

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

Councillors Griffith (Mayor), Adamou, Allison, Amin, Basu, Beacham, Bevan, Bloch, Brabazon, Browne, Bull, Butcher, Canver, Christophides, Cooke, Davies, Demirci, Dogus, Egan, Ejiofor, Engert, Erskine, Gibson, Goldberg, Gorrie, Hare, Jenks, Khan, Kober, Mallett, McNamara, Meehan, Newton, Peacock, Reece, Reid, Reith, Rice, Scott, Solomon, Stanton, Stennett, Stewart, Strang, Strickland, Vanier, Waters, Watson, Weber, Whyte, Williams, Wilson and Winskill

Apologies Councillor Adje, Alexander, Diakides and Schmitz

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
CNCL74.	<p>DELAYED START OF MEETING</p> <p>Due to a public disturbance, the start of the meeting was delayed until 9pm.</p>	
CNCL75.	<p>TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Adje, Alexandra, Diakides, and Schmitz.</p>	
CNCL76.	<p>TO ASK THE MAYOR TO CONSIDER THE ADMISSION OF ANY LATE ITEMS OF BUSINESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 100B OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972</p> <p>See Minutes 84 & 90.</p>	
CNCL77.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>The Chief Executive advised of the following advance notice of declarations of interests:</p> <p>Councillor Davies declared a personal interest in Items 12 & 13 as he was an employee of the housing charity – Shelter, and his partner was a Chair of Governors at a Primary School in Haringey, and a prejudicial interest in Item 16 Motion T as he was employee of the housing charity – Shelter.</p> <p>Councillors Reith and Winskill declared personal interests in Item 13 as Haringey Leaseholders.</p> <p>Councillor Strang declared a prejudicial interest in Item 16 Motion R as an Employee of Transport for London.</p> <p>Councillor Engert declared a prejudicial interest in Item 16 Motion R as a</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

	<p>Board Member of London Travel Watch which came under the Greater London Assembly.</p> <p>Councillors Adamou, Basu, Brabazon ,Egan, Engert, Griffith, Jenks, Khan, Meehan, Peacock, Rice, Scott, Stanton, Vanier and Waters declared an interest in Item 12 as they were Freedom Pass Holders.</p>	
CNCL78.	<p>TO ASK MEMBERS WHETHER THEY NEED TO MAKE A DECLARATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 106 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE ACT 1992 IN RELATION TO UNPAID COMMUNITY CHARGE OR COUNCIL TAX LIABILITY WHICH IS TWO MONTHS OR MORE OUTSTANDING.</p> <p>Members were reminded of the need to consider whether they needed to make a declaration in accordance with Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 in relation to unpaid community charge or council tax liability which was two months or more outstanding.</p> <p>No such declarations were made.</p>	
CNCL79.	<p>TO APPROVE AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 17 JANUARY 2011 RESOLVED:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 17 January 2011 be signed as a true record.</p>	
CNCL80.	<p>TO RECEIVE SUCH COMMUNICATIONS AS THE MAYOR MAY LAY BEFORE THE COUNCIL</p> <p>Item not considered</p>	
CNCL81.	<p>TO CONSIDER A "STATE OF THE BOROUGH" REPORT BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council, Councillor Claire Kober, gave the following "State of the Borough" address:</p> <p>Mr Mayor, the state of the borough is typically an occasion to reflect on the successes of the past year, and consider the opportunities for the one ahead and how together as 'one borough' we will grow.</p> <p>But I approach this year's address lacking the positivity that typically marks the occasion. That is not to say that we have lost our way or forgotten our vision but rather that the scale of the challenges before us clouds almost everything we are striving for.</p> <p>Earlier this week I was thinking about my speech this evening and pulled out the previous two state of the borough addresses I have made. What struck me was the things that I'd trumpeted on previous occasions, things that we could rightly be proud of:</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

The Decent Homes programme - £200 million pounds of investment in our housing stock, giving tenants the dignity that comes from a refurbished home. More than new kitchens, bathrooms, windows and roofs, the programme gave families a renewed sense of optimism in the circumstances and futures.

And what of the Decent Homes programme today? Before Christmas the Tory led coalition government announced a 75 per cent reduction in the programme. Nothing short of decimation. And despite the hard work of our officers, which has seen Haringey receive the highest allocation in London, our allocation is reduced by £50 million pounds – 25 per cent of the value of the entire Haringey programme – in the next two years alone. As ward councillors we all know how vital these works are, and our tenants have been promised that they will go ahead. They have been badly let down by this government.

Last year I spoke with pride of the Future Jobs Fund bringing 221 real jobs to the borough – for young people struggling to get a foothold on the employment ladder and those who had been unemployed for more than six months. Over the last year I've met tens of Future Jobs Fund workers – in the council, and in the community. Each of them has been doing valuable work, making a real contribution while in many cases gaining back the self confidence that can be badly knocked when you're out of the job market.

But in a move that echoes previous Tory administrations, the government has deemed the programme to be unaffordable. They believe, as they always have done, that unemployment is a price worth paying.

The result? One million young people out of work. The utter waste of human talent. And the economic bankruptcy of an approach that says it's preferable to have young people on the dole queue than in work, paying taxes. Nothing short of a national scandal.

I also spoke about the brilliant success of our schools in driving up pupil achievement, closing the national attainment gap and doing so in buildings that were being transformed as part of £212 million investment in the building schools for the future programme. Another programme that the coalition government has brought to an abrupt halt through a series of botched, inaccurate announcements in the House of Commons. No consultation, no negotiation, the programme scrapped and with it the belief that our young people deserve to be taught in the very best facilities we can provide. Even a high court judge deemed the decision, and I quote, 'so unfair as to amount to an abuse of power'.

Thankfully we have been spared these abuses of power. We had managed to get our schools into an earlier wave of the programme. Our work was completed. In September we opened Heartlands, a new co-ed community school in the heart of our borough. It may be one of the last of its kind following the government's recent pronouncement that all new

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

schools will have to be either academies or faith schools.

I've spoken about pupil attainment. Another considerable success of recent years has been the massive reduction we've achieved in young people not in education, employment or training. A key aspect of this success was the Educational Maintenance Allowance, a payment of £30 a week to young people from disadvantaged backgrounds who committed to staying on in education.

The decision to axe the EMA has not received as much attention as the massive hike in tuition fees but don't think for a moment that it won't have a devastating effect in our borough. At the college of north east London 3,300 learners received the EMA; 2,800 qualified for the full £30 a week.

The majority of students spend this money on food, or often to help out their families, and travel. But from September that money is gone. Axed. £3.5 million pounds from the pockets of young people in low income families. And if that was not bad enough the government has also slashed the colleges welfare fund by 80 per cent – from £2 million to just £400,000.

Mr Mayor, as I believe these examples demonstrate, we face some of the toughest times ever seen in our borough. Health, the police, the fire service and the voluntary sector all face swingeing cuts.

The response from the government is the rhetoric of the big society – that charities and volunteers will step in to fill the breach left by the state. But this neglects the fact that the funders of the voluntary sector are the very organisations – local councils, health authorities and police services – that are facing huge cuts to their budgets.

And on top of this we are seeing draconian changes to our benefits system – over £18 billion pounds of the deficit reduction strategy is based on reducing benefits to those on low incomes. It is the case that the poor and the vulnerable of our country are paying the price for failure in the global financial markets. How can anyone claim that we are all in this together?

The cumulative effect on the borough is difficult to gauge but I am sure will be nothing short of devastating. In cash terms we know it's over a third of a billion pounds. This though will not capture the profound and disastrous social impact on communities across Haringey.

Let me be clear:

- These cuts will have an undoubted impact on all frontline council services, including care services to the vulnerable.
- Rather than assist the country's recovery in a way that can protect local economies and the frontline, the cuts are so structured that they will do the opposite.

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

- Instead of chastising and denigrating local authorities through the media, the Government should deploy all its efforts to help councils minimise the impact on vulnerable communities and frontline services.

Not my words but the words of 90 Liberal Democrat group leaders in a letter to the Times earlier this month. The letter was signed by a number of group leaders in London including the Lib Dem leaders in Islington, Waltham Forest, Barnet and Lewisham. But not the leader in Haringey.

Instead, at council meeting after council meeting, all we've heard from the benches opposite is a defence of the speed and depth of the government's cuts.

Eric Pickles little helpers.

Only too happy to support the dogmatic ideology which lies at the heart of this coalition government's attempt to dismantle public provision.

And the MP for Hornsey and Wood Green, who is busy designing petitions against service closures when she isn't voting in the Tory lobby for the obliteration of public provision, has shared with us her words of wisdom.

She's currently circulating an email to local people telling us that the Liberal Democrats in Haringey are extremely concerned about some of the cuts. Well not concerned enough to vote against them, or sign up to a letter in the Times against them.

Her email goes on to justify the speed of the government's spending cuts, repeats the lie that our funding has been reduced by 7.9 per cent when independent observers accept its 13 per cent. She even trumpets the freedoms that we've been given with funding ringfences having been removed. It beggars belief.

But our local MP has underestimated the public she serves. Scores of people in Hornsey and Wood Green are aghast at this gross hypocrisy being attempted in their name. Let us be absolutely clear, to the Minister for Equalities and members opposite - this is your government, these are your cuts.

Mr Mayor I would like to make clear I am incredibly proud of the successes of the Council in recent years, reductions in poverty, improvements in educational attainment, and a rise in employment. Within the economic constraints I have outlined, my aspirations and ambitions as Leader of this Council are undeterred. I remain committed to One Borough One Future, our ambition for tackling inequality and developing a better society for our residents to live, thrive and work.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke in response.

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

	<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the Leader of the Council's "State of the Borough" report be received and agreed.</p>	
<p>CNCL82.</p>	<p>TO RECEIVE THE REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE ON "RETHINKING HARINGEY"</p> <p>The Chief Executive reported proposals to re-organise the top three tiers of staff within the Council, as detailed in the circulated report entitled "Rethinking Haringey".</p> <p>The Chief Executive advised that resulting from the re-organisation it would be necessary to reallocate some of the officer delegated powers so that they reflect the new structure, which would require express authorisation to effect the change. A "Reallocation Schedule" would be prepared for sign off and it was therefore suggested that an additional recommendation be added to the report to effect this, as follows:</p> <p>3.3" That, arising from the adoption of these recommendations, (i) Members note that the Leader will approve, with respect to "executive-side" functions, a schedule reallocating all existing powers delegated to officers to be added to Appendix E to the Council's Constitution and (ii) Members agree that the Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer be delegated authority to approve the same schedule with respect to "non-executive-side" functions."</p> <p>Councillor Kober moved the resolution as set out below and it was:</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. That the proposals attached at appendix one of the report to restructure the top three tiers of Council staff be noted, and that subject to any significant amendments arising from consultation, that the proposals be implemented.2. That the consultation with staff taking place during February 2011 be noted and that should any amendments other than minor administrative changes arise, that it be agreed that General Purposes Committee consider and approve the staffing structure.3. That, arising from the adoption of resolutions (i) and (ii), that it be noted that the Leader will approve, with respect to "executive-side" functions a schedule reallocating all existing powers delegated to officers to be added to Appendix E to the Council's Constitution and that authority be delegated to the Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer to approve the same schedule with respect to "non-executive-side" functions.	
<p>CNCL83.</p>	<p>TO RECEIVE THE REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER AND HEAD OF LEGAL SERVICES</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

	<p>There were no matters to consider.</p>	
<p>CNCL84.</p>	<p>TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES</p> <p>The Mayor agreed to admit the report as urgent business. The report could not be circulated earlier as information was awaited from Party Groups. The report was urgent to permit changes to be made to outside body memberships.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">That appointments to outside bodies as set out in the attached Appendix 1 be approved.</p>	
<p>CNCL85.</p>	<p>TO CONSIDER REQUESTS TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS AND/OR PETITIONS AND, IF APPROVED, TO RECEIVE THEM</p> <p>There were three deputations to address the meeting.</p> <p>The first deputation was received from Dave Morris of Haringey Alliance for Public Services.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Members asked questions of the deputation and received responses thereto.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The Leader of the Council responded to the deputation.</p> <p>The second deputation was received from Symeon Brown - Save Haringey Youth Centres.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Members asked questions of the deputation and received responses thereto.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Councillor Reith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services responded to the deputation.</p> <p>The third deputation was received from Funmi Abari - Haringey Youth Council.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Members asked questions of the deputation and received responses thereto.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Councillor Reith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services responded to the deputation.</p> <p>The Mayor thanked the deputations for attending.</p>	
<p>CNCL86.</p>	<p>SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 7</p> <p>The meeting agreed to suspend Council Procedure Rule 7 to permit the</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

	<p>meeting to continue beyond 10pm, due to the earlier disruption and consequential late start.</p>	
<p>CNCL87.</p>	<p>TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM THE FOLLOWING BODIES</p> <p>A. Cabinet Reports 7 and 8 - 2010/11</p> <p>Councillor Kober introduced Cabinet Reports 7 and 8- 2010/11 – Medium Term Financial Planning 2011/12 to 2013/14, and moved the recommendations contained therein, noting the earlier debate on the ‘state of the borough’. Councillor Goldberg seconded.</p> <p>Councillor Gorrie, seconded by Councillor Wilson moved the following 5 budget amendments:</p> <p>BUDGET AMENDMENT 1</p> <p><u>Action on Crime</u></p> <p>The Council’s budget consultation showed that crime was the biggest concern among local residents. The Labour budget proposes cuts to anti-crime initiatives such as funding for police overtime used to tackle high priority targets and local crime fighting projects. The Labour budget cuts funding for Metropolitan Police cover in Haringey’s parks and volunteers for British Trust for Conservation Volunteers. Overall these come to £400,000.</p> <p>Liberal Democrats consider action on crime to be a priority and therefore propose reversing Labour’s cuts to the front-line community safety budget. Liberal Democrats would use £40,000 of this budget to maintain the Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator post in Haringey.</p> <p>We propose that the balance of the investment should be spent priorities set by area committees in partnership with the local Police.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Revenue cost: £400,000</p> <p>To fund this action on crime we would challenge officers to deliver a further 4% saving on management costs in a full year. The annual cost of senior managers, on salaries over £50,000, is more than £20million per year. This proposal would save £800,000 in a full year, £400,000 in a part year</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Management revenue saving £400,000</p> <p>BUDGET AMENDMENT 2</p> <p><u>Investing in our young people</u></p> <p>In a borough such as Haringey youth services are vital and much-valued by our young people and families. Labour plans a disproportionate 75%</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

cut in this budget for these services.

Liberal Democrats would reverse £900,000 of the cuts proposed by Labour.

This investment will be paid for by improvements in our fostering service and reductions in spending on IT.

It is well known that outcomes for children in foster care are better if they are placed close to their home. Haringey Council has relied on expensive out-of-borough agency foster placements which cost twice the amount of a Council foster placement. Liberal Democrats believe that a £300,000 first year investment in the fostering service would reduce the need to rely on expensive foster agencies would improve the outcomes for our vulnerable children could deliver gross savings of £700,000.

We accept this will be a challenge but we feel it is one worth setting given the service benefits it could achieve.

Haringey currently spends £16.5million a year on running its IT. Labour is proposing less than a 6% real cut to this budget. Liberal Democrats believe that youth services are a greater priority than corporate IT and would take out further £500,000 from the IT budget.

	Cost	Saving
Youth Service revenue cost	£900,000	
Foster care revenue cost	£300,000	
Foster care revenue saving		£700,000
IT revenue savings		£500,000
Total	£1,200,000	£1,200,000

BUDGET AMENDMENT 3

Action on the local economy and jobs

Long-term unemployment remains a major problem in Haringey. Labour is cutting £700,000 of funding from projects to tackle worklessness. Liberal Democrats believe that the Council should be committed to helping residents back into work. We would therefore invest £350,000 for job creation projects.

Job creation cost	£350,000
-------------------	----------

Liberal Democrats believe that the Council should fund the creation of real jobs for residents by removing the notional cost of vacant posts in its own hierarchy. At the end of the year there were 640 of these posts in the Council. We propose deleting the budget for 20 to make further staffing savings in non-front line services.

Vacant post revenue saving	£675,000
----------------------------	----------

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

Credit card fees cost the Council £100,000 a year. We propose that these costs should be covered by the card users when purchasing services.

Credit Card revenue saving £100,000

Labour are going to increase the cost of parking for shoppers in our local high streets by 115%. This threatens the viability of local businesses and the jobs they provide. Liberal Democrats would use the balance of money saved from deleting vacant posts and charging for credit card use to reduce Labour's increase in parking income.

Parking charges revenue cost £425,000

BUDGET AMENDMENT 4

Protecting our vulnerable older people

Labour will close front-line services for older people such as the drop-in centres at Willoughby Road, Abbysinia Court, the Irish Centre and Woodside House. Labour is also planning to close the luncheon club at Jackson's Lane and cut funding for Day Centres. Liberal Democrats believe that this is a short-sighted decision which targets the most vulnerable older residents and will also place extra strain on the NHS and other Council services.

Liberal Democrats would reverse Labour's cuts to older people's day centres, drop-in centres and luncheon clubs.

Revenue cost £171,000

Labour spends £500,000 on paying union officials. Liberal Democrats, whilst understanding the benefit to staff of union representation, believe that this cost is too high. We would reduce spending by 50%.

Revenue savings £158,000

The Council currently spends more than £4million on "policy and performance". The balance needed to protect older people's services would be generated by increasing the proposed savings on "policy and performance" by 1%.

Revenue saving £13,000

To provide a sustainable future for these older people's service we propose a further reduction of £254,000 in policy and performance spending would be required in 2012/13.

BUDGET AMENDMENT 5

Protecting the Voluntary Sector

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

Liberal Democrats believe that the voluntary sector is crucial to supporting vulnerable people in our borough.

Labour is choosing to substantially cut voluntary sector funding. Liberal Democrats will invest £700,000 in a new fund to protect the voluntary sector.

Voluntary sector cost	£700,000
-----------------------	----------

Labour currently spends nearly £2million on communications. Liberal Democrats believe that, whilst the proposed budget has reduced spending, more needs to be done to cut the waste of taxpayers' money on unnecessary glossy publications and Council propaganda. We would reduce the communications budget to £1million.

Revenue saving	£529,000
----------------	----------

Alexandra Palace currently receives a subsidy of over £2million per year. A reduction of 2% in its operating costs would enable the Council to reduce its subsidy by £171,000.

Saving in Alexandra Palace	Revenue Saving	£171,000
----------------------------	----------------	----------

A debate ensued and other Members contributed to the discussion.

Councillor Goldberg, Cabinet Member for Finance and Sustainability responded to the proposals.

The amendments to the Motions were then voted on individually.

Budget amendment 1, on being put to the vote there were 21 in favour of the amendment and 31 against. The amendment was declared LOST.

Budget amendment 2, on being put to the vote there were 21 in favour of the amendment and 31 against. The amendment was declared LOST.

Budget amendment 3, on being put to the vote there were 20 in favour of the amendment and 32 against. The amendment was declared LOST.

Budget amendment 4, on being put to the vote there were 20 in favour of the amendment and 31 against. The amendment was declared LOST.

Budget amendment 5, on being put to the vote there were 21 in favour of the amendment and 31 against. The amendment was declared LOST.

In respect of the Cabinet reports 7 & 8 2010/11 as MOVED by Councillor Kober - On a vote there being 31 for, 21 against, and 0 abstentions it was:

RESOLVED

1. That the Cabinet Report 7 - 2010/11 be received and adopted;

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

2. That the Cabinet Report 8 - 2010/11 including –Medium Term Financial Planning 2011/12 to 2013/14 be received and adopted, and that the following recommendations contained in the appendix to report number 8 be agreed:
 - I. that the outcome of the consultation process on the Budget set out in Section 17 of the report be noted together with the ongoing consultation covering the proposals set out in Appendix 6;
 - II. that approval be given to the overall Medium Term Financial Plan as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 of the report;
 - III. that approval be given to the new investment proposals set out in Appendix 3 of the report;
 - IV. that approval be given to the changes and variations set out in Appendix 4 of the report;
 - V. that approval be given to revisions to previously agreed investment and savings proposals set out in Appendices 5.1 and 5.2 of the report;
 - VI. that approval be given in principle to the new savings proposals set out in Appendix 6 of the report with each of the proposals representing a decision which would in the future be considered by the responsible Directorate and, where appropriate, the responsible Cabinet member, and that where appropriate certain of these would be the subject of consultation and of equality impact assessment when they come to be considered and a decision as to whether or not to proceed would be taken at that time; in the event that the relevant decision-maker decides not to proceed, with the result that savings were not realised, there would be an enquiry as to whether equivalent savings could be found elsewhere in the budget. Accordingly, Cabinet with the Leader's agreement delegated final decisions on the savings to be adopted to Directorates and where appropriate to the relevant Cabinet members within their portfolio responsibilities, following appropriate consideration of the results of any consultation and with due regard to the Council's duties under the Equality Act 2010;
 - VII. that it be noted that significant savings were still required to be identified to deliver a balanced budget in 2012-13 and 2013-14;
 - VIII. that approval be given to the level of un-earmarked general fund reserves of £10.5million and specific and

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

other reserves as set out in Appendix 7.1 of the report;

- IX. that approval be given to the proposals for the Children and Young People's Service Dedicated Schools Grant budget set out in Section 13 and Appendix 8 of the report;
 - X. that approval be given to the proposals for the Housing Revenue Account budget set out in Section 14 and Appendix 10 of the report;
 - XI. that approval be given to the housing rent increases at an average of £5.36 per week (6.5%);
 - XII. that approval be given to the housing tenant service charge changes set out in Section 14.13 of the report;
 - XIII. that approval be given to proposals for the capital programme and funding set out in Section 15 and Appendix 11 of the report;
 - XIV. that approval be given to proposed general fund budget requirement for 2011-12 of £286.169m net of Dedicated Schools Grant, subject to the decisions of precepting and levying authorities;
 - XV. that approval be given to the indicative criteria set out in Appendix 8 of the report to be applied by all Directorates both in the consultation concerning and in the determination of the future funding of Third Sector organisations, and other organisations where appropriate.
- 3. That the North London Waste Plan be approved for publication and subsequent submission to the Government.
 - 4. That authority to submit changes to the Plan in the run up to and during the public examination of the document in response to objectors' submissions, requests from the Planning Inspector and any emerging evidence, guidance or legal advice be delegated to the Director of Urban Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration and in conjunction with the other North London Boroughs.
 - 5. That Haringey's Core Strategy and supporting documents including the schedule of proposed minor amendments and further changes to housing and employment land be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination by an Independent Planning Inspector.

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

	<p style="text-align: center;">11</p> <p>Councillor Meehan moved the recommendations contained in General Purposes Committee – Report Nos. 03 & 4 /2010 -11.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the General Purposes Committee – Report Nos. 03 & 4 /2010 -11 be received and adopted, and that the recommendation concerning the Treasury Management Statement for 2011/12 be approved.(Cabinet concur with this recommendation) The version at appendix 6 of the Medium Term Financial Planning report incorporates the updated version.</p>	
<p>CNCL88.</p>	<p>TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE RESOURCES IN RESPECT OF MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLANNING FOR 2011/12 - 2013/14 AND TO AGREE THE COUNCIL TAX FOR 2011/12</p> <p>Councillor Goldberg moved the budget report and it was:</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. That the earlier debate on the 'state of the borough' and the proposed budget package agreed by Cabinet on 8 February 2011 be noted.2. That approval be given to the Medium Term Financial Plan to March 2014 as attached in Appendices 1 and 2 of the report.3. That the final housing rent subsidy determination be noted and the proposed Housing Revenue Account budget and average rent increase of £5.36 per week (6.5%) be agreed.4. That the Greater London Authority precept be noted.5. That the reserves policy attached at appendix 3 of the report be agreed.6. That the level of un-earmarked general fund reserves of £10.5 million and specific and other reserves as set out in Appendix 4.1 be approved.7. That the budget scrutiny recommendations made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and the responses of the Cabinet as set out in Appendix 12 to the Cabinet report of 8 February 2011 be noted.8. That the budget resolution in the specified format as set out in the attached appendix 5 of the report and the consequent freeze in council tax be agreed.	

**MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011**

	9. That the revised Treasury Management Strategy Statement attached at appendix 6 of the report be agreed.	
CNCL89.	TO CONSIDER OPPOSITION BUSINESS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NO.12 Item not considered	
CNCL90.	TO ANSWER QUESTIONS, IF ANY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE NOS. 9 & 10 Item not considered	
CNCL91.	TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING MOTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE NO. 13 Due to the hour Motions R, S, T (2010/11) were not considered.	

COUNCILLOR EDDIE GRIFFITH

Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank

Proposed Appointments to Outside Bodies

24 February 2011
Report for Council

Body name

Fin Future

Term of Office: 1 Year

Category: Trust

Representatives

Councillor Dhiren Basu

25/05/10 23/05/11

Councillor Sheila Peacock

24/02/11 23/05/11

Deputy appointment

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTION

1. That it be noted that on 13 January 2011 the Director of Corporate Resources in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources agreed the amount of 86,567 as the council tax base for the year in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax base) Regulations 1992 made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
2. That the following amounts now be calculated by the Council for the year 2011/12 in accordance with the Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
 - (a) £1,037,226,280 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2) of the Act.
 - (b) £781,505,280 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3) of the Act.
 - (c) £255,721,000 being the amount by which the aggregate at 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with the Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year.
 - (d) £153,221,233 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates, revenue support grant, additional grant, or SSA reduction grant increased by the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its collection fund to its general fund in accordance with Section 97(3) of the Local Government Act 1998 or reduced by the amount of sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its general fund to its collection fund in accordance with Section 97(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1998 and increased by the amount of any sum which the Council estimates will be transferred from its collection fund to its general fund pursuant to the Collection Fund (Community Charges) directions under Section 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1998 made on 7 February 1994 or reduced by the amount of any sum which the Council estimates will be transferred from its general fund to its collection fund pursuant to the Collection Fund (Community Charges) directions under Section 98(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1998 made on 7 February 1994.
 - (e) £1,184.32 being the amount at 2 (c) above less the amount at 2(d) above, all divided by the amount at 1 above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(l) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year.

(f) Valuation Bands

	£
A	789.56
B	921.14
C	1,052.73
D	1,184.32
E	1,447.39
F	1,710.70
G	1,973.87
H	2,368.65

Being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at 2(e) above the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(l) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number in which that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(l) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

3. That it be noted that for 2011/12 the amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in respect of the Greater London Authority and its functional bodies, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Valuation Bands

	£
A	206.55
B	240.97
C	275.40
D	309.82
E	378.67
F	447.52
G	516.37
H	619.64

4. That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 2(f) and 3 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2011/12 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below.

Valuation Bands

	£
A	996.11
B	1,162.11
C	1,328.13
D	1,494.14
E	1,826.06
F	2,158.22
G	2,490.24
H	2,988.29