absence from Cllr das Neves and apologies for lateness from Cllr Gordon.

### **57. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **58. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Arkell declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 9 and would recuse herself from the meeting for this item.

Cllr Hakata and Cllr Chandwani declared personal interests in item 9, and stated for the record that they did not own or have access to a motor vehicle and therefore were not eligible for application to receive permits through the estate management scheme.

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

None received

### **60. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 5<sup>th</sup> of December 2023 as a correct record of the meeting.

**61. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

There were no deputations received.

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

No items received.

**63. AMENDMENTS TO THE ESTATE PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME**

(Cllr Arkell left the room for this item)

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning introduced the report which sought approval to amendments to the Estate Parking Management Scheme (EPMS), as approved at Cabinet on 8 December 2020 following the insourcing of the former Homes for Haringey into Haringey Council. This report also sought approval for funding of the scheme as set out in section 11 of the attached report.

(Cllr Gordon entered the meeting at 6.39pm)

The following information was outlined by the Cabinet Member:

- The proposed scheme would make estate parking fairer by guaranteeing every household have access to one parking permit, providing dedicated disabled parking bays to those who need them, ensuring the swift removal of abandoned cars, and preventing trespassing.
- The new scheme would be introduced using traffic management orders and enforced by our Parking Services' civil enforcement officers.
- An insourced service would monitor estate parking more frequently and more effectively.
- A limit of one permit per household was proposed to reduce parking pressure on estates and discourage excessive car use in line with Council climate and air quality commitments.
- To allow social care staff, NHS health professionals, charity, or not-for-profit employees to provide care to residents, the existing Care at Home parking permit would allow parking both on streets and on estates. The parking process would be more straightforward by bringing estate parking in line with parking across the borough, meaning there would no longer be a need for two separate permits.

- Permits would be available for less than 14 pence a day. The permit charge was in place solely to cover to cost of the scheme.
- There was a commitment to review the parking schemes annually.

In response to questions from Cllr Hakata and Cllr da Costa, the following information was provided.

- With regards to meeting residents needs for bike parking and making provision for future increased need, this would be picked up in the engagement process. There would need to be consideration that each housing estate would have differing needs, and this will be explored more fully in the planned engagement.
- Furthermore, in line with the delegation provided to the Cabinet Member to manage consultation and engagement with estate residents, she would ensure that provision of cycling parking was considered as part of the consultation.
- If there were circumstances where residents wanted an extra permit, they could purchase CPZ permits to park. This would be through the same Council system used for CPZ permits and visitor permits.
- Haringey housing fleet vehicles would not need a permit to park on the estates, but private contractors would need a visitor permit.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note that, before a final decision to implement the proposals may be taken, any representations submitted to the Council following consultation under s105 Housing Act 1985 must be considered; and delegates authority to the Director of Placemaking and Housing, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning, to consider any representations which have been submitted as a result of S105 consultation and then to take the decision as to whether to implement the EPMS scheme.
2. To note that Parking Services will assume the responsibility for the operational management and maintenance of the scheme under the provisions of the TMOs, as approved in the 2020 Report, included as Appendix 6 to this report.
3. To approve the proposed EPMS permit offer, as shown in Appendix 1, including new charges for estate resident parking permits, and the required capital expenditure, to be put forward in the 2024 to 2029 HRA Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) budget report for Cabinet in February 2024.
4. To approve the implementation costs as outlined in Appendix 2.
5. To note that Parking Services, in partnership with the Housing Engagement Team commissioned by Housing Services, manages consultation and

- engagement with estate residents (which is consistent with Cabinet's decision to approve the 2020 Report, included as Appendix 6).
6. To approve, for all affected housing estates, the amended resident engagement resource model and process, outlined in Appendix 3, which delivers a resident-led scheme focused on each estate, and which will be utilised to enable the Council to comply with its duty to consult under S105 of the Housing Act 1985.
  7. To delegates approval of consultation materials to the Director of Placemaking and Housing.
  8. To recommend that statutory consultation, for estate parking TMOs, as outlined in Appendix 3, takes place following the engagement process and that recommendations following statutory consultation are then taken to Cabinet for approval.
  9. To agree development of a new estate parking policy, aligned to the Council's CPZ policy, subject to consultation and engagement to be submitted for Cabinet approval later in 2024.
  10. To agree that the Estate Controlled Parking Scheme adopts the same Disabled Parking Place Policy as used by the CPZ Parking Scheme.
  11. In the event that Wing Security Ltd remains operational at the relevant time, to note and approve that the Council shall undertake the prescribed process under the Transfer of Undertaking (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE) for the insourcing of parking enforcement staff.

### **Reasons for decision**

The current Estate Controlled Parking Scheme (ECPS) is enforced under contract law, with terms and conditions for parking displayed on signs on estates included in the scheme.

The ECPS has become ineffective following the introduction of the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 and changes to government guidance with vehicle keeper information no longer being provided by the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) to private contractors on private land owned by local authorities in London. This means there is no mechanism to contact vehicle owners following issue of penalty charge notices (PCNs) for contravention of parking rules on the estates, with the result that we are unable to effectively collect from PCNs issued. This has also had an impact on the ability to remove abandoned vehicles under tenancy and leaseholder agreements.

These limitations on enforcement have resulted in a scheme which is financially unviable for private contractors that rely on revenue from PCNs. Subsequently, there are parking problems on Haringey estates which cannot be addressed under the current arrangements.

This led to the Council's enforcement agent for estate parking, Wing Parking Ltd., ceasing operation in December 2022. An extension to the enforcement contract has been arranged with the parent company, Wing Security Ltd. to the end of May 2024. Officers are currently reviewing and discussing the possibility for an extension to the start of the new EPMS, pending agreement from the contractor and all parties concerned. Wing Security Ltd currently employs three enforcement staff; any enforcement staff would need to be given the option to transfer to Haringey Council's Parking Enforcement Team via the TUPE process if Wing Security Ltd is in operational up to the time enforcement operation is assumed by the Haringey Council Parking Enforcement Team.

A traffic management order (TMO) based scheme is the preferred solution because it is the only option which meets the aims of the estate parking review to deliver a financially viable scheme with the powers to effectively control parking and meets residents' needs as well as assisting in tackling the climate change emergency. In addition, a TMO scheme is the Department for Transport's recommended solution and is operated successfully by neighbouring boroughs including Enfield and Islington.

Bringing the delivery of estate parking enforcement in-house to Haringey Council's own Parking Service meets the objectives of the estate parking review established by Cabinet in the 2020 Report and will not be subject to the limitations which affect the private enforcement of the current EPMS. This will allow Haringey Council to share resources and expertise in a sustainable way to generate efficiencies and savings. In addition, estate parking management will benefit from the improvements delivered by the Parking Transformation Programme including new IT systems, online offers and resource management.

Income generated by permits issued on housing land, and the costs of setting up and managing the scheme must be accounted for within the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) charges. Income generated from enforcement activities and the costs of enforcement are accounted for within the Parking and Highways Budget within the General Fund.

The financial assessment presented in Appendix 2 indicates that income generated by permit sales will be accounted for in the HRA and PCN income will be accounted for in the Parking and Highways Budget, within the General Fund.

Following Cabinet approval of the [EPMS in the 2020 Report](#), presented as Appendix 5, a number of wider changes have taken place which necessitate a review of what the EPMS will deliver, and how the EPMS scheme designs will be determined.

Housing provision previously delivered through Homes for Haringey has now been brought back into the Council. Delivering housing provision through the Council provides an opportunity to better align housing and related services with delivery through one organisation. This includes how parking services and estate parking schemes are designed and delivered.

As part of this transition, the Haringey Deal launched in November 2022

provides an opportunity to reshape how residents are involved in the specifics of EPMS scheme design on their estate. Engagement with residents feeding back to a scheme design will result in a more effective and sustainable service – ensuring schemes better meet the needs and priorities of estate residents.

As the proposal includes changes to parking which affect practice or policy regarding housing management and the provision of services or amenities to Council tenants, consultation will seek the views of all affected estate residents including secure tenants, non-secure tenants and leaseholders in compliance with S105 of the Housing Act 1985.

A further wider change is the implementation in 2021 of the new Taranto parking management IT system, upgraded in November 2023. To ensure there is consistency firstly in permit offer, and secondly in the customer journey to apply for and manage permits, there are some amendments required to specific aspects of the original EPMS permit proposal.

In addition, existing measures will be retained to protect vulnerable groups such as the disabled and elderly to ensure that they have access to a free estate parking permit and to align the scheme with the Disabled Parking Place Policy as used by the CPZ Parking Scheme. The proposal includes measures to tackle the climate emergency by financially incentivising households to consider the number of vehicles they own.

#### **Alternative options considered**

Alternative options to the proposed new EPMS have been considered. These follow from changes in circumstance since the 2020 Report, including the insourcing of the Council's housing stock from Homes for Haringey into Haringey Council.

- **Do Nothing:** this option was discarded as effective parking management is needed to control parking arrangement on estates, particularly where there is high demand for parking space, low availability of parking spaces and/or issues with non-residents taking up parking space, such as displacement from nearby CPZs or demand from events.

- **Keep existing estate parking arrangements:** this option was discarded as the existing arrangements are difficult to enforce, ineffective, and do not meet the needs of residents or the political and financial objectives of Haringey Council.

- **Provide traffic management orders for existing scheme arrangements:** This option would have transferred the current arrangements as is to the Haringey Council Parking Enforcement Team. This was discarded as permits would remain free of charge with no mechanism to recoup the cost of implementation including required consultation and provision of new signage. The current permits also do not align with the existing on-street CPZ offer resulting in different customer journeys for residents of estates and other Haringey residents.

- **Introduce the scheme as originally set out in the 2020 Cabinet Report:** this was discarded as changes to Council policy, such as the Haringey Deal, needed to be included in the approach to resident engagement for the new scheme (see below for the options considered for resident engagement). Costs of these measures and to introduce the scheme also needed to be reviewed.

5.2 Alternative options for resident engagement have been considered:

- **Continue with the previously approved engagement approach:** the previous approach incorporated a pre-defined structure and content, with limited scope for residents to shape the process. In revising the proposed approach for resident engagement, it is recognised that housing insourcing brings it within scope of the Council's Haringey Deal approach – meaning a co-design approach should be taken to fully engage residents throughout the process.

A range of options have been considered regarding the most appropriate and effective permit proposal for estate parking. These include the following specific considerations:

- **Continue previously approved permit proposal:** the option to continue the previous permit proposal as approved in 2020 has been impacted by 2 key changes since approval. Firstly, the insourcing of Homes for Haringey in 2022 and, secondly, the introduction of a new parking management IT system in 2021. Each of these factors affects the validity of the previously approved proposal. Firstly, having a different permit offer (in terms of permits offered and associated application customer journeys) is not reflective of a cohesive, unified organisation. Secondly, some specifics of the original permit proposal would not have been deliverable within the new parking management IT system without system development. For these reasons and others noted above, the original proposal is not being pursued.

- **Closest alignment to CPZ permits:** In aligning the permit proposal to CPZ provision, a balanced approach has been taken, accounting for estate parking and residents. An alternative approach would be to fully mirror the CPZ permit offer and pricing structure (albeit with reduced charges overall): this would include, for example, applying charges to resident permits to include a base charge plus surcharges (for second and subsequent vehicles and diesel surcharges).

- **Higher limit for (or unlimited) estate resident permits:** the proposal of the limit of one estate resident permit per household recognises the parking pressures on estates and allows each household a fairer chance of being able to park on their estate, while also contributing toward carbon reduction by encouraging use of alternate modes of transport and/or lower emitting vehicles. An alternative would be to have a higher limit – or no limit at all – on estate resident permits per household, thereby introducing potentially higher pressure on estate parking with reduced fairness.

- **Variations of assumed permit demand:** it is not possible to definitively

know the behavioural impact of the introduction of a charged permit scheme – i.e., how many of the current free permits will translate into future charged permits. In permit income modelling underlying the financial model (Appendix 2), a conservative approach has been taken – assuming a 30% reduction in the number of permits issued (applied to all permit types where there is a known current volume). It may be the case that greater demand is realised following implementation – with this increased revenue improving HRA income.

• **Adopt CPZ costs for Estate Resident Parking Permits with no discount:** the proposed limit of one permit per household and limitations on the availability of parking space on the estates mean that residents may also need to buy CPZ permits to park. The proposal to offer Estate Resident Parking Permits at a discounted rate mitigates the cost impact of this to residents.

#### 64. HOUSING ANNUAL REPORT 2022-23

(Cllr Arkell returned to the room at 6.46pm)

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning, introduced the Housing Annual report 2022- 23 which the Council were obliged to produce by the Housing Regulator.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the Annual Report for 2022-23 provided a retrospective view of performance since the Council brought housing services back in house, and progress against commitments to improve it. It described progress in respect of compliance with fire and electrical safety standards; the support the Council had provided to tenants through the cost-of-living crisis; and involvement of residents in the key decisions along with the improvement journey.

The Cabinet Member expressed that there were still significant challenges, and it was important that the Council were open and transparent about these. There was more to do to tackle the repairs backlog; damp and mould issues and boost tenant satisfaction and the Council were determined to improve in these areas in the coming year.

In response to questions from Cllr da Costa, the following was noted.

- The Cabinet Member was aware of the incoming new statutory requirements for emergency repairs in 24 hours, 7 days for other repairs and damp and mould inspections in 14 days and the Council would respond to the government requirements. The Assistant Director for Operational Housing and Buildings added that the Council were already working to these timescales and already working to complete emergency repairs within 24 hours . Also within the Housing Improvement Plan there was a particular action to launch a new category to do repairs in five days rather than the seven days as stipulated by the government. With regards to damp and mould, the Cabinet had already agreed a policy which required inspection of reports of damp and mould in properties within 14 days.



- On addressing tenant dissatisfaction with the repairs service, this was a retrospective report and there were measures to improve tenant satisfaction. There was confidence that this would improve as the new tenant boards and engagement activities continued.
- Page 11 of the annual report indicated that resident involvement over the last year had generated over £2million in social value and the Assistant Director for Operational Housing would provide Cllr da Costa with a written response on how this had been calculated.
- The service had implemented a number of changes to improve the culture, with new management within the service, increasing visibility of housing officers, introducing new performance matrix and having a new governance in place as well.

### **RESOLVED**

To note and approve the Housing Annual Report 2022-23 attached as Appendix 1 so that it can be made available to tenants and leaseholders on the Council's website.

### **Reasons for decision**

It is essential that the Council is transparent about the landlord services it provides to tenants and leaseholders; explains the work it is doing to improve its services; and how it is spending the money it receives from tenants' rents.

### **Alternative options considered**

As a social landlord, we are obliged to produce an Annual Report by the Housing Regulator so an alternative option was not considered

## **65. DETERMINATION OF THE COUNCIL TAX PREMIUM PAYABLE IN RESPECT OF PROPERTIES OCCUPIED PERIODICALLY**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Local Investment introduced the report which set out a proposed increase in Council Tax charge for dwellings which are substantially furnished and have no resident (which are colloquially known as "second homes"). It was proposed that a 100% premium should apply in such circumstances.

In response to questions from Cllr Hakata and Cllr da Costa, the following information was provided:

- In relation to the threshold for assessing if a second home, this did not have to be a year and could be a lower period where there were reasons to understand that the properties were being let or the properties were left open for periods of time without anybody living in them. This proposal only came into effect in the next year and would provide some time to acquire the required market information in the course of this year.
- For properties that were between lets and whether these would be liable for the 100% extra just for the period they were vacant, this policy would not affect a property where there was nobody living there. Also, if it was not furnished it would be dealt with in the empty dwellings policy also on the agenda.

- The Director for Finance clarified that the Council were expecting £900k income and that additional income was not hypothecated.

## **RESOLVED**

To recommends to Full Council that it determines that –

1. For any dwelling within the area of the Council if, on any day, there is no resident of that dwelling and it is substantially furnished, the following shall apply:
  - i. the discount in s11(2)(a) of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992 (LGFA) shall not apply to that dwelling; and
  - ii. the amount of council tax payable in respect of that dwelling and that day shall be increased by 100 percent.

### **Reasons for decision**

Council Tax legislation changed allowing councils to charge a premium of up to 100% on dwellings where there is no resident, and it is substantially furnished.

Applying the 100% premium has the potential to bring additional income which would help lessen the councils funding pressures in 2025.

An increased premium may encourage those using properties in the borough as second homes to relinquish them thus becoming available to those who live in the borough on a permanent basis.

Due consideration has been given to circumstances where the reason a dwelling is empty and furnished is because it is between lets. However, the new legislation does not provide for any interim period (e.g., a two-week grace period) before the premium is applied and instead, it applies with immediate effect. Charging the premium in this type of scenario would likely incentivise the properties to be brought back into use as soon as practicable.

The Council will continue to have the means to reduce or remove Council Tax liability under section 13A (1)(c) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (e.g., cases where there is exceptional hardship).

### **Alternative options considered**

#### **Not applying the premium or applying it a lesser percentage**

The Council could choose not to apply the premium, or to apply the premium at an amount less than 100%.

This is not proposed because the Council is under significant financial pressure to deliver a sustainable Medium Term Financial Strategy. Applying

the Council Tax premium at 100% would likely generate additional income for the Council.

In addition, increasing the premium to the maximum 100% may encourage residents to bring such properties (whether used as a second home or otherwise) back into permanent residential use which could in turn lead to an increase in available housing.

**66. DETERMINATION OF THE LENGTH OF TIME ALLOWED BEFORE A COUNCIL TAX PREMIUM IS PAYABLE IN RESPECT OF EMPTY PROPERTIES**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Local Investment introduced the report which set out the proposed reduction in time that a property can remain empty before the premium on Council Tax is charged on long-term empty dwellings.

The additional 100% council tax charge on properties that have been empty for more than one year was designed to encourage owners to act with urgency and ensure that empty buildings are brought into use in a timely manner.

In response to questions from Cllr Arkell and Cllr Hakata, the following was noted:

- This was one of the policies and powers that the Council was using to bring empty homes back into use. Where properties were empty for a considerable period of time, there was legal intervention undertaken to take possession of those properties. This was more of a complicated process but still taken forward, in line with the Council commitment to bring as much housing into use for families as possible.
- It was estimated that in London there were about 34,000 long term empty dwellings, and in Haringey probably more than 1000. The proposed new policy reduced the timescale from two years empty dwelling to one-year empty dwelling and would enable more properties to fall into this category, meaning more ability to take action.
- The Council Tax team were developing a mechanism so that residents can report empty properties through the website and officers would work with communications team on publicity to make sure people are aware of that.

**RESOLVED**

To recommend to Full Council that –

1. With effect from 1 April 2024, that a determination be made that a premium shall be applied to long term empty dwellings as defined in s11B(8) of Local Government Finance Act (LGFA) 1992 (as amended from time to time), and that the amount of council tax payable in respect of that dwelling and that day shall be increased by 100 percent.
2. That a determination be made that, if on any day a dwelling is a long-term empty dwelling, the discount in s11(2)(a) of LGFA shall not apply to that dwelling.
3. Notes that until 1 April 2024, the decision made by Full Council in January

2019 in relation to the premium payable in respect of long-term empty dwellings, shall continue in full force and effect.

4. Notes that the premium shall not apply to dwellings that are exempt under Regulations 9 and 10 of the Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings) (England) Regulations 2003.

### **Reasons for decision**

In January 2019 full council agreed to increase the premium charged on longterm empty dwellings from 50% to 100% from 1 April 2019.

At that point, a dwelling was defined as a “long-term empty dwelling” if for a continuous period of at least 2 years ending with that day it had been unoccupied, and substantially unfurnished.

With effect from 1 April 2024, the definition of long-term empty dwelling in s.11B(8) LGFA has been amended by section 79 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 to substitute “1 year” for the previous “2 years”.

As the definition in the legislation has changed, the Council is making a new determination to clarify that the new time period applies.

### **Alternative options considered**

The Council has considered not making a new determination but considers that, for the avoidance of doubt, the Council should make it clear that, from 1 April 2024, the premium shall apply to dwellings that are empty for at least 1 year in line with the changed legislation.

The Council could choose to remove or reduce the existing premium.

This is not proposed because the Council is under significant financial pressure to deliver a sustainable Medium Term Financial Strategy. Removing or reducing the Council Tax premium would reduce the Council’s income.

In addition, removing or reducing the premium may reduce the incentive for residents to bring long-term empty properties back into use.

## **67. REPORT ON THE OUTCOME OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE ESSENTIAL SERVICE PERMIT SCHEME**

The Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Resident Services & Tackling Inequality introduced the report which sought approval to implement changes to the Essential Service Permit scheme following the outcome of statutory consultation.

The Cabinet Member explained that the report and proposed decision acknowledges that there were services that operate in the borough that require vehicle access such social workers who do home visits or community-based services such as religious leaders who visit residents to give last rights.

The Council had conducted a review on the ESP's both in line with transport policies, but also to tighten up a very manual process.

The Cabinet Member highlighted the positive changes including new charges, for diesel surcharge to bring this permit in line with all other parking charges. Also, introducing Essential Service Permits to foster carers for the first time, following extensive co production work with children's social services.

The Council were also introducing team permits with staff, so that staff did not have an individual annual permit for a specific car but received visitors permits instead.

In response to a question from Cllr da Costa regarding which services retain vehicle specific permits and the provision that will be made for this in the revised operational policy, it was noted that the aim was not to have a rigid policy that becomes unworkable in the future, and, at the moment, there was not a specific team in question. However, this could apply to teams that need that vehicle access every day such as civil enforcement officers.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To consider all feedback including objections to the proposed order, given during the 2023 consultation, as set out in Appendix 4 of this report.
2. that the Council shall exercise its discretion to not cause a public inquiry to be called.
3. That an allocation of 20 parking permits be issued to schools annually at a flat fee of £200 each, with an additional 10 available subject to a surcharge of £100 each.
4. That Essential Service Permits issued to Council staff being transferable ('Team') permits, with provision retained for vehicle specific permits on a needs basis.
5. That access for regulated foster carers with children up to the age of 15 years to the subsidised ESP scheme.
6. To agree the change to charges as proposed in Appendix 1.
7. To agree the delegation of authority to the Head of Highways and Parking to take all consequent steps necessary to implement the proposed measures in recommendations 3 to 6 above.

## **Reasons for decision.**

This scheme allows those delivering essential services to residents to park in controlled parking zones (CPZs). Schools can also access the scheme which is required to support recruitment and retention as well as the efficient operation of the school. The scheme is reviewed periodically to ensure that it remains aligned with the Councils wider transport policies.

This review sought to address residents' concerns about the impact of ESP holders parking on busy roads, without compromising the benefit of the scheme to users. The recommendations in paragraph 3.1 of this report also address the concerns raised by users in particular schools (who need more flexibility to support their wider recruitment and retention challenges) and registered foster carers (who have expressed a need

for free or subsidised parking to support them when taking children to appointments). Allowing foster carers to obtain permits under the ESP scheme at the subsidised charge is considered reasonable considering the many appointments carers are required to attend when fostering.

**Alternative options considered.**

Retaining current arrangements was considered. This would fail to address the dissatisfaction with the scheme. It would also prevent foster carers accessing the scheme.

Consideration was given to excluding schools from the ESP scheme. Those permits are mainly used by teaching staff to commute to work.

There are growing concerns about transport-related pollution and its impact on air quality near schools. The Council has implemented 23 School Streets to address the growing concerns about transport-related air pollution around schools and the impact on children's health. ESPs for schools inevitably contribute to traffic and congestion and the associated impact on air quality.

While some schools have car parks, others do not and distance from public transport hubs can make it difficult to carry materials or equipment. Those schools therefore feel that parking permits are an important aid to recruitment and retention. The Council aims to support the efficient running of those schools.

Consideration was given to implementing a 2-hour time limit for each ESP parking session. This was considered to minimise the impact of ESP parking on busy roads preventing extended or all-day parking. This would not meet the needs of all users, especially those involved in safeguarding.

**68. CONTRACT AWARD FOR THE NEW CAPACITY BUILDING PARTNER FOR THE VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR**

The Cabinet Member for Culture, Communities & Leisure introduced the report which detailed the outcome of an open tender process and sought approval to award the contract to the successful tenderer for the Provision of Capacity Building Partner for the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) in Haringey in accordance with Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1 (d).

The Cabinet Member highlighted the following:

- The voluntary and charitable sector in Haringey played a vital role across the borough, supporting residents and providing services to different communities and the Council were committed to supporting the sector and to support a provider to provide advice and support.
- The Council had redesigned the service specification to better meet the needs of the sector, and this had been informed through engagement with that sector.

- The contract focused more strongly on capacity building and set out clear and transparent accountability to both the Council and the wider sector, ensuring equitable access to support and external funding opportunities.
- The Council had carried out a robust and thorough open tender process toward a new contract to a provider who submitted a strong bid outlining their experience, expertise and commitment to providing services required and the outcomes specified in the tender documents.
- Delivery against the contract will be regularly monitored, monitored on a quarterly basis to ensure key performance indicators were met and service outcomes were delivered.
- Agreement was being sought to award this contract for three years starting on the 1st of April 2024.

In response to questions from Cllr da Costa, the following information was provided.

- The Council were looking for a provider in a niche market as there were few organisations that are able to meet the contract specification. However, out of the organisations that did tender for this bid, they had set out some really strong outcomes that the Council want to deliver and to support the voluntary sector across Haringey in the future.
- Regarding making contract monitoring performance publicly available, the Council would be working with the provider to develop a clear suite of public reporting indicators. The Council wanted the successful winning bidder partner to work with the voluntary sector to agree what the sector feels are the important outcomes that really mattered to them and then to agree what the mechanism of reporting and transparency would be. Therefore, the intention was to develop the performance indicators with the sector and with the partner once appointed.

Further to considering exempt information at item 19,

## **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the award of a contract to the successful tenderer, for the Provision of Capacity Building Partner for the Voluntary and Community Sector, in accordance with Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1(d). The successful bidder is identified under Appendix 1 - Part B (exempt information) of this report).
2. To approve the contract award for a period of three (3) years, commencing 1<sup>st</sup> April 2024 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2027, with option to extend for further periods of up to plus 2 years.

3. To note that there is the potential for additional investment from North Central London Integrated Care Board (NCL ICB). Any additional activities to be delivered as a result of this funding will be agreed with the provider by way of variation to the contract.
4. To note that the Director of Culture, Strategy and Engagement will approve any variation of contract resulting from any additional NCL ICB funding as stated above.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Council is committed as part of the Haringey Deal to working more closely with residents, understanding the specific needs of different communities in more depth and granularity, and getting better at listening to voices that are often overlooked. The voluntary and community sector is a key partner in realising this ambition and as a Council we need to support the development and growth of the sector so that it effectively represents and supports all of our diverse communities.

Further support for and development of partnership working with the voluntary and community sector in the borough is therefore a key strategic priority for the Council and is incorporated throughout the Corporate Delivery Plan 2022 - 2024.

The current VCS strategic partner contract was originally let some years ago and does not reflect current Council priorities and ways of working under the Haringey Deal. The specification has therefore been re-designed. The redesign of the new service was informed through engagement with the VCS, focused more strongly on capacity building and with clear and transparent accountability to both the Council and the wider sector, ensuring equitable access to support and external funding opportunities. The service specification reflects that the new service should be innovative, responsive, flexible, and more strategically aligned as a VCS Capacity Building Partner service in Haringey.

The decision to award a contract to the successful tenderer is based on the conclusion of a competitive procurement process and is made according to the outcome of the Most Economically Advantageous Tender.

### **Alternative options considered.**

**Do Nothing** - The Council could elect not to commission this service. However, it has been concluded given the Council's strategic objective to develop support for the voluntary and community sector, to no longer commission the service would have an adverse impact on delivery of strategic outcomes as well as on those organisations in the sector and therefore on the many small organisations who they support. The option to do nothing was considered and rejected.

**In-house** – This provision was considered and found not to be suitable for full delivery of this service. There is a need for an independent partner to provide representation to the sector, which already works collaboratively with the Council's dedicated Voluntary & Community Sector Team. The need for a



partner from within the VCS was expressed clearly in the engagement with the sector that informed this decision.

**Extend existing contracts** – Extension periods available within the existing contract have been exhausted and in addition the specification set out in the existing contract does not now match the Council's and sector's priorities.

## **69. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

### **RESOLVED**

To note the following minutes:

Cabinet Member Signing  
30 November 2023 10am  
30<sup>th</sup> November 2023 1.30pm  
4 December 2023  
5 December 2023  
7 December 2023 2pm  
7 December 2023 3.30pm  
12 December 1.30pm

## **70. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

To note the significant and delegated actions taken forward by Directors.

## **71. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None

## **72. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

### **RESOLVED**

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as items 16 to 17 contain exempt information as defined under paragraphs 3 and 5, Part 1, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings

## **73. EXEMPT CONTRACT AWARD FOR THE NEW CAPACITY BUILDING PARTNER FOR THE VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR**

The exempt information was considered and recommendations approved as set out above.

**74. EXEMPT - MINUTES**

**RESOLVED**

To approve the exempt minutes of the meeting held on the 5<sup>th</sup> of December 2023.

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

None

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....