

MINUTES OF THE MEETING Cabinet HELD ON Tuesday, 15th July, 2025, 6.30 - 7.53 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Ajda Ovat, Peray Ahmet (Chair), Mike Hakata, Emily Arkell, Zena Brabazon, Dana Carlin, Seema Chandwani, Lucia das Neves, Ruth Gordon and Sarah Williams

ALSO ATTENDING:

Councillors: Cawley-Harrison

230. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The filming at meetings notice was discussed.

RESOLVED:

The filming at meetings notice was noted.

231. APOLOGIES

There were none.

232. URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

233. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr das Neves – Trustee of the Selby Trust. As a result, Cllr Das Neves will withdraw from the meeting for the item: Approval to Tender for the Construction of Selby Urban Village

Cllrs Hakata and Carlin were noted as Board Members of the North London Joint Waste Authority. On the 26 September 2024, the Standards Committee agreed to grant a dispensation to Councillor Hakata and Councillor Carlin to allow them to participate in debates and votes on matters relating to NLJWA business: waste disposal, energy from waste, waste facilities, waste transfer stations, reuse and recycling and any other waste related issues until Councillor Hakata and Councillor Carlin cease to be a member of NLJWA; and until May 2026.

RESOLVED:

That, resultant of the agreement of Standards Committee on 26 September 2024 to grant a dispensation to Councillor Hakata and Councillor Carlin to allow them to participate in debates and votes on matters relating to NLJWA business, that It was agreed that Councillor Hakata and Councillor Carlin would participate in the item on the NLJWA Strategy 2025-2040.

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

There was none.

235. MINUTES

That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2025 were discussed.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2025 were agreed as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

236. AMENDMENTS TO AGREED MINUTES

The proposed amendments to previously agreed minutes on 22 April 2025 were discussed.

RESOLVED:

The amendments to previously agreed minutes on 22 April 2025 were agreed

237. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

There were none.

238. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny introduced the report.

It was noted that there was a common theme within the recommendations, which focussed on how local government, communities and law enforcement could collaborate more effectively to tackle community safety issues.

The Cabinet Member for Communities provided a response. It was explained that the housing and community safety team were working to develop better ways of working with other teams in the Council and with partner organisations. It was also noted that the online anti-social behaviour reporting systems would be improved and rationalised to ensure ease of access for residents.

It was explained, following questions, that the Council would work with young people to include them in helping to improve community safety.

RESOLVED:

1. The responses to the Climate, Community Safety and Environment Scrutiny Panel– One off Scrutiny Review of Community Safety made by the Cabinet, were agreed.

239. 2024/25 PROVISIONAL FINANCIAL OUTTURN

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services introduced the report.

It was explained that, over the last financial year, Haringey had prioritised supporting its most vulnerable residents and strived to provide excellent services that residents relied on and enjoyed.

However, it was stressed that, despite considerable extra funding being allocated to the 2024/2025 budget, the outturn report showed that demand and the cost of delivering essential services again outstripped funding, primarily in adults' and children's social care and the cost of providing temporary accommodation. It was explained that adult social care supported almost 4,000 vulnerable adults, children's social care supported over 5,000 children, and there were 2,630 households in temporary accommodation.

It was noted by the Cabinet Member that these overspends were predicted throughout the year. The Council had initially agreed with the government on £28 million of potential exceptional financial support, but judicious use of various contingency funds and reserves reduced this to a £10 million borrowing requirement to close the budget.

The Council did everything possible to mitigate these additional costs and to ensure that every pound counted. It did this to keep cuts to frontline public services in Haringey to an absolute minimum. Haringey was a borough with high levels of deprivation and deep inequalities between east and west. The Council remained ambitious about what it could do to help local people, even with very serious limits on local public spending. It worked tirelessly to make the borough fairer and greener with the tools and funds available.

In response to comments and questions from Councillors Hakata and Cawley-Harrison, the following information was shared:

- It was explained that the Council was, when developing financial plans, working to take a whole Council approach to delivery of services.
- It was explained that the Council was borrowing to meet financial challenges for year 2024/25, and that repayment would be undertaken over a 20-year period.
- Officers noted that there were additional unknown pressures that were difficult to forecast for, particularly relating to changes in demand. It was explained that the Council had undertaken work to undertake monitoring on pressures to

understand the underlying causes, which would help the Council to ensure that it would be better prepared to forecast better in future.

- It was explained that contingency funding for 2025/26 had been increased, to meet with the expected financial challenges for the upcoming year.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Noted the provisional revenue and capital outturn for 2024/25 as detailed in the report.
2. Approved the capital carry-forwards as set out in Appendix 3.
3. Approved the transfers to/from reserves as set out in Appendix 4.
4. Approved the budget transfers as set out in Appendix 5.
5. Noted the debt write-offs approved by officers in Quarter 4 of 2024/25 as set out in Appendix 6;
6. That, in light of the changing financial scenario facing the Council, approved the re-instatement of fees for Haringey Learns adult learning service in line with the policy for academic year 2025/26 as set out in Section 11.0 and attached as Appendix 7.

Reasons for the Decision

A strong financial management framework, including oversight by Members and senior management, was an essential part of delivering the Council's priorities and statutory duties. It was necessary at year-end to review the use of reserves and balances in light of the financial position during the year and knowledge of the Council's future position and requirements.

Alternative Options Considered

The Corporate Director of Finance and Resources, as Section 151 Officer, had a duty to consider and propose decisions in the best interests of the authority's finances and that best supported the delivery of the agreed Corporate Delivery Plan outcomes whilst maintaining financial sustainability. This report by the Corporate Director of Finance and Resources attempted to address these points. Therefore, no other options were presented at that time.

240. DRAFT 2026-27 BUDGET AND 2026-2031 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY REPORT

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services introduced the report.

It was explained by the Cabinet Member that Haringey had a number of achievements over the past four years that were driven by its priorities. From a 'Good' rating in Children's services, building hundreds of beautiful, high-quality council homes, planting thousands of trees to improving governance and internal processes. However, it was stressed that Haringey was still a Council where many residents, especially those in the eastern wards, continued to live in circumstances of poverty, ill health and poor outcomes. It was explained that, as a borough, it had to make deep savings for over 10 years. Considered outer London, it did not receive the top-ups that were awarded to some councils. But it also had an economy made up of low wages and small businesses, many working from home. It did not have the vast tracts of land for development and business that its northern neighbours could utilise. It fell through the cracks.

It was additionally explained that the high level of need, increasing numbers of those over 65 and a large number in insecure private sector housing (over 50% in some wards) continued to drive the increasing cost of providing services that residents relied on. Adult social care, children's social care, temporary accommodation were the three primary drivers seen up and down the country.

In response to comments and questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison, the following information was shared:

- Officers explained that this was the first time that the Medium Term Financial Strategy had been brought to Cabinet in July, rather than September, which allowed for early reporting and planning.
- It was explained by officers that a Fairer Funding consultation was underway. However, it was stressed that the Council had developed the proposed MTFS based on current figures, rather than assuming any changes.
- It was noted that there was a level of risk relating to staff pay awards which was dependent on negotiations with Trade Unions. It was additionally noted that there was an assumption that inflation was expected to decrease, which was expected to reduce any required pay award.
- It was stressed that any assumptions in the report were subject to change, and that the report gave an indication of where the Council was currently, and how it would work to tackle its current financial pressures.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Noted the Council's financial position as set out in the report which set the foundations for the full budget for 2026/27 that would be presented to Cabinet in February 2026 and onward to Full Council in March 2026.
2. Noted the agreed pressures for 2026/27 (Appendix 1) and any additional emerging budget challenges since the last update in March 2025 that had been

- identified for 2026/27 and across the medium term as set out in Section 12.
3. Noted the agreed revenue savings proposals summarised in Section 12.1.
 4. Noted the risks and uncertainties in Section 18 that still remained.
 5. Noted that the General Fund Revenue Budget, Capital Strategy, Capital Programme, HRA 2026/27 Budget and Business Plan and Treasury Management Strategy Statement would be presented to Cabinet on 11 February 2026 to be recommended for approval to the Full Council meeting taking place on 3 March 2026.
 6. Noted the new Capital Delivery Governance Framework attached as Appendix 2.

Reasons for decision

The Council had a statutory obligation to set a balanced budget for 2026/27 and this report formed a key part of the budget setting process by setting out the approach to delivering this and a refreshed Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). It also highlighted key updates in terms of funding, expenditure, risks and issues since the last report in March 2025. The final budget for 2026/27, Council Tax levels, Capital Programme, Treasury Management Strategy, Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget and Business Plan would be presented to Cabinet in February 2026 for recommending to Full Council on 3 March 2026.

Alternative options considered

The Cabinet had to consider how to deliver a balanced 2026/27 budget and sustainable MTFS over the five-year period 2026/31, to be reviewed and adopted at the meeting of Full Council on 3 March 2026.

This report was a key tool in achieving this as it set out the approach, scope and timetable to delivering the 2026/27 Budget.

241. APPROVAL TO TENDER FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF SELBY URBAN VILLAGE

The Cabinet Member for Placemaking and Local Economy introduced the report.

It was explained that Haringey Council had been working towards creating an ambitious, sustainable and inclusive urban village on the Selby Centre site that improved the health and wellbeing of residents and the wider community, noting that the report recommended beginning the process to tender for a build contractor so that work could begin in March 2026 to deliver the scheme.

It was explained that the ambitions for this development had been fashioned through a collaborative, co-design process with the Selby Trust and local community for four years. Through the Memorandum of Understanding, a joint vision was set out to create an urban village in Haringey where people could have all the amenities to enjoy

healthy, fulfilled lives right on their doorstep. Not only was the Council building more than 200 high-quality sustainable council homes at social rent, but it was also creating a community hub including workspace, green and open park space, and a suite of sporting facilities. The Council had a long history of working with the Selby Trust, which delivered valuable resources to the local community in Tottenham, Haringey and North London—from business support to social advice tailored to diverse communities, to food banks.

The Cabinet Member noted that phase one involved the building of the community centre, sports changing rooms, and the regenerated park facilities and sports pitches. The finished development created a hub of sporting amenities for physical and mental wellbeing and a community space where people could come together for cultural celebrations, start innovative enterprises and hold community events. The new Bull Lane Park featured extensive tree-planting, a large children's play area, an outdoor gym and a new cycle route. Phase two brought more than 200 new homes for council tenants by November 2029, including many family-sized homes and 21 wheelchair-adapted homes for residents who struggled to find suitable housing. The scheme supported the Council's target to build more than 3,000 genuinely affordable high-quality council homes by 2031. The homes and spaces on the Selby site were designed to high sustainability and energy efficiency standards. The site also included a commercial unit for a small local convenience store.

It was explained that the project would make a significant contribution to the aims and objectives set out in the Council's 'Shaping Tottenham' strategy, serving as a beacon of excellence for urban living that enhanced North Tottenham as a destination for sports and leisure and healthy living in a sustainable environment. Selby Urban Village was expected to emerge as an exemplar of how placemaking could work for existing and new residents.

In response to comments and questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison, the following information was shared:

- Officers explained that the Greater London Authority (GLA) were supportive of the scheme and that indications were that they would like to see it commenced, noting that they had been part of the development of the scheme and were involved in planning. It was explained any referral to the GLA would be expected to take up to eight weeks to conclude.
- It was explained by officers that the lease was subject to negotiation with the Selby Trust, which was expected to take place over the Autumn 2025. It was explained that any arrangements made would return to Cabinet in a separate report.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the commencement of a tendering process for a main contractor to construct Phase One and Phase Two of Selby Urban Village.

2. Approved the upper limit of the total scheme cost set out in the exempt report and delegate authority to the Lead Member for Placemaking and Local Economy, in consultation with the Section 151 Officer and the Corporate Director of Culture, Strategy and Communities, to award the contract subject to the tendered sum being within the upper limit and affordable within the context of the funding strategy.
3. Approved receipt of a maximum £2,041,298 capital grant from the Football Foundation towards the new 91 x 55m FIFA Quality 3G FTP, pavilion, grass pitch improvement and MUGA, and delivery of the aims and objectives detailed in the Football Foundation funding application and the Site Development Plan.

Reasons for Decisions

The regeneration of the Selby Centre to create the new Selby Urban Village was in line with the previously published Cabinet approval decisions set out in appendices to design the scheme and seek planning permissions. These approval decisions ensured that the Council would not lose the grant allocations it had secured, by tendering the build contract in readiness to have entered into contract by March 2026. Details of grant funding were set out in the exempt report.

Alternative Options Considered

The Council could have decided not to tender the scheme. This option was discounted as it would not have been in line with previously agreed strategic objectives for the Selby Urban Village scheme. The Council could have adopted a different procurement strategy from that set out in section 13 of the report. Alternative procurement approaches were rejected as it was deemed that the current strategy would meet the Council's objectives in terms of the programme timescales and value for money requirements.

242. KERBSIDE STRATEGY AND ELECTRIC VEHICLE STRATEGY

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport introduced the report.

It was explained by the Cabinet Member that around 60% of Haringey households did not own a car, rising to 70% in many areas across the east of the borough, and that kerbside space previously allocated to storing cars represented potential for transformation that extended beyond transport.

It was noted that there was a potential for the Council to develop parklets, community gardens, play areas, seating, cycle storage, and green infrastructure. It was additionally noted that the Electric Vehicle Strategy recognised that where people did need cars, those vehicles had to be as clean as possible. The Council had been accelerating the delivery of charging points, ensuring that the transition to electric became accessible regardless of income or housing type.

It was explained that the five kerbside priorities demonstrated how environmental action generated multiple co-benefits: supporting local businesses, enabling active

travel, improving bus services, reducing congestion, and building climate resilience. Each represented a step towards neighbourhoods where infrastructure served people, not just vehicles.

It was explained by the Cabinet Member that the Council was building the foundation for communities where getting around became healthier, where local economies thrived, and where public space truly served the public.

In response to comments and questions from Councillors Cawley-Harrison, the following information was shared:

- Officers explained that they would be undertaking a review of the accuracy of maps and street level assessments. It was explained that this would be the first time that the Council would be undertaking such a detailed exercise.
- It was explained by officers that any demands on the kerbside that would be made by businesses would be balanced appropriately across the whole network.
- It was explained that there had been a £25 million investment from central government for kerbside electric vehicle charging, which had been welcomed as a support for the development of the pilot for electric vehicle charging.
- It was explained that the Council was undertaking work on the improvement of kerbside gullies.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Noted the feedback received from the initial informal consultation regarding the preparation of the Kerbside Strategy and the Electric Vehicle Strategy.
2. Approved the draft Kerbside Strategy and Electric Vehicle Strategy for public consultation, subject to no consultation commencing until after the conclusion of the call-in period following this decision.

That the Leader:

1. Agreed to allocate to the Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport and Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality the decision to adopt the final Kerbside Strategy and Electric Vehicle Strategy having had due regard to all representations received as part of public consultation.

Reasons for decision

The Council had committed to developing these new strategies, in alignment with the emerging Safe and Sustainable Transport Strategy, to establish individual, but coordinated, strategic frameworks to:

- Prioritise how kerbside spaces were shaped and used.

- Enable the Council to further develop and enhance its electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

To enable residents and businesses to provide feedback on the proposals, which would help influence the final strategies.

In addition to aligning with the Council's current and emerging decarbonisation and low-emission policies, the Electric Vehicle Strategy aimed to address the projected increase in demand for electric vehicles, which would arise, in part, from the UK Government's ban on new conventional petrol and diesel cars and vans from 2030 and the ban of hybrid vehicles from 2035.

Alternative options considered

Not to produce new strategies

The Council would have had no coherent strategies focused on how kerbside space was used or provision for electric vehicles, which would not have supported or benefited residents, and would have failed to advance the Council and Government's decarbonisation plans.

Not consult on the draft strategies

A lack of public consultation would have meant local views were neglected and overlooked in the development of these strategies, which would affect all residents and businesses, and this would not have been in accordance with the principle of co-production.

243. NOEL PARK PROJECT

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning, and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report.

It was explained that Haringey Council aimed to provide fairer housing across the borough, safe, warm, comfortable, affordable homes for all and that it had a major retrofitting and refurbishment plan for council homes across Haringey. In the Noel Park conservation area, the Council retrofitted hundreds of homes. 103 had already been finished on Farrant Ave, Morley Ave and Moselle Ave, with another 131 on Gladstone Ave getting underway. New roofs, windows, doors and other key upgrades were made to keep homes warm and dry – and to cut the cost of heating them for residents. Affordable homes didn't just have genuinely affordable council rents; they were made affordable to run – these works helped to bring energy bills down.

It was explained that the Council also fixed up the interiors at the same time in Noel Park, putting in new kitchens and bathrooms – bringing homes up to the Decent Homes standard. This was just one project in the wider mission to get 100% of council homes in Haringey to Decent Homes standard by 2028.

In response to comments and questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison, the following information was shared:

- Officers explained that the Council was continuously assessing the market to ensure that the delivery of the contract for Noel Park was good value for

money.

- It was explained that would be no increase in costs to leaseholders from any additional works, and that any increased costs from the proposals would be absorbed by the Council.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved a variation of the contract with Equans Regeneration Ltd (formerly Engie Regeneration Ltd) by an increasing the Noel Park project budget from £21.46m to £32.2m, an increase of £10.7m; and also approve an increase in the professional fees budget from £847,000 to £1,270,500, an increase of £423,500, to enable the completion of essential Health & Safety and Decent Homes as part of Noel Park project, with funding allocated from the existing Cabinet approved HRA capital investment programme budget.

Reasons for the decision:

Cabinet had approved the award of a contract to Engie (now Equans Regeneration Ltd) to carry out major works on the Noel Park estate following a full procurement process. On completion of the procurement, the Council, through Homes for Haringey, had decided to split the project into two phases:

Phase 1 - 103 tenanted dwellings located on Farrant Avenue, Morley Avenue, Moselle Avenue and on Gladstone Avenue.

Phase 2 - 131 homes on Gladstone Avenue which were occupied by both tenants and leaseholders.

Phase 1 of the Noel Park project had been practically completed at the end of May 2025, with works to 103 properties having been completed.

Phase 2 works had commenced on 88 properties and PODs had been installed in 14 properties. However, works had been suspended pending the approval of additional funding by Cabinet to allow the completion of the project.

Current spend to date for the completion of Phase 1 and works completed to date on Phase 2 was £20,263,308, excluding professional fees, against the Cabinet-approved budget of £21.46 million. An increased project budget was required to enable the completion of essential health & safety and Decent Homes works and the completion of the project. The increased professional fees were based on the increased scope of the project and additional activities including party wall notices.

This increased budget was required due to:

- i) Significant enhancement to the original scope of works due to the condition of these period properties and their Pods, which were significantly beyond their designed life span and presented significant health & safety risks due to previous underinvestment, and the need to ensure these homes met and maintained the Decent Homes standard

and complied with statutory and regulatory requirements. In addition, as Noel Park was a conservation area, works to the properties required different and often complex construction methods and materials from those originally specified.

ii) The increase in costs due to the extension of time as a result of the impact of the COVID pandemic on the original procurement, contract award and planning process; Brexit and the global material shortages and the subsequent inflation in global material costs and UK labour rates.

The increased budget would enable the completion of all essential health & safety works to all in-scope properties; for the Council tenanted properties to be brought up to the Decent Homes Standard and the overall completion of the project. The enhanced scope of works included:

Programme Delivery

The completion of Noel Project Phase 2 works would be undertaken operating under a contract with a defined scope of works, delivery programme, and contract sum. A period of remobilisation would be undertaken to prepare for the works to recommence, and this would include detailed planning for each individual property and significant resident engagement to prepare residents for the extensive works being undertaken in their homes. In order to ensure Value for Money and effective and efficient project delivery, a robust governance and contract management approach had been implemented which included:

- Monitoring of project progress through the Housing Capital Board.
- A dedicated project team with a dedicated Senior Project Manager, Resident Liaison Officer, a dedicated Equans site project team and dedicated Ridge team to provide assurance and support the administration of contract.
- An extensive verification of all previous and future claims submitted by the contractor by Ridge, the appointed multi-disciplinary consultant, to ensure payment claims were in line with terms of the contract and were reasonable and evidence-based.
- Regular analysis of key project risks so that these could be closely monitored and risk mitigation strategies put in place.
- Regular joint Lessons Learnt reviews to identify areas for improvement and ensure lessons were learnt and weekly reviews of residents' complaints, customer feedback and completed customer satisfaction questionnaires.
- Enhanced communication activities and initiatives aimed at improving the resident experience.
- Identifying opportunities for improving the critical path for delivery such as agreeing a reduced lead time with LB Haringey Highways Road closures which were required when Pods were craned into place.

The funding for the additional project budget including the additional professional fees, would be through the HRA Capital Programme Budget approved by Cabinet as part of the HRA Business Plan.

The need for additional cost to complete these essential works had been anticipated for some time and factored into Asset Management's major works budget spend plans for 2025/26 and 2026/27. This would have no impact on the ability to achieve 100% decency by 2028 and budgets for 2025/26 and 2026/27 had been allocated accordingly.

Alternative options considered

Option 1 - Halt Project & Reprocure

This option would have involved the completion of all works in progress, the suspension of any new works and the procurement of a new contractor to complete the works. This option was discounted due to the timescales required to reprocure the works and obtain new planning permission; the impact on residents (tenants and leaseholders) due to the delay; the potential for increased costs given that a new contractor would be taking over partially completed works; increasing material and labour costs; and potential contractual disputes. In addition, there were likely to be potential claims and significant reputational damage.

Option 2 - Close Down Project

Completion of all works in progress. No new works orders issued. Decent Homes & Essential Works added to future programmes. Evaluation of options for remaining PODs. This option was discounted due to the following issues: failure to resolve significant health & safety issues, achieve Decent Homes targets; essential works would be delayed and the impact on residents.

244. LONDON BOROUGH OF CULTURE 2027 DELIVERY ARRANGEMENTS: CREATION OF A CHARITABLE COMPANY LIMITED BY GUARANTEE

The Cabinet Member for Culture and Leisure introduced the report.

It was explained that being the host borough of culture in London was an opportunity to showcase the rich creativity and culture which was at home in Haringey, showed that the Borough was a home for creatives and artists and enabled young people to see that the creative industry was a place for them to build and have a fulfilling career.

However, the Cabinet Member stressed that there were financial and reputational risks involved and that the Council had worked to mitigate these with a detailed review and planning of delivery options. It was explained that research into previous models used by other boroughs highlighted the need for a bespoke, sustainable, and agile delivery mechanism suited to Haringey's ambitions and context. The proposed charitable company limited by guarantee model provided and set out the governance arrangements to enable the delivery of London Borough of Culture in Haringey in 2027 aligned with the borough's cultural and community ambitions. It was explained that it also supported legacy-building beyond 2028, allowed for external partnerships and funding not readily available to a Council-hosted programme, and ensured continued Council control through sole membership and board appointment rights, while maintaining appropriate independence and public benefit safeguards.

It was explained that the Articles of Association and Master Collaboration Agreement provided the legal and operational framework for effective partnership and governance between the Council and the Charity and allowed flexibility to wind down or repurpose the Charity following programme completion, subject to the outcome of the 2028 evaluation.

In response to comments and questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison, the following information was shared:

- Officers explained that the independent members of the Board of the proposed Charitable Company Limited by Guarantee (CCLG) would be supportive and have the expertise to adequately scrutinise the work of the CCLG.
- It was explained that £800,000 of match funding had been committed by the Council to the project. It was noted that this was new funding, which would not take away from other cultural event funding.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Noted the research and development that had been conducted since the London Borough of Culture 2027 award in March 2024
2. Approved the implementation of an alternative delivery arrangement, in the form of a Charitable Company Limited by Guarantee, for the delivery of the London Borough of Culture 2027 programme for Haringey.
3. Approved the Council as the sole and founding Member of the Charity.
4. Approved the adoption of the Articles of Association for the Charity and the Master Collaboration Agreement between the Council and the Charity, set out in Appendices 1 and 2 respectively.
5. Delegated the mobilisation, deployment and operations of the Charitable Company Limited by Guarantee to the Corporate Director of Culture, Strategy and Communities.
6. Agreed to evaluate and assess the realisation of the co-designed objects of the Charitable Company Limited by Guarantee, via regular monitoring through the proposed governance outlined in this report, and to receive a report no later than December 2028 enabling a decision to be made as to whether to retain or close down the CCLG following the completion of all LBoC-related activities.

Reasons for decision

Haringey had the unique benefit of a longer lead-in time than previous London Borough of Culture (LBOC) boroughs, as this was the first time the GLA had announced two consecutive awards for the biennial programme. This allowed LBH to scrutinise processes and explore potential new approaches to:

- Deliver the LBoC programme successfully
- Fulfil the ambitions of the original proposal
- Create a sustainable and robust legacy for LBoC for the borough

Having conducted research into delivery options used by previous LBOC award winners, their approaches were not felt to be viable options for Haringey, for reasons set out in section 6. Over the previous 18 months, LBH had worked closely with partners and sector experts to develop the recommendation of creating a Charitable Company Limited by Guarantee (“CCLG”) to deliver the LBOC programme.

A CCLG was a specific not-for-profit organisation, registered with both Companies House and the Charity Commission. Members guaranteed a nominal amount of the company's debts, whilst the company had no shareholders or profit distribution.

The CCLG was established to achieve specific charitable ‘objects’, which were outlined in the CCLG's governing document, the Articles of Association attached as Appendix 1. These objects had to align with the requirements set forth in the Charities Acts, as did the general operation of the charity. If it fulfilled the criteria for doing so, an organisation that had been set up as a CCLG had to apply to the Commission to be registered as a charity and the Commission would confirm this and provide a charity number. Charity registration was public domain evidence that the CCLG was, by legal definition, a public benefit organisation, and that status had a high level of public recognition. The Council therefore applied to the Commission for charitable status for the CCLG.

The CCLG, founded solely by LBH, had independent operational systems, which could be more inclusive, agile and responsive to the immediate needs of the programme, and leaned into the expertise and background of the Council's Culture team.

The CCLG could also reduce the demand on LBH resources by bringing in external support through strategic partnership and sponsorship, which would not all be available to a council-hosted function.

LBH retained control of the charity as the sole corporate member, with power to appoint the charity board and could pass company members' resolutions directly as written resolutions. LBH made appointments in the best public benefit interests of the CCLG and the strategically aligned public benefit interests of LBH and these included at least two trustees who were not directly connected to LBH, to ensure the CCLG had a means of managing the potential for conflict of interest, within the overall collaborative public benefit interests of LBH and the CCLG.

External legal counsel had been commissioned to develop and draft the constitutional document for the CCLG – Articles of Association and a Master Collaboration Agreement as a contractual framework to govern the operational partnership relationship between the CCLG and LBH in the delivery of the programme. The Master Collaboration Agreement was key to the success of this model as it dictated the relationship, influence and constitutional control that LBH had over the CCLG.

The Master Collaboration Agreement provided a framework for a collaborative working relationship to promote and deliver the LBOC project. It covered the various means by which and the conditions upon which LBH supported the CCLG, the payments the CCLG made for services provided by LBH, and provided for effective communication between LBH and the CCLG in the planning and delivery of the project. The

framework allowed for more specific detailed agreements on specific areas within the collaborative LBoC project. This agreement was attached at Appendix 2.

The CCLG was included as part of the master evaluation of LBoC and provided valuable learning for the Council and the Borough. Dependent on evaluation and monitoring of realisation of the charitable objects, the CCLG could be wound up after the LBoC delivery year, which ran from April 2027 to April 2028, or sustained as a new model of cultural infrastructure, advocacy and support. The CCLG could develop from delivery of the specific programme into a post-programme legacy as a charitable Haringey community organisation and the proposed report to Cabinet in 2028 enabled the Council to take an informed decision at that point.

Alternative options considered

Total restructure of internal delivery model: An alternative approach would have been to work with leaders from across the council to redevelop internal infrastructure to include dedicated, allocated resources via a multi and inter-departmental approach. The Council would have explored how the delivery team could better understand and utilise systems to feasibly deliver the programme, and where efficiencies and/or alternatives might have been possible.

LBH would have sought to develop a new structure; a multidisciplinary, dedicated team of leaders from across the council - including (not limited to) Culture & Creativity, Project Management, Communications, Business Support, Procurement and Children & Young People. LBH would have built out the core team and then brought in additional producers/directors and other professionals/experts from the arts and culture sectors to produce a world-class programme and maximise external funding and investment.

The long-term ambition would have been for LBH to strengthen and expand its network of partners, building on the momentum created by community networks etc. In this model LBH would have created an advocacy and partnership board with partners to develop collaboration with funders, external organisations and individuals to facilitate promotion, and delivery of the programme safely and efficiently.

This would have presented the following challenges:

- Front-loaded new, and full financial and resource cost, and risk, to the council;
- Reduced opportunity to leverage external support, infrastructure and funding;
- Systems would have required scrutiny and adaptation - organisation-wide redevelopment likely not feasible, which might have caused multiple systems being needed to do the same thing for different services - time, capacity and workforce issues;
- Required council-wide buy-in and offering of resources at a time of financial pressure across all services, including statutory ones;
- Sustainable legacy models would have meant a longer period of higher investment.

Do Nothing: Current framework, capacity, resources and infrastructure would not have supported the delivery of the ambitions of the programme, and would have required significant, if not total, reprofiling of the LBoC programme.

Outsource to an external partner: Would not have delivered the borough-wide ambition and transformation as outlined in the bid, and would have required flexibility, capacity and scale that was not available at that time in the borough.

245. NORTH LONDON JOINT WASTE STRATEGY 2025 - 2040 (NLJWS)

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport introduced the report.

It was explained that the proposed strategy demonstrated the commitment to transforming how the Council thought about waste, moving from a linear 'take-make-dispose' model to a truly circular economy where materials were kept in use for as long as possible. It was explained that the Council was already making progress: through Community Fund supporting grassroots repair initiatives, expanding networks of specialist recycling services, ReUse Shop at King's Road, and education programmes at the new EcoPark House.

It was explained that the Council aimed to double the amount of material reused through our Reuse and Recycling Centres, reduce avoidable food waste and recyclable materials in residual waste by 50%, and achieve zero waste to landfill by 2040. These were stretching targets that reflected the urgency of the climate emergency.

In response to comments and questions from Councillors Ovat and Cawley-Harrison, the following information was shared:

- Officers explained that the 50% recycling rate target of the North London Joint Waste Strategy was contained and mirrored within the London Environment Strategy.
- It was explained by officers that the types of waste from households had changed significantly since COVID, noting that the weight of waste had decreased and that packaging size had decreased, which would necessitate a change in how the service worked.
- It was explained that the Strategy would look at ways to reduce waste at source and look at the potential to encourage repair and reuse, as part of a circular economy.
- It was explained that there was a comprehensive schools plan as part of the strategy which would work to educate children to promote recycling.
- It was explained that the authority were undertaking food waste trials for flats above shops; it was explained that different pilot methods were being used to identify the best way of disposing of food. Officers highlighted that there were multiple different solutions which were being trialled and suggested.
- It was explained that the waste incinerator utilised by the authority was one of the cleanest in the UK. It was additionally stressed that, without that incinerator, the Council would be required to utilise other provision, which would further increase the Council's carbon footprint, and increase costs.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the draft North London Joint Waste Strategy;
2. Delegated authority to the Corporate Director of Environment and Resident Experience to agree minor changes to the strategy as appropriate.

Reasons for the decision

It was a requirement under section 32 of the Waste and Emissions Act 2003 for waste authorities for a two-tier area to have had a joint strategy for the management of municipal waste (household waste and business waste collected by the local authority, and waste which was similar in nature and composition to household waste, as required by the Landfill Directive).

The most recent JWS covered the period 2004 to 2020. That strategy largely focused on finding a solution for residual waste disposal infrastructure in north London, which had since been agreed upon through a comprehensive options appraisal and formal planning process, and facilities were then under development.

The development of this strategy over the past 3 years had been timed in relation to both the above process and because of significant legislative changes that had been in development by Government over the previous 5 years and which were coming into practice at that time and in the coming 2 years.

It was therefore the right time to put an up-to-date strategy in place that had been able to take into account these changes.

In all, the strategy was necessary to provide the framework within which the eight authorities would make decisions on and deliver essential services over the coming 15 years, facilitating the most cost-effective and environmentally advantageous management of waste.

It should also be noted that the strategy did not define or restrict how borough collection services would operate in the future, in response to local circumstances, which would be decisions for individual authorities to make, having regard to the objectives of the Strategy. The council was undertaking its own process across street cleansing as well as waste collection through the procurement of services for April 2027 onwards.

Alternative options considered:

Not proceeding with a joint strategy for the management of waste. However, this would have meant non-compliance under section 32 of the Waste and Emissions Act 2003 for waste authorities for a two-tier area to have had a joint strategy for the management of waste.

246. REVIEW OF THE DIRECT LABOUR ORGANISATION REPAIRS AND VOIDS DELIVERY MODEL

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning, and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report.

It was explained that Housing services had undertaken a range of work to improve services for residents through the Housing Improvement Plan, where there had been improved performance for the repairs service from the impact of the work carried out.

Although the outcomes of these improvements were being seen, it was important to continue to reevaluate how services were delivered to ensure the Council was equipped to deliver the best service it could for residents.

It was explained that the proposals highlighted the need to deliver a responsive and high-quality repairs service that was cost efficient, which was also echoed by the Consumer Standard requirements set by the Regulator of Social Housing.

The Cabinet Member explained that there was a need to undertake an options appraisal to be completed for different delivery models of the repairs and voids service, so that the scope for improvement was not limited and the Council could ensure the delivery of a high-quality repairs and voids service that was cost-efficient and offered value for money.

In response to comments and questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison, the following information was shared:

- It was explained that there were some internal costs from the proposals, but these were justified based on condition of properties and higher internal specifications.
- Officers explained that the service had a six-month long timescale to undertake detailed analysis of the delivery of repairs and voids.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved an options appraisal on the Direct Labour Organisation (DLO) of Haringey's Repairs & Voids Service and consider alternative delivery model options.
2. Noted that the options appraisal would consider performance management and cost control arrangements currently in place and provide recommendations for further enhancements or revisions, and/or where such arrangements should be realigned as part of any alternative delivery model options proposed.

Reasons for the decision:

When considering the findings of the high-level review, it was evident that there were further improvements needed to the Council's repairs service for both responsive repairs and voids in order to provide a good value service for its tenants and leaseholders.

The review identified that the cost of the repairs service for both repairs and voids was high when compared to the wider industry costs. On average it would have been expected to see an average repairs job value of between £140 and £170, however Haringey's average repairs job value was between £305 and £337. The same applied for voids, in that the average void refurbishment job value for the wider industry was

£3,000 to £3,500 and Haringey's average void job value was between £8,297 and £9,068.

There were considerations however that could have explained part of the difference in these costs, for example where Haringey's specification might have been of a higher standard than of the average registered provider, as this was not factored into the review.

In relation to productivity, the review identified that the average number of repairs per operative per day was very low when compared to the wider industry. The average figure for Haringey was around 1.35 jobs per operative per day, where it would typically have been expected to see at least 2 repairs per day as a minimum and a figure of 3 to 3.5 repairs per day as an industry standard. This was caveated by the size and nature of the repairs, and would have varied depending on trades, e.g. the number of electrical repairs per day, would have been far higher than roofing repairs.

The average value figures set out above were however above the industry average even when taking variables into account, and over time this would have had a significant and unsustainable financial impact.

As of April 2024, the Council was subject to the new Consumer Standards introduced by the Regulator of Social Housing, where there were 4 standards: Safety & Quality, Tenancy, Neighbourhood & Community, and Transparency, Influence & Accountability.

As part of the Safety & Quality Standard, there were many requirements of landlords that related to repairs services. Some of the most relevant requirements to the issues being considered in this paper were outlined below:

- Registered providers had to provide an effective, efficient, and timely repairs, maintenance and planned improvements service for the homes and communal areas for which they were responsible.
- Registered providers had to set timescales for the completion of repairs, maintenance and planned improvements, clearly communicate them to tenants and take appropriate steps to deliver to them.
- Registered providers had to ensure that the delivery of repairs, maintenance and planned improvements to homes and communal areas was informed by the needs of tenants and provided value for money.

As part of the introduction of the Consumer Standards, a new inspection regime was introduced which would grade registered providers based on how well they complied with the standards varying from C1 (where a provider was delivering the consumer standards overall) to C4 (where there were very serious failings).

The Transparency, Influence and Accountability Standard required all registered providers to generate and report tenant satisfaction measures (TSMs) as specified by the Regulator. The TSMs were a core set of performance measures against which all providers had to publish their performance. This was to provide tenants with greater transparency about their landlord's performance and informed the Regulator about

how a landlord was complying with the Consumer Standards. Some of the TSMs relevant to the repairs service were:

- Overall satisfaction
- Satisfaction with repairs
- Satisfaction with time taken to complete most recent repair
- Satisfaction that the home was well maintained
- Satisfaction that the home was safe
- Satisfaction that the landlord kept communal areas clean and well maintained

Out of the 12 TSMs that were obtained from tenant perception surveys, 50% were impacted in some capacity by the repairs service whether this was within tenants' and leaseholders' homes or the communal areas surrounding them. The perception of the repairs service and how it performed had a significant impact on satisfaction and therefore how the Council complied as a landlord to the Consumer Standards.

This difference in cost when compared to the wider industry might have been unsustainable, however when coupled with the obligations the Council had to its residents and the Regulator of Social Housing, it was integral that alternative options were explored to ensure that the Council could provide the best service for its residents that was more cost effective.

Alternative options considered:

Do nothing:

This was not an option given that the current level of productivity and cost was not comparable with the sector and the mock inspection had found that the Repairs Service was not delivering a consistent standard.

Develop a new Target Operating Model (TOM) with the Direct Labour Organisation (DLO) at its core:

Whilst this was comparable to the option being proposed as it would have required a similar review, only exploring options with the DLO would have significantly limited the Council's scope for improvement and this option should have been considered with other options so that the focus was predominantly based on improvement.

All options required investment in both external expertise and core system development and were subject to contractual changes, either during the review or when consulting on, or implementing any recommendations.

247. STREET LIGHTING TERM CONTRACT EXTENSION

The Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality introduced the report.

It was explained that the maintenance and improvement street lighting played a key part in ensuring the safe movement of all road users and that street lighting reduced accident risk by improving visibility for pedestrians and drivers. Well-lit streets also deterred crime, making them safer for everyone.

It was explained that the proposals recommended the extension of the Street Lighting Term Maintenance Contract to continue to ensure the ongoing cost-effective delivery of the Council's planned and reactive street lighting works. It was also noted that the proposed extension also allowed the Council to align the expiry of this contract with the wider Highways Contract to allow the Council to pursue greater efficiencies when retendering those services.

In response to comments and questions from Councillors Hakata and Cawley-Harrison, the following information was shared:

- It was noted by Cabinet Members that reductions in carbon emissions by the Council were partly down to investments into energy efficiency in street lighting.
- There were concerns raised regarding contract extension and whether Council is getting the best value for money. It was explained by officers that the Council was undertaking work to ensure that procurement exercises were all good value for money. It was stressed that the contract to extend street lighting provision was well considered and that it was value for money.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the extension of the existing Street Lighting Term Maintenance Contract awarded to Marlborough Highways Ltd for the maintenance of the Council's street lighting assets for a period from 1st October 2025 to 30th June 2027 at an estimated total value of around £2.8m over the extension period.

Alternative options considered:

The Council could have considered retendering the contract to test the market.

However, besides the significant cost of the procurement exercise, there was limited value in such an option having regard to the following factors:

Potential disruption to the synergy benefit that had been achieved through the delivery of both street lighting and highway works contracts by a single contractor operating from the same depot within the borough.

Relative competitiveness of the initial tender – the tender evaluations had revealed at that time that overall, in a combination of price and quality, the successful contractor had achieved an overall margin of 4% over the nearest competitor. In terms of pricing, the contract had secured a price margin of 7.5%.

Current uncertainties within the market might have led contractors to perceive greater risks when tendering. This would likely have been reflected in inflated prices received in any new tendering round.

The strategy had been for the highways and street lighting contracts to be let in parallel timelines and therefore a percentage reduction option for the award of both contracts might have been afforded. A tendered short contract of two years for lighting was unlikely to attract competitive pricing.

248. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES

The minutes of other bodies were discussed.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of other bodies were noted.

249. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were none.

250. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED:

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

251. APPROVAL TO TENDER FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF SELBY URBAN VILLAGE

The exempt report was discussed

RESOLVED:

The exempt report was noted.

252. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair

Date