

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2007**

Councillors \*Meehan (Chair), \*Reith (Vice-Chair), \*Adje, Amin, \*Basu, \*Canver, \*Diakides, \*Haley, \*B. Harris and \*Santry

\*Present

Also Present: Councillors Engert, Newton and Williams

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
<b>CAB64.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (Agenda Item 1)  An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillor Amin.	
<b>CAB65.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b> (Agenda Item 3)  A declaration of interest was made by Councillor Santry in respect of agenda item 15 – Homes for Haringey Performance Report April – August 2007 (see Minute CAB.76 below).	HLDMS
<b>CAB66.</b>	<b>MINUTES</b> (Agenda Item 4)  <b>RESOLVED:</b>  That, subject to the substitution of the words ‘net overspend of £0.4 million’ for ‘net balanced position’ in the preamble to Minute CAB 49, the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 18 September 2007 be confirmed and signed.	HLDMS
<b>CAB67.</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS</b> (Agenda Item 5)  <u>Haringey Children’s Centres</u>  We received a deputation the spokesperson of which, Alana Bates, addressed our meeting and referred to the decision taken by the Cabinet on 17 July 2007 to begin a tendering process for 5 of Haringey’s Children’s Centres to be outsourced to an independent body. She advised that the deputation would like to represent parents and concerned residents by raising the following points which were contained in their written submission :  1. What consultation was made with parents and staff at the Centres as to whether they thought this would be conducive to providing better services for parents and children in the Borough? (The report “Children’s Centres – Sustaining and Developing the Provision” that went to the Cabinet in July stated that considerable consultation had taken place with a range of stakeholders.)  2. In his speech at the launch of the International Centre for Study of the Mixed Economy of Childcare (UEL, September 10, 2007) Stephen Timms MP made reference to the Childcare Act:	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2007**

“The Act goes further. It contains provisions – in section 8 (3), coming into force next month – to restrict the ability of local authorities to set up their own childcare in competition with existing good PVI provision.

That doesn't mean that, as of next month, local authorities have to decommission their existing provision. Section 8 (3) only applies to new or expanding childcare. What it does mean is that when a local authority decides that there is a need for new or expanded provision, it should establish the willingness and ability of alternative organisations to provide the services, independently or under contract. If no alternative providers are available, or if – after carrying out an appropriate tendering exercise – it is considered appropriate, the local authority may provide childcare directly.”

Taking this statement into account, plus the fact that the Council had spent millions of pounds on new Children's Centres which were working to an excellent standard, why had the Council decided to directly contradict the statement and the sentiments expressed in it?

3. The Children and Young Peoples Service had employed a consultant to undertake the consultation regarding the outsourcing project. At a parent's network meeting she stated that she was the Chair of the organisation 4 Children. As 4 Children was one of the organisations that might well be invited to bid for the running of the Children's Centres, was this not a direct conflict of interests which Councillors should be raising in terms of the Council's Financial Regulations on tendering processes?
4. If our Children's Centres were run by a business or private company how could it be guaranteed that free services to parents, like the mother and baby groups, health visitor drop-ins and ante-natal classes, would continue to run as free services available to everyone? Could it be guaranteed that childcare costs would not rise to excessive and unaffordable levels? How could it be guaranteed that the excellent staff who were currently running the centres would not be replaced with cheaper, less experienced staff?
5. If our Children's Centres were run by a charitable organisation how could funding be guaranteed to sustain the levels of provision and expand the support available to all parents?
6. What provision could be guaranteed for children or families with special needs if the Centres were outsourced?
7. It appeared that the Council were not taking into account the socio-economic status of it's residents.
8. Privatisation and closure of baby groups could result in isolation of mothers; had the Council considered the impact of this on health issues such as post natal depression?

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2007**

In conclusion, the deputation indicated they were opposed to the proposal to privatise the Children's Centres and requested that the Cabinet reviewed its decision to push ahead with this plan. They believed it was not conducive to ensuring the much needed support and care needed to bring up our children in a healthy, supportive community.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People responded and welcomed the opportunity to speak with the deputation on this issue and to correct the many inaccuracies that had been made so far in the work that was going on. She stated that there was no intention to privatise the five Council-run Children's Centres and no decision had been made to engage with any other partners at this stage.

She expressed her pleasure that Haringey had 10 Children's Centres up and running and was developing a further 8 Centres to be opened by March 2008. The services that these Centres provided was crucial to supporting families in the community and working to give children the best start in life.

The report approved by the Cabinet in July had commenced a process to examine and review the five Council-run Children's Centres and to look at potential options to work in partnership with other not for profit and voluntary organisations, including schools and other children's centres, but not private sector providers, to see whether this would add value to the work that was taking place.

The Childcare Act (2006) made clear an expectation that local authorities should no longer be the sole provider of childcare and other services and rather should look to increasingly take on a commissioning role. This of course did not mean that local authorities did not have any role in providing services but it was good practice to review the services that they offered to ensure that they were providing good value and the right choice for the local community and this was exactly what was being done.

The Council was taking a planned phased approach to this work beginning with reviewing what was done in its Children's Centres, including whether the range of services children, parents and communities needed were being provided, whether the most vulnerable families were being reached, whether the Centres were being made financially sustainable and whether the Council could work with new partners to improve what was being done. It also involved speaking with other local authorities who had gone down this route to understand their experiences.

There had been no formal consultation with parents and staff because no decision had been taken to engage with another partner for one or more of the Centres. However, a letter had been sent out via the Centres to all staff, parents and stakeholders on 17 September informing them of the work of the project and meetings that had taken place with all Centre Heads, the Children's Centres Parents Forum, Unison and those which were planned with the Primary Care Trust and others. If a

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2007**

	<p>decision was taken to engage with another partner at whatever level there would be stakeholder engagement and consultation but the Council were not yet at this stage.</p> <p>All this work would need to take place before any decision was taken to approach potential partners. This whole process would take some time and the Council would consult all interested parties throughout the process as it developed further. A copy of responses to the specific points contained in their written submission was passed to the deputation and our Chair thanked Ms Bates and the other members of the deputation for their attendance.</p>	
<p><b>CAB68.</b></p>	<p><b>PROGRAMME HIGHLIGHT REPORT - END AUGUST 2007</b> (Report of the Chief Executive - Agenda Item 7):</p> <p>Arising from consideration of Section 12.2 of the report – Regeneration Stream Board attention was drawn to the apparent anomaly between paragraph 12.2.2 which stated that seven of the ten European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) projects were now complete and the remainder would be completed by 30 November 2007, and paragraph 12.2.4 which stated that the AMBER status at the end of August which reflected a small percentage of unallocated grant money (£50,000 against an overall ERDF grant allocation of £1.927m) and a possible claw back due to a shortfall in output targets.</p> <p>We noted that although the overall status of the Primary Schools Capital Programme remained amber, it was now hoped that the Tetherdown and Coleridge projects could be completed on time and an update on this Programme would be provided in the next monthly monitoring report. We also noted that the question relating to the anticipated costs of the Campsbourne landscaping project within the Better Haringey Estates Improvement Programme had now been resolved.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">That the report and progress against the Corporate Programmes as shown in Appendix 1 to the interleaved report be noted.</p>	
<p><b>CAB69.</b></p>	<p><b>THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE - AUGUST 2007</b> (Joint Report of the Chief Executive and the Acting Director of Finance - Agenda Item 8):</p> <p>We noted that performance continued to improve across the Council with 85% of measures meeting or being close to achieving target.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the report and the progress against Council priorities as shown in the Appendix thereto be noted.</li> <li>2. That approval be granted to the virements as set out in Section 21.5 of the interleaved report.</li> </ol>	<p>ADF</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2007**

<p><b>CAB70.</b></p>	<p><b>CABINET RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY REVIEW OF IT SERVICES PROJECT MANAGEMENT</b> (Report of the Director of Corporate Services - Agenda Item 9):</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the recommendations made in the Scrutiny Review of IT Services project management be noted as they further supported the project management improvement initiatives already under consideration by IT Services and other central Council functions.</li> <li>2. That IT Services, working in conjunction with other relevant Council departments, be directed to factor the recommendations contained in the Scrutiny Review into the development of the initiatives already under consideration.</li> <li>3. That IT Services, working in conjunction with its Council project customers, be directed to reconsider the benefits and realisation plans of existing key projects, re-defining them as necessary to allow them to be meaningfully assessed as part of the recommended post-implementation reviews.</li> </ol>	<p>DCS</p> <p>DCS</p>
<p><b>CAB71.</b></p>	<p><b>ADMISSIONS TO SCHOOLS - APPROVAL TO CONSULT</b> (Report of the Director of the Children and Young People's Service - Agenda Item 10):</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That approval be granted to the proposed admission arrangements for consultation for all community primary and secondary schools and St Aidan's Voluntary Controlled Primary School as set out in the interleaved report.</li> <li>2. That approval be granted to the proposed admission arrangements for consultation for sixth form provision in Alexandra Park School, the Highgate/Hornsey Consortium and the Sixth Form Centre as set out in the interleaved report .</li> <li>3. That approval be granted to the proposed consultation for Qualifying Schemes for the co-ordination of arrangements for admission to reception classes in all maintained primary and secondary schools in Haringey as set out in the interleaved report and it be noted that at secondary level, this entailed the Council's continued participation in the Pan-London Scheme.</li> </ol>	<p>DCYPS</p> <p>DCYPS</p> <p>DCYPS</p>
<p><b>CAB72.</b></p>	<p><b>DRAFT LAWRENCE ROAD PLANNING BRIEF (SPD) &amp; SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</b> (Report of the Director of Urban Environment - Agenda Item 11):</p> <p>In response to a question about public open space provision, we were informed that the depth of concern felt by residents of the area was appreciated as evidenced by the second bullet point in paragraph 11.7 of</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2007**

	<p>the interleaved report and Section 5.11 of the Brief. Officers would seek to use opportunities, where appropriate planning obligations, to increase the provision of public open space including by extending the existing public open space at Elizabeth Place Park or by creating new open space elsewhere within or near the planning brief site.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the proposed amendments to the Draft Lawrence Road Planning Brief be noted.</li> <li>2. That the amended Brief and accompanying Sustainability Appraisal be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</li> </ol>	DUE
CAB73.	<p><b>DEVELOPMENT OF THE UPPER LEE VISION NORTH LONDON'S WATERSIDE</b> (Report of the Director of Urban Environment - Agenda Item 12):</p> <p>Arising from consideration of Section 14 of the report – Transport Improvements – while support was expressed for the proposed 4 tracking of the West Anglia Route using the existing track bed, concern was also voiced about the possible implications this might have for the Northumberland Park area which would in effect be split into two by the upgrade and we asked that this disquiet be reported back for consideration.</p> <p>In response to questions about existing arrangements, contracts, European funding programmes, and member involvement we noted that the proposed new partnership would work under the direction of the Leaders' Forum which would comprise the Leaders and the Cabinet Members for Enterprise and Regeneration from each of the 3 boroughs. The other issues raised would be addressed in a report on Urban Futures which would be submitted later in the year.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the vision for the Upper Lee Valley as set out in the interleaved report be endorsed in order to guide the approach to that area.</li> <li>2. That approval be granted to participation in the co-ordinating structure as proposed in the interleaved report including the funding arrangements set out in paragraph 16.1 thereof.</li> <li>3. That it be noted that a further report on the details of the structures outlined in the interleaved report would be dealt with using the Council's normal decision taking processes.</li> <li>4. That approval be granted to the Council's withdrawal from the Upper Lee Valley Board and the local economic partnership.</li> </ol>	<p>DUE</p> <p>DUE</p> <p>DUE</p> <p>DUE</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2007**

<p><b>CAB74.</b></p>	<p><b>HARINGEY'S GREENEST BOROUGH STRATEGY</b> (Report of the Director of Urban Environment - Agenda Item 13):</p> <p>On considering the report we commended the officers who had been involved in its preparation. Our attention was drawn to the comments of the Acting Director of Finance in Section 4 of the report and in particular to the need for the strategy to be aligned with the Council's financial and business planning framework, so that any emerging actions could be considered as part of these processes. We noted that identifying and maximising external funding for greening the Borough had to be a priority.</p> <p>Reference was made to the Sustainable Haringey Group, a borough-wide coalition of community groups and local residents committed to securing a sustainable future, which had already submitted comments on the report and Strategy and we asked that officers take the points made in the submission fully into consideration.</p> <p>Reference was also made to the question of climate change which was felt to cross cut a number the key priorities set out in paragraph 7.3. Although mention was made of the need for action to tackle climate change consideration should be given to highlighting the Council's commitment in this respect in the light of the responses received to the impending consultation procedure.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the context for the development of Haringey's Greenest Borough Strategy (Draft) be noted.</li> <li>2. That approval be granted to the vision and scope of the key priorities for Haringey's Greenest Borough Strategy (Draft) as summarised in paragraph 7 of the interleaved report.</li> <li>3. That approval be granted to the proposals to go out to full consultation on the Strategy (appended), as set out in paragraph 10.3 of the interleaved report.</li> <li>4. That following conclusion of consultation, the final strategy be re-submitted together with an action plan for approval, prior to submission to the Full Council for adoption in the spring of 2008.</li> </ol>	<p>DUE</p> <p>DUE</p> <p>DUE</p> <p>DUE</p>
<p><b>CAB75.</b></p>	<p><b>CABINET RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY REVIEW OF IMPROVING ROAD SAFETY IN HARINGEY</b> (Report of the Director of Urban Environment - Agenda Item 14):</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the Scrutiny Review on Improving Road Safety in Haringey be noted.</li> <li>2. That approval be granted to the proposed response to the Review</li> </ol>	<p>DUE</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2007**

	as set out in the interleaved report and to the Action Plan as set out as an Appendix thereto.	
<b>CAB76.</b>	<p><b>HOMES FOR HARINGEY PERFORMANCE REPORT APRIL - AUGUST 2007</b> (Report of the Director of Urban Environment - Agenda Item 15):</p> <p>Councillor Santry declared a personal interest in this item by virtue of having been a member of the Homes for Haringey Board for the period covered by the report.</p> <p>Our attention having been drawn to the concern about the rent collection rate and the danger of arrears becoming un-collectable, we were informed that Homes for Haringey had put in place several action plans to address the increase in rent arrears and the recommendations in the recent Audit Commission inspection.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	HLDMS
<b>CAB77.</b>	<p><b>URGENT ACTIONS TAKEN IN CONSULTATION WITH CABINET MEMBERS</b> (Report of the Chief Executive - Agenda Item 16):</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That the report be noted and any necessary action approved.</p>	
<b>CAB78.</b>	<p><b>MINUTES OF SUB-BODIES</b> (Agenda Item 17):</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That the minutes of the Procurement Committee held on 18 September 2007 be noted and any necessary action approved</p>	
<b>CAB79.</b>	<p><b>NEW ITEM OF URGENT BUSINESS – I15 TOWER GARDENS ROAD, COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER</b> (Report of the Director of Urban Environment - Agenda Item 15):</p> <p>Our Chair agreed to accept the report as urgent business. The report was late because of the need to obtain the correct plan. The report was too urgent to await the next meeting because the decision of the Cabinet in relation to this matter was subject to confirmation at the meeting to which these minutes relate.</p> <p>We noted that while the substantive report on this matter which we considered at our meeting on 18 September had been correct the wrong plan had been attached.</p> <p>Concern having been concerned at the state of the property, we asked that officers take all appropriate action including use of health and safety powers to make it secure.</p>	



**MINUTES OF THE CABINET  
TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2007**

	<p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That approval be granted to the use of compulsory purchase powers to acquire the property known as 115 Tower Gardens Road, Haringey, London N17 (shown edged red on Plan No. NGL379049) compulsorily under section 17 of the Housing Act 1985 and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981.</li> <li>2. That the Head of Legal Services be authorised to make and seal the Order for submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for consideration and approval and to confirm the said Compulsory Purchase Order in the event of the Secretary of State returning the Order.</li> <li>3. That upon confirmation of the Compulsory Purchase Order to proceed with the acquisition.</li> <li>4. That, subject the confirmation of the Compulsory Purchase Orders by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government or the Council, approval also be granted to the disposal of the property to a Registered Social Landlord in the first instance, or to a Private Developer (in which case the sale would be by way of auction) with covenants applied to bring the property back into use as soon as possible.</li> <li>5. That a capital provision of £200,000 be approved from capital receipts, to fund the purchase of this property and this sum be repaid once the sale has been executed.</li> </ol>	<p>DUE</p> <p>HLS</p> <p>DUE/ HLS</p> <p>DUE/ HLS</p> <p>DUE/ ADF</p>
<p><b>CAB80.</b></p>	<p><b>MINUTES</b> (Agenda Item 20):</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That the exempt minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 18 September 2007 be confirmed and signed.</p>	<p>HLDMS</p>

GEORGE MEEHAN  
Chair