

DECISION NOTICE OF THE Cabinet HELD ON Tuesday, 10th February, 2026

Set out below is a summary of the decisions taken at the meeting of Cabinet held on Tuesday, 10 February 2026.

If you have any queries about any matters referred to in this decision sheet please contact Richard Plummer, Committees Manager.

9. BUDGET 2026/2027 AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2030/2031

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Noted the content of the Section 25 Statement provided by the Corporate Director for Finance and Resources (Appendix 11).
2. Considered the outcome of the budget consultation to be included in the report to Council (Appendix 3).
3. Noted the content of the Cumulative Equality Impact Assessment for 2026/27 (Appendix 5).
4. Approved the responses made to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommendations following their consideration of the draft budget proposals (Appendix 4).
5. Proposed approval to the Council of the 2026/27 Budget and MTFs 2026/31 Budget, new budget requirements and savings proposals (Appendices 1 and 2 a-f).
6. Proposed approval to the Council of the 2026/27 General Fund Revenue Budget as set out in Appendix 1, including specifically a General Fund budget requirement of £343.4m, but subject to final decisions of the levying and precepting bodies and the final local government finance Settlement.
7. Proposed approval to the Council of the General Fund Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2026/2031 (Appendix 1).
8. Proposed approval to the Council that the overall Haringey element of Council Tax set by the London Borough of Haringey for 2026/27 would be £1,803.26 per Band D property, representing a 2.99% increase on the 2025/26 Haringey

- element and with an additional 2% for the Adult Social Care Precept amount.
9. Noted the Council Tax Base of the London Borough of Haringey, as agreed by the Section 151 Officer under delegated authority (Article 4.01(b), Part 2, of the Constitution), as 80,924 for the financial year 2026/27 (Appendix 6).
 10. Proposed approval to the Council of the General Fund Capital Programme 2026/27 to 2030/31 (Appendix 7).
 11. Proposed approval to the Council of the strategy on the use of flexible capital receipts to facilitate the delivery of efficiency savings, including utilisation for redundancy costs (Appendix 8).
 12. Noted the Capitalisation Policy (Appendix 9).
 13. Noted the Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2026/27 for approval by Council (Appendix 10).
 14. Proposed approval to the Council of the 2026/27 Minimum Revenue Provision policy (Appendix 10, Annex C).
 15. Proposed to the Council the Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB) allocations for 2026/27 of £149.8m as set out in Table 16 and paragraph 14.2.
 16. Noted the funding distributed to primary and secondary schools for 2026/27 based on the figures advised to Schools Forum and submitted to the Department for Education (DfE) in January 2026, as set out in Section 14.
 17. Noted the budgets (including the use of brought forward DSG) for the Schools Block, Central Services Block, High Needs Block and Early Years Block, as set out in Table 16.
 18. Delegated to the Director of Children's Services, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families, authority to amend the Delegated Schools Budget to take account of any changes to Haringey's total schools funding allocation by the DfE.
 19. Delegated to the Section 151 Officer, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services, authority to make further changes to the 2026/27 draft budget to Full Council.

Reasons for the decision:

The Council had a statutory obligation to set a balanced budget for 2026/27, and this report formed part of the budget-setting process for forecasting funding and expenditure for 2026/27, which would be presented to Full Council on 2 March 2026. As part of good financial management and transparency, the report also set out the funding and expenditure assumptions for the following four years in the form of an updated Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). The final budget for 2026/27, Council Tax levels, Capital Programme, Treasury Management Strategy Statement,

Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget and Business Plan were to be recommended to Full Council on 2 March 2026 following consideration at Cabinet on 10 February 2026.

Alternative options considered:

The Cabinet had to consider how to deliver a balanced 2026/27 budget and a sustainable MTFs over the five-year period 2026/2031, to be reviewed and adopted at the meeting of Full Council on 2 March 2026.

The Council developed the proposals contained in the report in light of its forecasts for future income levels and service demand. These took account of the Council's priorities; the extent of the estimated funding shortfall; and the estimated impact of wider environmental factors such as inflation, interest rates, household incomes and, in some service areas, the legacy of the Covid-19 pandemic.

10. ADOPTION OF THE CAPITAL STRATEGY 2026- 2036

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Noted the proposed Capital Strategy 2026–2036 (Appendix A) and agree to recommend that Full Council approve and adopt the strategy as the Council's overarching framework for capital investment, financing and governance.
2. Noted that the Strategy would be reviewed annually alongside the MTFs and TMSS and reported to Cabinet and Full Council.
3. Endorsed the Capital Framework and governance arrangements.

Reasons for decision

The Capital Strategy set out the Council's statutory responsibility to define a clear approach for capital investment and financing. The 2026–2036 strategy built on previous iterations to reinforce affordability, prudence and sustainability in line with the CIPFA Prudential Code. It underpinned financial resilience by aligning the Council's strategic objectives with the Treasury Management Strategy to provide a coherent framework supporting investment in delivering the Borough Vision 2035 outcomes through the Capital Programme.

The Strategy provided a framework for long-term investment, setting out an evidence-led approach to allocating limited capital resources to projects that fulfilled the Council's legal and health and safety obligations, met contractual commitments

and, where affordable, delivered its strategic priorities. It responded to significant financial challenges, including:

Rising inflation and higher interest rates, which had significantly increased the cost of borrowing and future debt-servicing pressures.

Continuing growth in demand for housing, adult social care and temporary accommodation.

Limited government funding, alongside the use of Exceptional Financial Support (EFS), which was used to fund immediate budget pressures but increased long-term revenue commitments through higher capital financing costs and long-term debt for the Council.

In this context, the Capital Strategy set out a disciplined approach to capital investment, prioritising schemes essential for the delivery of statutory services, health and safety compliance and the reduction of long-term revenue pressures. A significant proportion of the capital programme was funded through borrowing, and the year-on-year increase needed to be reversed to protect the Council's financial sustainability and ensure affordability within prudential limits.

The Strategy brought together the Housing Revenue Account and the General Fund into a single strategic portfolio view for governance and reporting, while fully maintaining statutory and ring-fencing requirements.

It embedded robust business planning, risk management and benefits-realisation arrangements, strengthening transparency and confidence in decision-making. By prioritising affordability while retaining flexibility, the Strategy supported long-term financial sustainability and enabled the Council to respond effectively to changing economic conditions and strategic priorities.

Financing and Affordability

The Capital Strategy, alongside the Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) and the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), set the parameters for a financially sustainable capital programme. Borrowing had to remain within approved prudential limits, with the Council prioritising external grant funding, ringfenced Housing Revenue Account resources and capital receipts before undertaking prudent borrowing in accordance with the Prudential Code. The Council remained within its approved prudential limits set out in the Treasury Management Strategy Statement elsewhere on the agenda, but debt levels were high compared to others, and the capital financing costs of the capital programme alone amounted to £55m for the General Fund and £32m for the HRA.

The use of Exceptional Financial Support (EFS) was a measure that increased future debt-servicing costs. The Strategy therefore sought to reduce reliance on EFS over time and prioritised investment in schemes mitigating longer-term revenue pressures,

such as housing delivery to reduce temporary accommodation costs and energy-efficiency measures to lower utility expenditure.

All capital schemes were required to demonstrate affordability on a whole-life basis, including robust revenue implications, realistic contingency provision and sensitivity analysis. Clear mitigation or reprofiling options needed to be identified where affordability was affected by funding changes, cost inflation or delivery risk, ensuring the overall programme remained affordable, prudent and sustainable.

Governance, Assurance and Delivery

Delivery of the Strategy was supported by the Council's Capital Delivery Framework and capital governance model, adopted in July 2025, which provided a consistent approach to business-case development, approval, monitoring and benefits-realisation across the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account programmes.

Cabinet held overall strategic oversight of the Capital Strategy and Capital Programme. Regular scrutiny and due diligence were provided through quarterly capital monitoring reports to the Corporate Leadership Team, Cabinet and Scrutiny, enabling Members to oversee affordability, delivery performance, risks and alignment with corporate priorities. Operational oversight was exercised through the Strategic Capital Board and Directorate Capital Boards, which managed programme delivery, interdependencies and escalation.

Assurance was provided through a layered monitoring and reporting framework, including:

Monthly project and programme monitoring, providing detailed performance, financial and risk oversight at Capital Programme Board level; and
Quarterly portfolio-level capital monitoring and assurance, providing Members with a consolidated view of spend, forecast, risks, benefits and compliance with prudential indicators and governance requirements.

Risk Management

The Council maintained a low-risk appetite for borrowing and exposure to market volatility, reflecting financial context and the need to safeguard long-term financial resilience. Capital investment decisions were informed by robust risk assessment and mitigation planning at both scheme and portfolio level.

Key risks and mitigating actions included, but were not limited to:

Interest rates and inflation: Use of prudent financial assumptions, regular benchmarking and realistic contingency allowances.

Legislative and policy change: Horizon scanning and early compliance planning to mitigate cost and delivery impacts.

Capital receipts and grant dependency: Conservative forecasting, active disposals

management and strict compliance with grant conditions.

Delivery capacity and supply chain: Investment in internal project-management capability, robust procurement and due-diligence processes and risk-sharing contract forms.

Where affordability or deliverability was challenged, the Council took early action to reprofile or pause lower-priority schemes, while protecting statutory compliance and projects already in delivery to avoid sunk costs and reputational risk.

Alternative options considered

Do Nothing – Not Recommended

Failing to adopt a Capital Strategy would have undermined compliance with the CIPFA Prudential Code, which required local authorities to maintain an up-to-date capital strategy. It would have increased the risk of uncoordinated and unaffordable investment decisions and reduced transparency and assurance in the public interest. In the context of sustained financial pressure, this would have significantly heightened the risk of an unsustainable capital programme, adversely affecting the Council's financial resilience and its ability to deliver outcomes for residents.

11. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUSINESS PLAN 2026/27

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Recommended the Housing Revenue Account 2026/27 Budget and 2026/27 to 2030/31 Business Plan for approval by Full Council at its meeting on 2 March 2026.

Reasons for decision

The Council must legally set a balanced HRA budget and have a sustainable HRA Business Plan to ensure that it is able to manage and maintain its homes, provide services to tenants and leaseholders and build much needed new Council homes.

Alternative options considered

Not applicable

12. 100 WOODSIDE AVENUE, N10- SALES STRATEGY AND UPDATED TOTAL SCHEME COSTS

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the disposal of nine open-market sale units on the terms and in accordance with the Sales Strategy set out in paragraph 7 of this report.
2. Granted delegated authority to the Delivery Director and the Section 151 Officer, the Corporate Director of Finance and Resources, to dispose of each of the nine sale properties as part of the development at 100 Woodside Avenue, as shown in the Exempt Part of this report, for the total capital receipt set out in the Exempt Part, and to approve the final terms of the disposal, and to enter into the contract and any associated documentation in connection with the disposal.
3. Granted delegated authority to the Delivery Director of Housing Delivery and the Section 151 Officer, the Corporate Director of Finance and Resources, to make minor amendments to the Sale Strategy at paragraph 7 of this report.
4. Approved the increased budget as set out in the Exempt Part of this report.

Reasons for decision:

Haringey had an ambitious and successful council-house building programme which, since its launch in 2018, had already delivered 840 new completed council homes, with the vast majority welcoming new tenants and their families in the previous 18 months. Separately, more than 1,500 homes were under construction. This important programme made a valuable and central contribution to addressing the pressing need for genuinely affordable accommodation in Haringey and reducing the overall costs of temporary accommodation.

The scheme at 100 Woodside Avenue, where construction had been under way for more than a year, would deliver 32 new council homes in the west of the borough (Muswell Hill), as well as nine homes for market sale. The sale of these homes would cross-subsidise the 32 council homes, bringing financial viability to the whole scheme.

The Council had already received consent to dispose of the nine homes for market sale at its Cabinet meeting on 8 November 2022 (Minute 83). The Cabinet report of November 2022 approved the disposal of the leasehold interests in the nine market-sale units: seven flats on 125-year leases and two houses on 999-year leases. This report now sought authority to dispose of the leasehold interest in the seven flats on 999-year leases and the freehold interest in the two houses due to better marketability.

The proposed disposal of nine units—two houses (freehold disposals) and seven flats (999-year leases)—was permitted under paragraph A.3.1 of the General Housing Consent 2013. These consents related to disposals of HRA properties under section

32 of the Housing Act 1985 and permitted a local authority, subject to certain limitations not applicable to this transaction, to dispose of land for a price equal to its market value.

As the homes were within 12 months of completion, the Council needed to finalise an agreed sales strategy and sale mechanism that would allow sales within the housing development programme to follow a similar approach.

The scheme was complex and had been challenging, resulting in extensive costs to replace sensitive underground infrastructure that had involved lengthy negotiations with third-party interests. This significantly lengthened the construction programme by approximately 22 months in total. Furthermore, a higher number of complex legal matters and challenges resulted in legal costs higher than originally anticipated.

Alternative options considered:

An option not to sell the homes on the private market and instead retain the nine homes for affordable housing purposes had been considered. However, this option was rejected because it would have impacted the viability of the scheme. Any proceeds raised from the sale of the nine homes would be used to cross-subsidise this scheme and other council-home schemes within the housing-delivery programme.

The additional funding for the scheme had been essential work needed to deliver the overall scheme. Not replacing the complex and critical sewer infrastructure servicing the new homes would have risked the entire development going ahead, affecting the overall delivery and construction of the scheme. A build-over agreement was a planning condition that needed to be met; without it, the scheme could not have continued.

13. ADMISSION TO SCHOOLS - DETERMINED ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2027/28

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Noted that no responses were received during the consultation period, which ran from 27 November 2025 to 15 January 2026. The anticipated reasons for this outcome were outlined from paragraph 7.7.
2. Noted the equalities impact assessment of the proposals on protected groups at Appendix 7.
3. Agreed the recommendation set out in the report to proceed with the proposal to reduce the published admission number (PAN) for the primary and secondary schools listed in Table 1 from September 2027.

4. Agreed the Council's admission arrangements for the academic year 2027/28 as set out in Appendices 1–4.
5. Agreed Haringey's fair access protocol as set out in Appendix 5 to come into force from 1 March 2026.
6. Agreed that the determined arrangements for all maintained primary and secondary schools in the borough were published on the Council's website by 15 March 2025, with an explanation of the right of any person or body, under the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Co-ordination of Admission Arrangements) Regulations 2012, to object to the Schools Adjudicator in specified circumstances.

Reasons for decision:

In common with many London authorities, Haringey had been experiencing a decrease in demand for reception school places for several years. The reasons for the declining numbers were multifaceted and included falling birth rates, changes to welfare benefits, the housing crisis, increases in the cost of living, the loss of the right of entry and freedom of movement for EU nationals (Brexit), and families leaving London during the Covid-19 pandemic. Many of these factors remained outside the Council's control and were not the fault of the schools or their leadership.

A report on Managing School Places and Admissions in London, published by London Councils in February 2025, provided wider context and independent analysis of the issue.

While recent focus had largely been on reducing primary school capacity, forecast demand for secondary school places was also declining. Year 7 intake was projected to fall below the notional capacity of 2,628 places by the end of the decade. In response, some reductions in secondary capacity had already been implemented to support the sustainability of the school estate and to ensure provision aligned with projected demand.

From 2026, Year 7 capacity reduced to 2,544 places, helping to manage surplus provision. This revised figure reflected permanent reductions at Heartlands High School (from 240 to 210 in 2025) and planned reductions at Hornsey School for Girls and Park View in 2026, to 135 and 189 places respectively. Further reductions might be necessary to maintain a balanced and efficient secondary school estate.

As previously mentioned, several secondary schools referenced in the report adjusted their Published Admission Numbers (PAN) to reflect changes in class-size models. Some reduced PANs to move from 27 to 30 pupils per class. These schools had agreed with staff unions to increase class sizes from 27 to 30 pupils, in line with Department for Education (DfE) guidance, which recognised 30 as the standard class size in secondary education. This adjustment supported schools in achieving greater operational and financial efficiency through more flexible staffing and improved resource deployment. It also supported schools in aligning their financial and staffing structures with current and projected pupil numbers while maintaining high standards of educational provision.

The proposals outlined in the report to reduce Published Admission Numbers (PAN), including adjustments to class-size models from 27 to 30 pupils per class, were intended to support schools in planning their staffing and educational provision more efficiently by aligning capacity with actual and projected demand. This approach reflected DfE guidance recognising 30 pupils as the standard class size in secondary education and enabled schools to realise operational and financial benefits. The consultation process being initiated sought to gather stakeholder views on these proposals, with a final decision to be presented to Cabinet in February 2026.

Alternative options considered:

No changes were proposed to the oversubscription criteria for community and voluntary controlled (VC) schools for the 2027/28 academic year. Although the School Admissions Code (2021) allowed for various mechanisms to influence the allocation of places—such as designated catchment areas, feeder schools, or prioritisation for children eligible for the early years or pupil premium—no alternative option was considered at that time.

The aim was to support schools in achieving long-term sustainability and to introduce greater flexibility across the school estate in response to fluctuating population demand. Reducing PANs was one of several strategies available to schools, alongside strengthening partnerships through soft or hard federations and formal agreements such as memorandums of understanding.

Some neighbouring London boroughs had taken more radical steps to address surplus capacity, including school closures and amalgamations. The previous year, the Council consulted on the future of three one-form-entry primary schools and subsequently approved their closure from 31 August 2025, with pupils transferring to local schools. These closures did not affect the consultation or determination of admission arrangements for schools governed by the local authority.

14. APPROVAL OF NEXT STEPS FOR WOOD GREEN STATION ROAD SITES

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the preparation and submission of a hybrid planning application for the Station Road sites, comprising a detailed planning application for the Western End (40 Cumberland Road and 48 Station Road) and an outline planning application for the Eastern End (River Park House, Alexandra House, 38 Station Road, 5 River Park Road and the adjacent car park), including all preparatory and consequent steps required to enable planning permission to be granted, such as undertaking public engagement and paying fees and costs

connected with the hybrid planning application.

2. Approved the procurement of a series of commissions, including a multi-disciplinary professional team, to prepare and submit the hybrid planning application and all costs relating to the submission of the application, with an upper cost limit of £4,180,000, with £2,270,000 funded by the Housing Revenue Account and £1,910,000 by the General Fund, as set out within the Exempt Portion (Appendix 2) of this report.
3. Delegated the appointment of the multi-disciplinary professional team to the Director of Culture, Strategy and Communities following completion of the competitive procurement exercise within the cost limit set out in the table in Chapter 3 of the Exempt Portion (Appendix 2) of this report.
4. Approved the Incorporation of the Western End of the Station Road sites (40 Cumberland Road and 48 Station Road) into the Housing Delivery Programme at Gateway 0.

Reasons for decision:

In 2017, the Station Road sites were designated for mixed-use redevelopment within the adopted Site Allocations DPD 2017.

In 2023, Cabinet approved the Shaping Wood Green vision. Shaping Wood Green had been developed through extensive engagement with local communities. It identified the Station Road sites as a key placemaking area offering a major opportunity to catalyse a generational transformation of Wood Green town centre and attract new uses and investment to diversify the town centre economy, create new jobs and deliver new homes. The Council's role in delivering this change was unique given its landownership and ability to convene local stakeholders. The Station Road sites subsequently formed part of the 'Wood Green Central' site allocation (WG SA01) within the Haringey Local Plan Regulation 18 draft, which had been subject to public consultation in November and December 2025. The site allocation identified the redevelopment of this land as suitable for the creation of a new mixed-use area with tall and mid-rise buildings and a welcoming public realm, acting as a catalyst for broader transformation within Wood Green through delivering new homes, town centre and employment floorspace, community and cultural uses at ground floor level and a new green public square.

Haringey 2035 set a vision for the whole borough with six calls to action.

Redevelopment of the Station Road sites provided an opportunity for the Council to contribute to the following:

- Providing safe and affordable housing in Haringey.
- Creating thriving places, by:
 - maximising the use of existing assets,
 - creatively sharing spaces and strengthening networks, and
 - highlighting the role of green spaces to improve outcomes.

In early 2027, the Council planned to complete the refurbishment of its new Civic Centre. Once complete, the Council's corporate accommodation would relocate from

the Station Road sites into the new Civic Centre and other borough locations. This created an opportunity to realise long-standing aspirations for the Station Road sites.

The business case for the Council Office Accommodation Review (“Civic Centre Business Case”) required that the Council utilise the redundant Station Road sites to reduce current revenue spend on the sites and generate income to support the cost of the new Civic Centre.

In line with this, three corporate objectives were identified for the redevelopment of the Station Road sites:

- To develop a placemaking-led approach to enable a once-in-a-generation transformation of the town centre.
- To meet the requirements of the Civic Centre Business Case, including the financial contribution expected from redevelopment of the Station Road sites.
- To aim for no empty buildings on the Station Road sites once the Council had relocated to the Civic Centre.

Over the previous year, officers carried out extensive testing of delivery options for the redevelopment of the Station Road sites. The option appraisals identified an approach that best met the objectives by dividing the sites into a Western End and an Eastern End:

- The Western End would be brought forward for delivery by the Council’s Housing Delivery team to provide new council homes using GLA grant funding, supporting the objective to deliver 3,000 new council homes by 2031.
- The delivery route for the Eastern End would be subject to future decision-making following further work on maximising community benefits and value, potentially involving a developer partner or direct Council delivery.
- A hybrid planning application prepared by the Council would provide a detailed approval for the Western End and an outline approval for the Eastern End, establishing development principles but retaining flexibility to adapt design proposals to future market conditions.

The preferred delivery approach met several objectives, including enabling early delivery of council homes, creating opportunities for other public benefits supporting Wood Green’s economic vibrancy and retaining Council control over outcomes. While some sites might be vacant while planning was sought, the Council would seek to minimise this.

A financial contribution would also be provided to the Civic Centre refurbishment costs. On the Western End, this would occur through appropriating land from the General Fund to the Housing Revenue Account, and on the Eastern End, through a capital receipt. Although contributions were not expected to match earlier income assumptions—given changing market conditions—any shortfall could be offset through lower maintenance costs, savings in temporary accommodation, and maximising land value during design and planning. Redevelopment was therefore recommended as the best approach to maximise value and deliver placemaking aspirations.

A multi-disciplinary team needed to be appointed to provide the necessary design, commercial, planning and cost advice to prepare and submit the hybrid planning application.

If approved, the design work for the hybrid planning application would enable the Council to explore various options for town centre uses on the Station Road sites, including places for working, eating and cultural and leisure activities, aligned with the Local Plan and the Shaping Wood Green vision. The final decision on town centre uses would be made by the Planning Sub-committee, anticipated in Spring 2028.

Alternative options considered:

Do nothing

This was not an option. Once relocated to the Civic Centre, the Station Road buildings would remain a cost burden on the General Fund and the Civic Centre Business Case assumed income would be generated from the sites. The Council needed a plan for their future.

Externally lease Alexandra House, 48 Station Road and 40 Cumberland Road as office space

The Civic Centre Business Case assumed these buildings would be leased to generate rental income. River Park House was assumed to remain empty or be demolished due to high refurbishment costs. No income was expected from 38 Station Road or 5 River Park Road and its adjacent car park.

However, commercial property advice received in 2025 indicated limited demand for office space in Wood Green, particularly for lower-grade space, and that the Council would face significant void costs. Refurbishment would also be required. This option did not resolve River Park House remaining empty and incurring costs.

Dispose of the Station Road sites to the market

Direct disposal would generate a capital receipt but would not achieve placemaking or regeneration objectives. Given challenging market conditions, there was a risk of achieving low land value and of purchasers land-banking sites, leaving buildings empty for years.

Procure a development partner to develop the entire site

Although this would secure a capital receipt and meet some objectives, current market conditions made delivery timelines uncertain. This option also prevented the Housing Delivery Team from delivering council homes quickly or using available grant funding.

15. APPROVAL OF THE VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR ACTION PLAN

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved Haringey Community Collaborative's priorities for the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) for 2025–2026 (Appendix 1).
2. Approved the Council's approach to supporting the sector's delivery of these priorities through the implementation of the VCS Action Plan, while beginning work during 2026/27 to explore co-creation of a Community Strategy for Haringey (Appendix 2).

Reasons for decision

HCC's priorities (Appendix 1) had been developed through a series of engagement sessions with the VCS, building on their experience of supporting the sector over approximately the previous 18 months. Two VCS Priorities Workshops were run (in person and online), engaging 42 VCS participants and 23 statutory partners, and the borough-wide survey run by HCC had 52 organisational responses. This engagement achieved more depth and breadth than the Council would have been capable of delivering with its current resources and utilised the trusting relationship formed between HCC and the wider sector since it took on the role of capacity-building partner.

In identifying its priorities for the VCS, HCC had considered alignment with the six Calls to Action in *Haringey 2035: Our Vision*, the borough-wide vision for the next ten years, and had been explicit in highlighting the connections between the two.

The VCS Action Plan at Appendix 2 set out the work deemed necessary to support the VCS in delivering against the priorities identified by HCC.

The VCS Action Plan responded directly to the six priorities using a theory-of-change approach and noted existing work and frameworks to ensure that current knowledge, resources and relationships were utilised and duplication avoided. The actions aimed to dovetail efforts to improve relationships and governance arrangements with the VCS—such as the Social Value Leases Policy—with the needs outlined in the priorities, such as better access to community spaces to improve health and wellbeing.

The report also highlighted the emerging national framework governing relationships between the VCS and public authorities and the need for Haringey to develop a more holistic picture of the different relationships and interactions the Council held with elements of the local VCS. It outlined a strategic intention over the coming years, building on community engagement and opportunities likely to arise from, for example, the London Borough of Culture year in 2027/28, to explore the development of a broader Community Strategy for Haringey in partnership with the VCS.

Alternative options considered:

Progressing with a VCS Strategy designed and developed solely by the Council had been considered but was not recommended due to the shift in relationship being sought between the Council and the VCS under the principles of the Haringey Deal. A Council-designed strategy would have been shaped primarily by the Council's perspective, whereas the approach suggested—using HCC's VCS priorities to frame Council actions—allowed the work to be led by the needs of the VCS as described by the sector itself. A strategy-development process would also have required significant

officer resource to run adequate engagement across the Council and the VCS, which was not feasible due to current capacity constraints.

16. DOWN LANE PARK - PHASE 2A:COMMUNITY HUB - PERMISSION TO INITIATE TENDER ACTION FOR A CONSTRUCTION WORKS CONTRACT

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved, pursuant to Contract Standing Orders 2.01(b), the commencement of a tendering process for a construction works contractor to deliver the Phase 2a new hub building within Down Lane Park.

Reasons for decision:

The appointment of a Principal Contractor to take over the design and build of the project from RIBA Stage 4 was required for Phase 2a, the construction of a new community hub building as part of the Down Lane Park Improvement Scheme, which was being delivered as part of the wider Tottenham Hale regeneration programme.

This project would comprehensively upgrade Down Lane Park as a core component of the broader Tottenham Hale regeneration programme, while also addressing current challenges and issues such as anti-social behaviour. It would deliver a new vision for the park, providing a high-quality central green space at Tottenham Hale that catered for the future requirements of all residents and visitors.

Phase 2a, as part of the wider scheme, would replace the existing Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) offer currently housed in the Pavilion building, which was being demolished to make way for new sports courts in Phase 3. A purpose-built new community hub and parks depot building would be located on the former Parks Depot site and would also include a new entrance into the hub from Park View Road.

It was proposed to procure a contractor on a single-stage design-and-build form of contract using the London Construction Programme General Framework or DPS. Soft-market engagement had been undertaken to gauge interest and availability within the market, and positive feedback had been received regarding the proposed approach.

Alternative options considered:

Do nothing – The Council could have chosen not to tender the scheme. However, part of the works was funded by Section 106 contributions from surrounding developments, and not progressing would have placed this funding at risk.

In-house delivery – This was not feasible as the Council did not have the capacity, specialist expertise or qualifications required to deliver this service.
Invite open tenders via Contracts Finder – This option would have resulted in a protracted tender period and delayed project delivery.

Use an alternative public-sector DPS – This would not have complied with Contract Standing Order 8.02, given that the LCP Framework or DPS had already been deemed suitable for the requirements.

17. HARINGEY'S TOILET STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN, 2025-30

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Noted the findings from the consultation and stakeholder-engagement work and that these informed the development of the strategy and actions.
2. Approved the development and publication of the Haringey Toilet Strategy and action plan (Appendix 1).
3. Noted and thanked the contributions of residents from the Loos for Haringey group in helping identify the need for the strategy and supporting its development.

Reasons for decision:

The strategy set out twenty actions to support the continued improvement and management of toilet facilities in the borough. All actions had been reviewed and agreed by the Toilet Strategy Delivery Group, which was a cross-council officer group supported by residents from Loos for Haringey. Best-practice guidance had been sought from other teams, including equalities and diversity, to ensure that the recommendations were evidence-based.

Recommendations were developed around the five strategic priorities in the strategy to address key cross-cutting issues:

- Location of public toilets and gaps in provision
- Planning and transport
- Safety and hygiene
- Inclusive access
- Communication and signage

By approving the Haringey Toilet Strategy, the Council aimed to:

- Improve the overall standard of existing and planned toilets in Haringey, particularly in Tottenham and the east of the borough where “loo deserts” existed.
- Address gaps in toilet provision to ensure future facilities were suitably located in areas of greatest need, such as parks, green spaces and shopping centres.

- Ensure integration of toilet provision into the Council's wider planning and transport agenda, for example through the new Local Plan for Haringey and through links with key organisations such as Transport for London and the NHS.
- Provide more inclusive access for user groups with diverse needs, including older residents, people with long-term conditions and parents/families.
- Improve the provision of Changing Places facilities for people with multiple and complex disabilities.
- Help tackle wider public-health issues such as loneliness and social isolation, where some people felt unable to leave their homes due to a lack of adequate facilities.
- Improve safety and address anti-social behaviour, including graffiti and street urination, where these had been identified as concerns.
- Support the objectives set out in key plans and strategies such as *Haringey 2035 – Our Vision*, to create a thriving place and tackle inequalities in health and wellbeing.

Alternative options considered:

Do nothing: leaving toilet facilities as they were. This was not considered a feasible option because:

- A lack of accessible and clean facilities risked worsening public-health issues such as loneliness and social isolation, as some residents might have chosen not to leave their homes due to insufficient facilities.
- Clean and accessible toilet facilities were crucial for economically successful and inclusive high streets across Haringey.

18. HIGH ROAD WEST - NEXT STEPS

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the commencement of a procurement exercise in accordance with Contract Standing Order (CSO) 2.01(b) for the new-build development of 61 council homes at High Road West, Phase 1A, for the anticipated total contract sum set out in the exempt report.
2. Delegated the appropriate route to market for High Road West, Phase 1A to the Chief Procurement Officer in compliance with the Council's Contract Standing Orders.

Reasons for decision:

These recommendations enabled the re-commencement of the Scheme and facilitated the rehousing of residents on the Love Lane Estate into new permanent homes within the Scheme, in line with the commitments set out in the Love Lane Landlord Offer, which had been the subject of a positive resident ballot. The Council

utilised Affordable Housing Grant funding from the Greater London Authority (GLA), already drawn down for the delivery of Phase 1A, helping it meet the milestones within those agreements. These steps created momentum and resulted in meaningful progress on site while work with Lendlease to agree a route forward on subsequent phases continued, with the aim that these would follow the delivery of Phase 1A.

Phase 1A provided 61 council homes on Council-owned land, including M4(3) wheelchair homes and family homes, along with associated refuse stores, cycle stores, service space, amenity space and landscaping. The council homes had been developed with Love Lane residents through engagement dating back to 2018. The site was granted detailed planning permission in August 2022 as part of the hybrid planning application for the Scheme (planning reference HGY/2021/3175), and a subsequent Non-Material Amendment application was approved in July 2023 (planning reference HGY/2022/3937).

Financial appraisals supported by an independent cost consultant demonstrated that the Phase 1A scheme was viable for delivery by the Council and that value for money could be achieved via the procurement route described in the report.

Under the Council's Contract Standing Orders, item 2.01(b) required Cabinet approval to commence a procurement exercise for proposed contracts valued at £500k or above. The works contract for Phase 1A included the construction of the 61 new-build council homes and the demolition of the existing 100 Whitehall Street building (also known as Whitehall Lodge and located within the Phase 1A red line boundary), which was a Council-owned emergency-accommodation hostel and was due to be decommissioned prior to redevelopment.

The Phase 1A works contract was also planned to include the demolition of the 2–32 Whitehall Street residential block, part of the Love Lane Estate. This block was nearly vacated, and the Council's rehousing team were working with tenants to relocate households into alternative accommodation within the estate prior to the completion of the new permanent homes at Phase 1A. Demolition of the empty block would improve the environment for residents on the estate and offer opportunities for temporary uses on the site prior to development, benefiting the local community.

Alternative options considered:

Not to proceed with direct delivery of Phase 1A

The Council could have chosen not to proceed with direct delivery of Phase 1A, following the removal of the site from the Development Agreement with Lendlease. However, this option would have meant that there was no route to delivering a 100% council-home scheme that had already secured detailed planning permission and would have enabled the rehousing of around half of Love Lane residents. This would have resulted in further delays to meeting commitments in the Landlord Offer.

Although this option would have allowed the Council to retain 100 Whitehall Street as emergency accommodation, it would have left a site that had been partially demolished and was experiencing issues with anti-social behaviour. The existing Whitehall Lodge building would also have required significant investment to continue operating in the medium and long term. The provision of emergency accommodation

would instead be met at alternative sites in the borough if Phase 1A were delivered. For these reasons, this option was discounted.

19. POLICY UPDATE ON SCHOOLS IN FINANCIAL DIFFICULTY

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the revised Scheme of Financial Regulations and Standing Orders for Schools.
2. Approved the introduction of the £25,000 spending limit control for schools in financial difficulty or schools in Deficit.

Reasons for decision:

The Schools in Financial Difficulty policy has not been updated for a considerable period of time. The attached document revises and updates the regulations and standing orders in line with current Department for Education (DfE) guidance. The updated policy will support schools and the Local Authority to work collaboratively to address and reduce structural deficits.

The role of the Scheme is to set out the financial relationship between the Local Authority and the maintained schools it funds. It describes the requirements relating to financial management and associated processes, and it is binding on both the Local Authority and the schools. The Scheme ensures clarity around responsibilities, decision making, and the standards expected in the management of public funds.

Alternative options considered:

No other options considered as preparation and publication of the Scheme for Financing Schools is a statutory requirement with which local authorities must comply.

20. PRIDE IN PLACE FUNDING

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST MADE FOR THIS ITEM:

None

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the acceptance of grant of £1.5m from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in accordance with Contract Standing

Order (CSO) 21.01, which required Cabinet approval to accept third-party grants of £500,000 and above.

2. Approved the increased the approved General Fund capital programme by £1.5m to deliver the schemes set out in section 6 of the report.
3. Delegated authority to the Corporate Director of Culture, Strategy and Communities to vary the schemes and budgets within the overall grant received.

Reasons for decision:

This investment provided a unique opportunity for the Council to deliver not only on its own corporate priorities but also on the priorities of local people and stakeholders. These priorities had been identified and developed through extensive engagement as part of Shaping Tottenham and Shaping Wood Green, in alignment with the principles outlined within the Haringey Deal.

Alongside physical improvements across the borough, delivering against these priorities built on previous engagement, strengthened relationships between the Council and local people, amplified the needs and voices of seldom-heard communities and enhanced civic pride across the borough.

Approval to accept the grant enabled the Council to begin project delivery and start spending the allocated funding. As the funding carried a spend deadline of March 2027, it was essential that expenditure commenced as soon as possible to ensure that the deadline could be met.

It was likely that unspent funds would need to be repaid to the funder, and approval to accept the funding in February 2026 reduced the risk of this occurring in March 2027.

The first tranche of funding had been received in October 2025 when the Memorandum of Understanding was signed and was being held in a holding account. Approval to accept the grant enabled the funds to be allocated to the relevant project areas so that expenditure could begin.

The allocation against each project was indicative at this stage, and project proposals were high-level and subject to further scoping and refinement. Delegating authority to the Corporate Director of Culture, Strategy and Communities to vary the schemes and budgets within the overall grant allowed any required changes to be made as more detailed information emerged during the process of project refinement.

Alternative options considered:

Do nothing – This option would have resulted in the funding being repaid to MHCLG. The shortlisted projects would not have been delivered, and the opportunity to deliver Council and stakeholder priorities would have been lost.

Make a decision at a later date – The MHCLG funding carried a spend deadline of March 2027. Although shortlisted projects were pre-selected partly on the basis that

they could be delivered within this timeframe, a Cabinet decision in February 2026 was required to mitigate the risk of delays and ensure the deadline could be met.

Fund projects using Council borrowing – The Council was not in a financial position to fund these projects itself. Delivery was contingent on receiving grant funding from MHCLG's Pride in Place programme.