

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

Councillors Claire Kober (Chair), Jason Arthur, Ali Demirci, Joe Goldberg, Stuart McNamara, Peter Morton, Alan Strickland, Bernice Vanier and Ann Waters

Apologies None

Also Present: Councillors: Engert, Connor, Newton, Carter, G Bull, Peacock.

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTON BY
CAB101	FILMING AT MEETINGS The Leader referred to agenda item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted this information.	
CAB102	APOLOGIES There were no apologies for absence.	
CAB103	URGENT BUSINESS There are no new agenda items of business .There was an addendum to consider as part of item 13, Wards Corner CPO, and additional responses to the Adults consultation to consider as part of item 8 , appendix 1.	
CAB104	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST There were no declarations of interest put forward.	
CAB105	NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH REPRESENTATIONS No representations were received.	
CAB106	MINUTES The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 20 th October 2015 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.	
CAB107	DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS RECEIVED the following deputations in relation to item 8 of the agenda (Corporate Plan Priority 2, outcome of consultation and decisions on proposals relating to Adult services). a. <u>Haringey Autism and Save Autism Services Haringey</u>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

Martin Hewitt on behalf of Haringey Autism and Save Autism Services in Haringey:

Mr Hewitt stated that whilst the consultation on the closures of the services detailed in the report was comprehensive, it was not transparent about what new provisions would replace the closed Day Centres. Mr Hewitt, the father of an autistic person, emphasised that the parents and users of the provisions would suffer as a result of the closures. Parents relied on the Roundways for a good standard of care and respite. He felt that the report was not clear in stating that the respite provision would be preserved. The National Autistic Society had conducted research to establish the importance of the provision at The Roundways and had made it clear that users did not want to see it closed. Mr Hewitt contended that the envisaged staff reductions were the most fundamental cuts in London. Mr Hewitt expressed that the Council would not be able to deliver the promises made in the consultation and would be open to legal challenge with cuts of this level.

In response to a question from the Leader about whether he was sceptical of outcomes to be delivered or had uncertainty of the unknown, Mr Hewitt said that he was making an empirical point and that the Council could not provide the promised outcomes with the level of cuts. Mr Hewitt felt the Council would not be able to comply with the Care Act or effectively monitor the quality of care which would have an impact on parents and users.

The Leader spoke on behalf of all Cabinet Members, who were all aware of the gravity of the decisions being taken forward and that these decisions were being considered in the interest of the community.

Councillor Morton was invited to respond to the deputation and also made clear that, at this stage of the meeting, Cabinet Members had not yet made up their minds on how they were going to vote for the recommendations. There had been a significant 3 month consultation in the summer to draw out the issues being raised in the deputation.

Councillor Morton reminded Cabinet of the principles that would underpin the re-provision of services including: providing dignity and respect, meeting Care Act responsibilities, supporting independence, personal choice. In the co-design of services, the Council would be using the findings of the equalities impact assessments and actions to mitigate the impacts of transition would be taken forward. The services provided at the Roundways would be provided at Ermine road and there would be individual assessments and support to enable service user, currently at The Roundways, to choose services that will benefit them.

Councillor Morton added that in recent years, fewer people had been placed in the Council's directly provided services for complex needs and were using direct payments or personal budgets for other day opportunities and support. There would be continued work on: transition arrangements, on co design, co production and assessments with the welfare of the service users in mind .All this work would be taking forward the issues identified in the EQIA's from having changed services. Councillor Morton referred to the section on the Equalities Assessment, at page 41, which had information on how Ermine road site would be managed.

b. Older People's Reference Group

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

Gordon Peters, Chair of the Older People's Reference Group, in Haringey echoed many of the comments made by Mr Hewitt as recorded above, and included the following issues.

He felt that the feedback from the extensive consultation had been included but the specific concerns had not made their way through to reflection in the recommendations before Cabinet, as closures were still recommended without fixed plans and costings for alternative services.

Mr Peters urged the Council to postpone these and other closures until the needs of users and carers were fully assessed and a genuine strategy on integrated care developed, scoped and costed. This should be fully shared with users and carers, as Healthwatch had pointed out in its letter to Councillor Morton.

Mr Peters spoke further of the potential difficulties for Tottenham residents travelling to provision in Hornsey and he thought that there was lack of planning for the safety and well being of service users and specifically for 76 people who used the Day Centres. He felt that the Council had not adequately explored other funding routes to avoid withdrawing services or considered co-operative models, which could have long term cost benefits to the Council. Mr Peters spoke about the wider economic benefits of having the Day Care Centres and asked for the Council to join the argument for more funding for social care.

Mr Peters referred to research on co-operative models which he felt could bring cost benefit to the Council and there was work available on this that could be considered alongside the Ethical Care Charter promoted by UNISON which puts forward, providing living wage to carers, and an end to 15 minute care visits.

Mr Peters contended that closures would further reduce trust in the Council, adversely affecting the wellbeing of older people at risk, and be open to legal challenge.

The Leader thanked Mr Peters and acknowledged his paper on co-operative models, which the Cabinet Members had received.

Councillor Strickland, Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, spoke about the Council being on the difficult receiving end of cuts and asked the deputation party what the Council could do to affect national developments. Mr Peters set out his thinking on ways to increase funding which included: joining the national argument for more social care funding, seeking inner London banding for funding, raising Council Tax and exploring options for social bonds whilst deferring a decision on the closures.

In response to comments, the Leader explained that raising Council Tax was not a viable option. The Council could only raise Council Tax by 2% without a referendum and this would only bring in £650k a year net income for Haringey. Also about a third of Haringey Households were in receipt of Council tax subsidy; therefore raising Council Tax would not bring in the required amount and impact on those least able to pay.

Councillor Morton thanked Mr Peters for his deputation and conversation during the consultation. Councillor Morton spoke of the significant amount of responses to the proposals and explained that the funding formula for local government was unfairly distributed with Shire County Councils receiving more

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

funding for social care than London boroughs. This was part of the political choices being by the Government. The Council has made representations about the £200m cut to funding and were continuing to make representations to government as well as making sure that its remaining resources were well used.

Councillor Morton stressed that people who received Day Care opportunities would continue to receive alternative services based on the assessment of their individual needs. The Council would offer support to guide service users through the process of finding and choosing the care they want to receive.

Councillor Morton added that, the Council had been considering the needs and requirements for The Grange service users. The mitigating factors were detailed in the report and consideration was being given to the where alternative services can be provided in the area. The Council would develop an approach for travel arrangements that would give people more support options to meet their requirements.

The proposals for Osborne Grove were different to the initial proposals as a result of consultation feedback. There was already mixed use at Osborne Grove, evidence of the nursing care market and the partnership with the NHS would keep the provision within the public sector

c. Social Care Alliance Haringey

Rod Wells made representations on behalf of the Older People's Reference Group and TPE14H [Group representing disabled people in the borough], and these representations included the following:

The closure of Day Care Centres was unfair for the most vulnerable part of the community who had to suffer from such large cuts and fundamentally flawed as there was no defined alternative provision and Mr Wells contended that the Council could find alternative funding. Mr Wells asserted that net savings from closing the Day Care Centres could not be known until alternative provisions and costs have been established.

Mr Wells contended that the cuts affect integrity and the quality of life of service users and the ability for them to be visited. He felt that reassessed personal budgets may not be enough for people to pay for alternative provision and long journeys to such alternative provisions would be difficult for them. Also closing services when new provision was not known to be effective was worrying for service users.

Mr Wells provided information about various community care services that were either closing or were having difficulty obtaining charitable funding and asked how service users would be able to afford alternative private provision at a cost of £60-100 per day.

The Social Care Alliance Haringey, wanted to see further studies taking into account the possibility of offering more social care services and exploring how Camden and Islington provide services.

The closures would have direct cost implications for families whose members might have to give up working and claim benefits, more carers would be needed and more people would be forced into residential care at a cost of £30k per annum for older people and £70k for a person with learning disabilities.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

Some of these costs would fall onto the Council.

Mr Wells urged the Council to: press the government for higher levels of funding from the government to match inner London Councils; explore other funding streams including the use of Council reserves, to support services for vulnerable people, and; vote to defer the closure of Centres to enable.

The Leader invited questions from Cabinet Members

Councillor Arthur, Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture, in response to the deputation, explained that there would be use of the Council reserves to cover the next three years to smooth some of the impacts of the cuts. But the challenge of how to continue to fund those services would still remain.

In response to Councillor Arthur's questions to the deputation about how Mr Wells felt the Council could change its proposed model to provide services, or how it could protect the current model, it was stated that with good quality community mapping some good alternative quality provision could be provided but the Council would need to build in some time and security for the under-utilised buildings and community centres to develop this provision. It would require guarantees of specialist staff being available and security of tenure and financing. Delaying closure was vital to ensure these alternatives were adequately planned and costed. It was reiterated by the deputation speakers that investment in Cay Centre care saved future costs on residential care.

The Leader acknowledged the point that investment was required to save money in the long term, but also drew attention to the fact that the local government funding formula will not, in the future, take into account 'need' and 'deprivation'. The Leader also highlighted the recent cuts to DCLG budget and impact of this on local government. The Leader explained that the government had abolished any deprivation factor in the funding formula, meaning that the Council would likely see greater reduction and impact in funding than other parts of the country. The Leader also referred to the deputation's examples of services provided at that both Camden and Islington. These boroughs received inner London funding, higher than Haringey which received outer London funding, and the examples further demonstrated the level of inequity in the services provided due to funding formula distribution.

Councillor Morton thanked the deputation and would talk to them separately on the care package issues raised. The savings attached to proposals were from; page 49 onwards and emphasised the validation exercises taking place. The report was clear and explicit on all of the points concerning how the savings would be taken forward. In terms of alternatives, Councillor Morton clarified that services would not be closed without alternative provisions being identified and being adequate. The recommendations in the report build in the appropriate requirements for provision in the borough, required transition plans, keeping to statutory responsibilities. Co design and co production was being taken forward at the beginning of new services which was why the Council were including users in co-design plans and considering mitigation risks, as detailed in the appendices of the report.

Councillor Morton also discussed the recruitment drives taking place to recruit more in-house staff and that interims were only recruited when there was a necessity and gap in service. Consultants were only used where there were projects to be completed which required specific expertise.

Councillor Morton reiterated that the Council want to work with the service user

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p>in the transition process. Within the annexes, which were over 700 pages, there was a significant co production report identifying issues. This included the deputation's reported issues on transport, meeting the particular needs of clients and how, when building services and taking forward transition, the service user will have substantial involvement. There was a specific risk register looking at mitigation and the required actions around this which would be followed up by the Council and the Safeguarding Adults Board, should Cabinet agree the recommendations.</p> <p>d. <u>UNISON</u></p> <p>RECEIVED the deputation from Chris Taylor on behalf of UNISON, about the consequences of the Cabinet taking the decision to close the Centres. Mr Taylor expressed that: people will either not receive the services they need to keep them well or they will receive often unsafe services outsourced from the private sector; staff will be required to work in the private sector with poor pay and conditions, zero hours contracts, lack of training and exploitation. Not-for-profit companies such as social enterprises and co-operatives sometimes resulted in being taken over by the private sector because local authority funding ceased after the initial few years. Mr Taylor contended that the re-ablement service was one of Haringey's most successful services and should not be handed over to the private sector who he claimed had neither the required the standards or expertise to provide the care.</p> <p>Mr Taylor added that the closure of the Haven will result in a decline in health to its current service users and would put pressure on carers. The closure of The Grange would mean no services in the east of the borough for people with dementia. Closure of the Roundways would mean having no specialist service for people with autism.</p> <p>The main consultation responses requested the Council not to close the services and indicated that the cuts would be a false economy and UNISON urged the Council not to make them.</p> <p>The Leader spoke of the 754 pages of responses to the consultation attached at appendix 1, which she had read through and agreed that the overwhelming response was not to make changes and closures. However, Cabinet were in a different position as they need to ensure a balanced budget and only making use of reserves, at the moment, to smooth the transition as long term use of reserves was not sustainable.</p> <p>Councillor Morton drew attention to his response to the previous deputations and added that, in relation to comments about The Grange, at page 44, and taking into account the EQIA and mitigation, the Council's intention to commission an alternative service in Tottenham.</p> <p>Councillor Morton further explained that although services would not be available at The Roundways, in terms of the building, the Council will be commissioning services at Ermine Road which would be the base for service users that currently use Roundways. Councillor Morton emphasised the support that would be available for service users in the transition to access care and support .He also remarked that, in the last couple of years, services users had also chosen alternatives to the Roundways.</p>	
<p>CAB108</p>	<p>CORPORATE PLAN PRIORITY 2 - OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION AND DECISION ON PROPOSALS RELATING TO ADULT SERVICES The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing introduced the report which set</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

out proposals for, a number of current adult services to either change or close to enable best use of limited resources to create a more sustainable adult social care system in Haringey to deliver the best care possible for residents.

The changes would help to create an adult social care system in Haringey that does more to promote and support individual independence, dignity and choice. It will see some care shifted away from institutions, giving more people the opportunity to live healthily in their own homes and communities for longer.

The reduced budget of the Council was making the continuation of current Adult Services unsustainable. The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing further outlined factors for the changes to provision at Osborne Grove, Haynes and Ermine road Centres and closures to day care services at the Haven, Roundways, Grange, Linden Road, Birkbeck Road, and Always Centre. This concerned changes to demographics, rising demand for services and changes to Government funding formulas which will see less funding for adult social care given to Councils in London.

These new proposals had been developed keeping in mind the responsibilities of the Council under the Care Act, and their increased role and responsibility for the broader social care market. A set of principles and values had been developed that the Council will be clear on which the services built and commissioned would be held to, and monitored against through contract management

The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing reiterated that the Council were fully committed to safeguarding adults at risk, meeting statutory responsibilities and continuing to provide services that meet the assessed needs of adults. The Adult's Service would be working with service users and their families and carers in the design of services going forward. There was continuing work into co –production and co design of Adult Services and the outcomes that would be focused on, this was set out from page 19 of the agenda pack.

Responses to the consultation had been fully set out in appendix 1 of the agenda pack along with actions to mitigate against the risks identified and summaries included of the financial position which would all be taken into account by the Cabinet.

The later budget monitoring report further exposed how continuing overspend by the Adult Services, in its current form, could not be sustained due to demographic change and increase in demand.

The Cabinet Member spoke of the depth of consultation undertaken which had started late last year with consultation as part of the budget process , continuing with a further 3 month consultation between July and October before papers were brought forward to Cabinet.

Cabinet Members put forward the following questions which were responded to by the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing.

- Councillor Arthur continued to ask a question about the risks of alternative provision. In particular, the new provision for users of the Haynes and ensuring the right provider was chosen and monitored. Councillor Morton responded and spoke of the Council's statutory monitoring and safeguarding role in the community. The Council was already working with the Care Quality Commission, other Councils and other borough providers on risks in social care and safeguarding. The

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

Council will continue to work with these stakeholders as part of the Safeguarding Board. Also, where there were new contract management relationships, the Council would be ensuring that providers are working to commissioning for social value as required by the care act and duty to wellbeing. There would continue to be independent scrutiny of the Adults services through the CQC and the SAB

- Cllr Strickland spoke of continuing to use staff knowledge to transform services and ensuring their views were fed in to the process. Councillor Morton advised that there were already regular meetings with all staff affected by the changes. They had also been engaged in the consultation process so far. The Council would continue to work with staff and seek their views on the new target operating model.

In response to a question on the closure of the Roundways Centre and transfer of services to the Ermine road, Councillor Morton referred to page 38 of the report at 6.5.4 which further expanded on experience of a community based model to deliver autism services in the borough. There was a section on mitigation and changes that would be made to the Ermine Road Centre to make this Centre accessible and appropriate for the assessed needs of users.

- Cllr Waters spoke about the success of the shared lives scheme and residents continuing to know how and where to access services. The strengths of the current shared lives scheme was recognised but it could not meet demand in its current form. The Council would be seeking a good alternative provider to grow the scheme and increase the carers involved. It would connect with the Council's own Customer Transformation Programme to make it easier for residents: to get advice at Council offices, be better directed and correctly signposted to the appropriate services.
- Cllr Vanier asked Cllr Morton to expand further on the mitigation measures being taken forward, following closure of the Haven and changes to the re-ablement service. She referred to , paragraph 6.8. which indicated that service users were over 80, with range of high level support needs. In regards to changes to the re-ablement services, assurance was provided that there will be safeguards in place to mitigate concerns that have been expressed in consultation. Councillor Morton advised that there will be an implementation plan compiled with carers, service users, and assessments completed for individuals to enable the right alternative provision. This was coupled with support to service users with a sensitive transition plan to mitigate impact. A support officer with specific focus on transition was being recruited.
- Cllr Goldberg referred to the EQIA findings page 44 and how the transitions for service users, at the Grange, who were mainly from the Afro Caribbean community would be handled. Cllr Morton outlined that the Council will look to commission and provide services to users at the Grange and ensure that the change is exceptionally and carefully completed. Representations on travel difficulties were well made, and would be taken forward as part of the mitigation action. The Council will commission services across the community and will be aware of the ethnicity of Grange users and this change would be handled exceptionally carefully. There were other dementia providers in Tottenham and the Council would be talking to them and commissioning services appropriately and bearing in mind statutory responsibilities

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

- The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing and Adult Services thanked officers who had worked hard to find an alternative solution for Osborne Grove and transfer the Centre to a statutory NHS group.

The Leader invited Councillor Connor to address the Cabinet.

Councillor Connor had previously notified Cllr Morton of the Adults and Health Scrutiny's Panel's views on the consultation process. Cllr Morton outlined that Panel had put forward concerns about: how the responses were being taken forward, the overwhelming objections to the closures and changes to services, how alternatives for the closed provisions not yet developed and how meaningful responses could be provided to the responders. There were further concerns about the consultation process and how the co design process being taken forward. Clarity was sought on the role on the carers re-designing services and having as much input as [possible from carers and users in how the service changes are taken forward.

In response Councillor Morton outlined the expansive consultation process undertaken which had covered complex issues. There had been a range of meetings with service users, written responses collated, and the publicity methods used to elicit responses which had provided 300 written responses. Previous Scrutiny Panel points raised about access to the consultation had been reflected in a FAQ section of the consultation.

Cllr Connor also referred to the percentage of consultees, who were against the proposals by way of a question and this should be reflected in the minutes.

Cllr Morton explained that the consultation responses had been read by Cabinet colleagues and they were clear about what respondents were advising them in relation to the changed services and closures of Day Care Centres. Where possible proposals had changed, for example Osborne Grove staying open and working with the NHS. Also the issues raised in the responses would be essential in, shaping the way the Council will consider the risks and mitigation actions to be taken forward. The Cabinet Member made clear that the Council will not close services until an alternative provision has been found for the service users.

Councillor Gideon Bull was invited to come forward and address the Cabinet.

Cllr Gideon Bull began by criticising the Cabinet report which he felt was lacking in evidence base, had little information in future planning of the service, and the mitigation was weak. He spoke further of the high cost provision at Linden House where most of the users were aged over 80 with high special needs and questioned how alternative provision would be able to accommodate their needs. He felt that the proposals should be based on the prevention agenda and highlighted the good work of the Haven in supporting clients with high levels of physical needs including supporting clients who were recovering from a stroke.

He highlighted the importance of the Day Care Centres in reducing isolation and questioned how some elderly clients will be able to manage their personalised budgets without the support of the Day Care Centres. He queried what services these users can now buy without the support of the Grange and Haven. He suggested investing in one or more of the Day Care Centres to limit

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

the future higher expenditure associated with residential care as he felt the Centres provided a key role in supporting clients to remain independent for longer. He also questioned why the report had not spoken further about an integrated service.

Councillor Gideon Bull, concluded by querying the local alternative provision available to service users, and asked for there to be more innovative solutions from existing structure. He asked Cabinet to pause taking forward the recommendations until alternatives were found.

Councillor Morton responded to the points raised by Councillor Bull by making clear that the proposals had a clear focus on prevention, re-ablement and responded to the Care Act. The prevention example for Haven was set out from pages 27 of the agenda pack. The Council were taking these decisions to improve physical health and to enable physical re-ablement in the home so service users can continue to live in the community. The Haven was a more expensive service, per unit cost, per week, than local care at the Irish Centre This was not equitable and not sustainable as demand grows. Cllr Bull disputed this as he claimed the unit costs would go down if there were more users assigned to the Centre with the investment in additional transport. Cllr Morton questioned why this issue had not previously been raised. It was clear last year that the Haven did not have the capacity to provide the kind of support as other Day Care Services. The Director for Adults further added that additional clients attending the Haven mean there would need to be more staff recruited to support them.

Cllr Morton re-iterated that there will be advocacy support for service users with personalised budgets and that service users will be provided with an assessment.

Clients with identified needs in Linden House will have a detailed assessment and the Council will seek to place these clients together, in the borough, in a proper supported residency with individual tenancies. They will continue to receive support, not just at home, but otherwise through a provider. The Council would continue to make sure their care is monitored and they continue to receive high level support.

Councillor Morton responded to the points on the combined impact of the closures .He was clear that services will not close until: alternatives are provided, the Council is clear on safeguarding and mitigation points to be taken forward for each individual user .This will be done in a managed way working with Council Social Workers, the Safeguarding Adults Board. The risk register will be used to manage and mitigate against the risks identified and this will be monitored by the Transformation Governance Board.

Cllr Morton reiterated that as part of the personalisation, clients will continue to receive support at home and there will be consideration given to new journeys and how they will be managed.

In summing up the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing described the choices being made as difficult and challenging which was why a 3 month consultation had been carried out. The process had endeavoured to lay out what people told the Council in the consultation, the risks, and actions in response to them. There were risks with continuing to use reserves to sustain the current service. However, regardless of the financial position the demand for services was growing. Therefore, to have a sustainable future, meet the corporate plan objective for healthier and fulfilling lives, allow the Council to

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

meet the requirements of individuals and statutory responsibilities the recommendations were put forward for agreement.

Following a vote of Cabinet Members -

RESOLVED:

1. Considered and taken into account the detailed feedback from the consultation undertaken.
2. Considered and taken into account the equalities impact assessment of the proposals on protected groups.
3. Considered and taken into account actions proposed to mitigate the impact of the proposals on the protected group i.e. service users.
4. To increase the Council's capacity to provide re-ablement and intermediate care services by:
 - a) The retention of Osborne Grove as a nursing and residential provision and developing re-ablement and intermediate care provision on site. This provision to be managed by an NHS provider through a statutory partnership arrangement.
 - b) The closure of the Haven Day Centre and changing the use of the premises to a community re-ablement Centre delivered by an alternative provider. The commissioning of the new re-ablement service to be informed by the co-design principles and outcomes set out at 3.10 below and service users and carers to be involved in the production of the service specification. The new community re-ablement Centre to be commissioned as part of the Intermediate Care Strategy, being developed jointly by the Council and the Haringey Clinical Commissioning Group, as part of an overall approach which builds re-ablement capacity for individuals, services and communities
 - c) The transfer of the Council in-house Re-ablement Service to an external provider following further engagement with staff and the Trade Unions in line with existing protocols, and a procurement process.
5. The closure of the Haven Day Centre to be subject to an implementation plan that includes a) engagement with all stakeholders including service users and carers, b) the re-assessment or review of the care and support needs of service users with a view to identifying suitable alternative provision to meet assessed needs, c) the assignment of a Personal Budget Support Co-ordinator to support service users to access other day opportunities and d) a transition plan that is sensitive to the needs of service users, mitigates the impact of the closure, ensures the process of change is safely handled and the care and support needs of the service users continue to be met.

**Deputy
CE/Dir
Adults**

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p>6. To expand the Council's capacity to ensure Supported Living Accommodation and Shared Lives schemes by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) The closure of Linden Road Residential Care Home; andb) The delivery of the Council's in-house Shared Lives Service through an alternative provider and following a procurement process. This is to ensure that the expansion of the scheme is delivered and that the benefits are felt throughout the system. <p>7. The closure of Linden Road Residential Care Home to be subject to an implementation plan that includes a) engagement with all stakeholders including service users, families/carers and independent advocates (where necessary), b) the re-assessment or review of the care and support needs of service users with a view to identifying suitable supported living accommodation or other alternative provision to meet assessed needs and c) individual transition plans that are sensitive to the needs of service users, mitigate the impact of the closure, ensure the process of change is collaborative, safely handled, in the best interest of the service user and enable their care and support needs to continue to be met.</p> <p>8. To increase the flexibility and availability of day services within the borough by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) The closure of the Roundways, Birkbeck Road and Always Day Centres for adults with a learning disability;b) The provision of a new and expanded day opportunities for adults with learning disabilities (including those with complex needs and autism) from Ermine Road Day Centre and through an alternative provider;c) The closure of The Grange Day Centre; andd) The provision of a new model of day opportunities for older people and those with dementia from The Haynes Day Centre through an alternative provider. <p>9. The closure of the Roundways, Birkbeck Road, Always and The Grange Day Centres to be subject to an implementation plan that includes a) engagement with all stakeholders including service users and carers, b) the re-assessment or review of the care and support needs of service users with a view to identifying suitable alternative provision to meet assessed needs, c) the assignment of a Personal Budget Support Co-ordinator to support service users to access other day opportunities and d) a transition plan that is sensitive to and mitigates the impact of the closure and ensures the process of change is safely handled and that the care and support needs of the service user continue to be met.</p> <p>10. To adopt the following principles and outcomes developed through the co-design process for the delivery of the future service models for day opportunities for people with learning disabilities, older people and people with dementia:</p>	
--	--	--

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

Principles

- a) Quality monitoring of all activities and services in Haringey
- b) Accessible and up to date information about activities and services
- c) Mobilising community volunteering and supporting this with infrastructure
- d) Working with providers so staff are well paid
- e) Working with providers to encourage staff development
- f) User, partner and staff involvement in the development and delivery of opportunities
- g) Enabling service users to lead a fulfilling life
- h) Working with the market to develop a breadth of opportunities that meet the needs of a range of individuals and provide choice
- i) Developing availability of sustainable opportunities

Outcomes

- a) Expanding out the availability of services in the wider community
- b) Information about services that are available
- c) Development of a travel programme to enable access to opportunities
- d) Help with personal assistants to provide help and support
- e) Enabling remaining Centres to work as hubs for needs of wider community
- f) Alternative methods of service delivery to be explored
- g) Support for people with Personal Budgets

- 11. Using the principles and outcomes above, to develop with stakeholders including users and carers, a service model upon which officers will base the specification for day opportunities for adults with a learning disability to be delivered from Ermine Road Day Centre and for day opportunities for older people and those with dementia to be delivered from The Haynes.
- 12. To tender the service for day opportunities for adults with learning disabilities based on the co-designed service model and specification, to achieve optimal outcomes for users and to achieve best value.
- 13. To tender the service for day opportunities for older people and those with dementia based on the co-designed service model and specification to achieve optimal outcomes for users and to achieve best value.
- 14. The implementation of the recommendations set out in 3.4 to 3.13 is delegated to the Director of Adult Social Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing.
- 15. The implementation of the proposals to be monitored and overseen by the Healthy Lives Priority Board and the Transformation Group. (See Governance Section 4.30).

Alternative options considered

Before the Council set its budget a consultation exercise was carried out on a wider set of proposals and savings proposals of £5.7 million set against care packages in Adult Social Services. This was considered but not taken forward.

The Council had also considered increasing Council Tax. It was decided that

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

this was not the right thing to do as government funding rules suggest that overall the Council would only receive an additional £600,000 if it raised tax by 2%. This would not be enough to make a substantial difference to the social care budget but would mean that people in Haringey would have to pay more tax which could be challenging for residents.

The Council also considered using its reserves and the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy does include some use of these reserves. However, the funding reductions are expected to continue for several years and are too high to be fully met from our reserves.

As the Council has set its budget, not making the Adult Social Care savings would be likely to mean that the overall Council budget would fall into deficit (i.e. expenditure could exceed its available resources). This would result in serious financial difficulty for the Council as a whole and call into question the sustainability of services in the future.

Legislative changes, demographic pressures and budget challenge mean that to continue to provide care and support in the current manner is unsustainable. The way we currently deliver services cannot meet expected outcomes and will not provide equitable services to meet demand.

To increase the capacity to develop services run by the Council would require more resources. The budget to provide adult social care has been reduced and, as such, there are no further resources therefore alternative ways of delivering services must be considered.

Responses to the consultation indicating the level of agreement/disagreement with the proposals have been considered in conjunction for the reasons stated for that view to understand the potential positive/negative impact of the proposal. Where opposition to the proposals was raised, we have identified areas where we could mitigate the concerns/risks including further increasing communication, and collaborative working with service users/families and providers. These are considered in further detail in the paragraphs below.

Reasons for decision

The need for change

The traditional role of adult social care is changing. In the past, adult social services centred on assessing people's care needs and providing services to meet those needs. This remains a very important part of what social workers do, but there is increasing recognition that adult social care must do more to support people *before* they need care. In an era where our population is ageing, investing in prevention is key to helping more people to stay healthy and live independently for longer - and it means scarce resources can be used more effectively to support those people who need them most.

Making the change from a system that reacts when people need acute help to one that supports more people to remain healthy and independent is not an easy task. It takes time and relies on close co-operation between organisations and individuals in health, social care and the wider community. But the benefits of this change are considerable. In Haringey it would help to increase people's quality of life; improve people's health and wellbeing, and develop stronger and more resilient communities.

The current model for adult social care in Haringey does not do enough to prevent care and support needs escalating, and is unsustainable in the long-

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

term. Last year, for every £3 the Council spent, £1 went on adult social care. Without significant change in how social care is delivered, that figure would rise, resulting in difficulties for the Council in delivering other services such as refuse collections, libraries and parks.

In Haringey there was a 5.3 percent increase in residents aged over 65 years between 2011-2013. This is great news but there is no doubt that it also places an ever-growing demand on care services. And while demand for services continues to rise, the money available to fund them has reduced. Across the country, there is currently £3.5 billion less in Council social care budgets than there was in 2010. This means that there is a pressing need for Councils to deliver social care differently. The Care Act has widened the scope of statutory duties with an increased emphasis on wellbeing as part of any assessment process. It is therefore important that our approach focuses on prevention and early intervention whilst continuing to meet eligible needs.

In Haringey, we want to keep people healthy and living in their own homes and communities for longer. We want to see a greater emphasis on promoting independence, dignity and choice - with care and support shifting away from institutional care towards community and home based support.

This will mean an increase in services like supported living housing, which helps people to maintain their independence in a safe and supportive environment. It will also mean development of schemes like Shared Lives - where carers choose to look after people in their own homes - and community-led programmes like Neighbourhoods Connects, which supports local people to participate in social activities and play a more active role in their community. It will also mean improving the work we do on prevention and early intervention so that more people are equipped with the information and advice they need to look after themselves and others better. This will help to delay and reduce the need for care in many circumstances, help people to remain independent for longer, and build more resilient communities.

Moving to this more sustainable model of adult social care would help us to reduce demand for services provided at traditional care institutions such as day centres and residential homes.

It would also mean that the Council would deliver fewer services directly, and would instead commission more services from the independent, community and voluntary sectors.

We know that care cannot be approached from a one-size-fits-all perspective, so we will ensure that specialist care services remain available for people with complex care needs. The recommended proposals enable the Council to continue to develop care and support which can be delivered within budget resources.

Proposal to increase the Council's capacity to provide re-ablement and intermediate care services.

The Care Act requires the Council to provide or arrange for the provision of services, facilities or resources, or take other steps, which it considers will prevent, reduce or delay the need for care and support. The Care and Support Statutory Guidance provides that the care and support system must work to "actively promote wellbeing and independence, and does not just wait to respond when people reach a crisis point. To meet the challenges of the future, it will be vital that the care and support system intervenes early to support

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

individuals, helps people retain or regain their skills and confidence, and prevents need or delays deterioration wherever possible”.

Re-ablement services are for people with poor physical or mental health to help them adjust to their illness by learning or re-learning the skills necessary for daily living. The Re-ablement Service works closely with an individual for up to six weeks to build up skills, confidence and increase the opportunity for them to care for themselves. The service is for adults who have difficulty managing personal care or daily living tasks, perhaps as a result of illness or a period in hospital, following for example an accident, and have the potential to regain or maintain those independent living skills. This tailored support allows the individual to regain independence and stay in their own home for longer.

Intermediate care is short-term care for people who no longer need to be in hospital and do, however, require extra support to help them recover. It increases the opportunity for individuals to care for themselves and access the support needed to gain independence. The type of support and the duration of support offered will vary according to the assessed needs of the individual.

We want to increase our capacity for re-ablement and intermediate care services to enable more people to live independently in their own homes. Supporting people to live as independently as possible, for as long as possible is a guiding principle of the care and support system.

Residential homes and hospitals provide valuable care for those in need of those services, but with the right support, it is clear that adults would like to be empowered to be healthy and independent in their own homes for as long as possible. Evidence has shown that increasing the facilities and the opportunity for re-ablement services can potentially reduce the need for high cost social care packages in the future through supporting individuals to become independent. An increase in our capacity to provide re-ablement and intermediate care would allow us to support a greater number of people to have the support they need to prevent, reduce or delay the need for care and support.

Proposal to increase our capacity to provide suitable accommodation that promotes individual well being through expanding Supported Living Accommodation and Shared Lives schemes.

Under the Care Act, (2014), the Council must promote individual wellbeing; relating to ‘domestic, family and personal relationships’ and the ‘suitability of living accommodation’. The Care and Support Statutory Guidance provides that “Local authorities should encourage a genuine choice of service type, not only a selection of providers offering similar services, encouraging, for example, a variety of different living options such as shared lives, extra care housing, supported living, support provided at home, and live-in domiciliary care as alternatives to homes care, and low volume and specialist services for people with less common needs”.

In Haringey we have developed a range of provision for vulnerable people that has a greater emphasis on helping people to continue to live independently at home - maximising their independence and reducing social isolation - and is less reliant on traditional institutions. Working closely with our partners we are increasing the availability of schemes such as Supported Living and Shared Lives – demonstrating how most needs, including complex needs, can be met in the community. Adult social care users in Haringey, including people with complex needs, have told us they would prefer to live as independently as

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

possible in the community where they have the opportunity to exercise greater control over their lives.

Supported Living Accommodation enables adults, who are assessed as being able to live independently, to do so. Individuals can have their own tenancy or choose to share with other eligible adults. Support is tailored to the needs of the individual and supports them with daily living including personal care, taking medication and money management.

Shared Lives is a well established scheme within Haringey Council and nationally. The scheme relies on the participation of the local community, where a family or an individual shares their family home with someone who needs support. The scheme is open to adults with various disabilities that have been assessed as being able to live within the community. It enables such adults to enjoy the independence and support of living with a local individual/family.

In consideration of feedback to the proposals, a broader spectrum of alternative providers will be appraised to ensure the best value for money option is identified to meet the needs of residents and benefit the whole community.

It is more important than ever that we get the most value from our public spending. Commissioning for social value involves looking at the collective benefit to a community when a service is provided.

Proposal to increase the availability and flexibility of day opportunities within the borough meeting the individual needs of residents.

The Care Act provides that “the local authority must promote the efficient and effective operation of a market in services for meeting care and support needs with a view to ensuring that any person in its area wishing to access services in the market” has a “variety of providers” and “variety of high quality services” to choose from.

Day services provide both respite for carers and opportunities for vulnerable adults to be active and socialise during the day. Haringey is continuing to develop new forms of day opportunities and move away from traditional buildings based services, supporting and increasing opportunities in the wider community. Working with the community and other businesses to develop services will promote more flexibility, availability and opportunity.

We are committed to the priorities set out in *Valuing People Now*¹, to improve outcomes for people with learning disabilities in employment, housing and health, through person Centred approaches and the promotion of personal budgets. All people with learning disabilities have the right to lead their lives like any others, with the same opportunities and responsibilities. The shift from buildings based care to community led support will enable all adults to make informed choices to enable the best outcome for them.

We have to move away from segregated buildings based day opportunities within the borough for people with learning disabilities and to continue to develop access to mainstream activities – these include local leisure educational and employment opportunities. We recognise, however, that people with specific needs will require a Centre to support them at particular

¹ [Valuing People - A New Strategy for Learning Disability for the 21st Century](#) and [Valuing People Now: Summary Report March 2009 to September 2010](#)

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

times and we are proposing to retain the use of Ermine Road Centre as part of the delivery of Learning Disability Day Opportunities in Haringey.

The Consultation Feedback

Feedback received to the consultation demonstrated that respondents overwhelming opposed the proposals. The value of the services currently received was reiterated throughout the consultation responses, with much accolade received for existing staff, facilities and the opportunities provided. The desire to keep services in their current format and directly managed by the Council was repeatedly presented along with feedback of positive outcomes achieved through the existing service provisions.

Concerns raised demonstrated anxiety around the proposed changes and how they might affect individuals and their families/carers, a) mentally (through isolation) b) financially (having to obtain services elsewhere and/or families having to change working patterns to accommodate their loved one), and c) physically (assuring the safety of service users, with appropriately trained staff within alternative provisions).

Appendix 1, *Analysis of the consultation process and results*, summarises the key themes identified through a) responses to the consultation questionnaires, b) correspondence received (letters and emails) and c) staff engagement, to each proposal². The document also provides the full responses received to the consultation.³

It is acknowledged that the recommendations will result in a reduction in services directed provided by the Council. The feedback received from the consultation demonstrates the concern for the continuation of high quality of services should services be delivered by an alternative provider. We will select alternative providers to deliver services based on their ability to meet the specification and the commissioned service will be subject to ongoing monitoring as detailed in paragraph 4.29 below.

Also, there will be changes to the established daily patterns of service users and their families/carers. Service users may need to adjust to new environments, new staff and new routines. We will work sensitively with each individual and plan with them, their families/carers, how best to manage any necessary changes.

Governance and monitoring

There will be monitoring and oversight of the implementation of the recommendations in Section 3 above, through: a) the Strategic Healthy Lives Priority Board (which has oversight of the strategic and operational delivery of the various service proposals); b) the Transformation Group (which provides scrutiny and challenge to the delivery of the Transformation proposals/plans and ongoing monitoring of quality and performance); and c) the Deputy Chief Executive, Director and Lead Member for Health and Wellbeing. This oversight will pay particular attention to the issues raised by consultees which includes potential loss of respite for carers, loss of experienced trained staff, perceived increase in safeguarding risk, lack of transitional support for people who find change difficult and lack of clarity about alternative provision. In addition the transformation is subject to scrutiny by the Council's overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Adults and Health Scrutiny panel.

² Pages 17-45
³ Page 112-234

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

CAB109	<p>APPROVAL OF A NEW COMMISSIONING MODEL FOR CHILDREN'S CENTRES IN HARINGEY.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced the report which included: detailed feedback from the consultation on the proposed commissioning model for Children's Centres at Appendix I; the findings of the equalities impact assessment of the proposals at Appendix II, the actions to mitigate the impact on service users; analysis of the issues was contained in the sections of the main report; and the legal duties of the Council were contained in section 8.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Children and Families reminded Cabinet of the context behind the proposed changes to the Children's Centre services and closure of 9 Centres. The financial challenges the Council was facing over the next three years meant that the Council would have to make some difficult decisions about which services it offers and must ensure that it is utilising remaining resources to best effect.</p> <p>Councillor Waters acknowledged that 87% of respondees did not want to see closures and valued the stay and a play provision provided by the Centres. However, these changes would allow the Council to continue to support the community and help provide access to the most vulnerable.</p> <p>As part of the plans Children's Centres will deliver services from fewer physical premises, but will continue to offer comprehensive support as well as making services available to more people and ensuring standards were more consistent from place to place. The Council had listened to views about the proposed community access points and these would not be taken forward as their role and focus was not fully understood. Instead there would be focus on making sure that the remaining Children's Centres were providing a good comprehensive support with focus on safeguarding and universally accessible services. There will be more integration with health services with a health check provided to all 1 and 2 year olds in the borough. There will be integrated outreach using staff and partners to provide better services to children.</p> <p>Councillor Waters advised that there will continue to be a strong emphasis on parental involvement and the majority of remaining Children's Centres would be located in areas where need is the greatest. There were plans being developed to expand services to a wider age range of 0 – 19 year olds, or 0 -25 in the case of those children with additional needs.</p> <p>These Centres will also be open more frequently and will provide additional support to groups including fathers and young parents.</p> <p>These proposals would see Children's Centres work more closely with parents, carers, health visitors and GPs, as well as many others in the community to ensure they are able to provide more support directly in the community.</p> <p>Councillor Waters advised that there would be a full timetable for development of the Children's Centres and there was a tremendous amount of information to take forward from the consultation to support this work going forward.</p> <p>In response to Councillor Morton's question on the average journey times to the Children's Centres from their location in the borough, it was noted that the locations had been chosen with the local partner network in mind and there</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

should be no more than 20 minutes travel to the Children's Centres for parents.

In response to Councillor' Strickland's question about good services being provided with a reduced budget, it was noted that the universal health visits to all 1 and 2 year olds will actually help the Council see more children and pick up any issues at an early stage and enable families to be signposted to Council or partner services.

In response to Councillor Arthur's question on the outreach work to be achieved, this would be commissioned according to the outcomes being sought and will help the Council identify the families that need support.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families also clarified that the buildings of the Children's Centres that were closing would likely continue to provide early years settings for the community. The Council were exploring how the buildings can be utilised to support the required national changes in the childcare policy, providing more care and preschool education for children.

Councillor McNamara welcomed the increased age range covered by the Children's Centres and hoped that the Centres could have a role in support educational welfare activities such as ensuring attendance at school which was a fundamental to ensuring that children are able to develop and achieve educationally.

Councillor Peacock was invited by the Chair to address the Cabinet.

Councillor Peacock spoke in her capacity as Chair of a Children's Centres cluster group, Chair of the Local Planning Group at Park Lane and Vice Chair of the Pembury Children's Centre. She expressed her disappointment at the proposals to close 9 Centres which she believed would provide additional pressures for staff in the remaining Children's Centres. Councillor Peacock put forward the concerns of staff in her associated Centre about their changing roles in the new model. Councillor Peacock was concerned that 4 schools would not be participating in the scheme and there would not be a Centre in the west of the borough until a Children's Centre could be commissioned.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families responded to the concerns raised by Cllr Peacock by reiterating that the Council had listened to all the views expressed in the consultation. However the Council would have less money to spend in the future and would need a Children's Centre model that targets the vulnerable and responds to families with a comprehensive service. A Centre would be commissioned in the west of the borough and this would be in a central location as possible. Cllr Waters clarified that Rokesly school had themselves opted not to have a Centre and Campsbourne did not want to take existing teaching time away from the school by adding a Centre

In terms of the Bounds Green and Noel Park Centres closing, the Council would ensure that the remaining Centres provide a full comprehensive service. Cllr Waters provided assurance that there would be detailed discussions with affected staff following Cabinet's decision with full explanation of the different designations being taken forward.

Councillor Engert came forward to speak and welcomed the universal visits to

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

families with 1 and 2 year olds by Health Visitors. Cllr Engert further hoped that the location of the new Children's Centre in the west of the borough would be as central as possible and easily accessible to families. It was agreed that Cllr Engert be supplied with the estimation of the number of children that the Health Visitors would be visiting in the borough.

Following a vote of Cabinet Members -

RESOLVED

1. Considered and taken into account detailed feedback from the statutory consultation which is summarised at **Appendix I**.
2. Considered and taken into account the findings of the Equalities Impact Assessment at **Appendix II**.
3. To take into account the concerns raised as part of the consultation exercise, actions proposed to mitigate these concerns and the adverse impact of the proposals on service users.
4. To take into account the statutory guidance (Sure Start Children's Centres Statutory Guidance) attached as **Appendix III** and to be found at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/273768/childrens_Centre_stat_guidance_april_2013.pdf
5. To take into account the options outlined in the report at Section 5.
6. To reduce the number of designated Children's Centres in the Borough from 16 to 9.
7. To close the following seven designated Children's Centres by 31st March 2016:
 - Bounds Green Children's Centre
 - Campsbourne Children Centre
 - Earlsmead Children's Centre
 - Noel Park Children's Centre
 - South Grove Children's Centre
 - Stonecroft Children's Centre
 - The Ladder Children's Centre

Closing these Centres will require the Council to de-designate the Centres by formally notifying the Department for Education (DfE) and Ofsted. Following this, they will no longer be recorded as Children's Centres on the DfE or Ofsted databases.

8. To close Rokesly Children's Centre, a school-based Children's Centre, at the request of the school's governing body, by 31st March 2016.

**Deputy
CE/AD
Commissioner**

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

9. To identify a new provider to deliver Children's Centre services covering Alexandra, Crouch End, Fortis Green, Hornsey, Highgate, Muswell Hill and Stroud Green wards.
10. To withdraw the proposal for the development of Community Access Points (CAPs).
11. To establish five Children's Centre planning areas, aligned with Haringey schools' Network Learning Communities (NLCs).
12. To confirm, that whilst Children's Centres should retain a focus on delivering services for children aged 0-5 years and their families, future developments should include services for children and young people aged 0 – 19, and 25 where children have additional needs and disabilities, and their families. These early help services, which intervene early to offer support at the right time before needs escalate, will form part of the locality based approach to early help.
13. To confirm that the commissioning of children 's Centres going forward will be outcomes focused, that the service offer will be informed by differing needs across the borough and that a core universal and targeted service offer will be available from all Children's Centres.
14. To prioritise access to Children's Centre services for Haringey residents.
15. To increase current service availability across more weeks of the year and note that work will continue with partner services, including health services, to enable greater access to services in the evenings and at weekends.
16. To bring the current arrangements for Children's Centre Advisory Boards to an end by 31st March 2016 and establish new Children's Centre Advisory Boards (CCAB) from April 2016.
17. To develop Parent Engagement Forums for each Children's Centre planning area.
18. To introduce the new model for Children's Centres in Haringey from April 2016 based on the key points above, including the reduction in the number of Children's Centres, embedding of Children's Centres within the wider delivery of early help in localities across the borough, an increased universal and targeted offer, a focus on the family, supporting access to children 0-19 (and 25 for children with additional needs and disabilities), strong links with health and other early help provision and greater parental and resident involvement in delivery and governance. The localities are areas that align with the locality groupings that schools in Haringey are organised by.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

19. The implementation of the recommendations set out above to be delegated to the Assistant Director for Commissioning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families.

20. The implementation of the proposals to be monitored and overseen by the Best Start in Life Priority Board.

Cabinet made the above resolutions taking into account the feedback from the consultation exercise, an appraisal of suggestions made, in terms of costs and impact, our strategic priorities for early help and the anticipated levels of funding available from 2016.

Alternative options considered

Option 1 - The responses to the statutory consultation showed that the majority of respondents did not agree with any reduction in the current number of Children's Centres in the borough.

This option would retain the current model and number of designated Children's Centres in Haringey but strengthen the outreach and partnership approach across the borough. The key elements included in this option are:

- Maintaining 16 designated Children's Centres
- 4 hour weekend service provision for 38 weeks per year
- Dedicated Centre manager for each site
- Allocation towards building running costs and service delivery

An analysis of this option suggested that this would cost £2.834m in funding. This is nearly £1m more than the recommended option and over £400k more than the current service delivery cost.

This option has not been proposed for implementation due to the high costs.

Option 2 – This option would propose to implement a commissioning model for Children's Centre delivery as set out in the statutory consultation. This proposed the retention of 9 designated Children's Centres and 7 Community Access Points. If taking forward this option, we would incorporate the feedback from consultees on the numbers of staff and level of running costs required to maintain this particular delivery model. The key elements included in this option are:

- Maintaining 9 designated Children's Centres
- Maintaining 7 community access point open for 15 hours service delivery per week
- 4 hour weekend service provision for 38 weeks per year
- Dedicated Centre manager for each site
- Allocation towards building running costs and service delivery

An analysis of costs suggested that the funding required to meet the delivery model as informed by the consultation would be £2.194m. This would represent a saving on the current budget but is still £334K more than the recommended option.

This option has not been proposed for implementation due to the costs.

Reasons for decision

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

The transformation of early years is a fundamental part of the Council's early help strategy and approach. We recognise that early years represents the best early intervention opportunity to improve outcomes for local residents. Children's Centres are an important part of the network of services, including early years education settings, schools, health services and the voluntary and community sector, that children and families use in the borough and that provide access to information, support and where required, more specialist services.

The five strategic objectives of our Early Help Strategy 2015-2018 are:

- Delivering prevention and early intervention to reduce escalation of need
- Enhancing access to, and co-ordination of, integrated services
- Sustaining resilience for children, young people and families
- Developing the workforce to be more confident and empowered practitioners of early help
- Increasing equity of access to quality provision for all children, young people and families

These objectives provide the framework for the approach we are taking to the development, commissioning and delivery of early help services, including early year's services, as we progress towards 2018/19.

The proposals set out in this section of the report aim to address the three key outcomes enabled by the Early Help Strategy:

- Improved family and community resilience
- Thriving children, young people and families and
- Strong partnerships, making effective use of resources

The future commissioning model for Children's Centres

A commissioning approach will be applied transparently and equitably to the delivery of early year's provision in the borough. This approach will seek to focus funding on the achievement of identified outcomes, rather than on settings, and allow for local variations to meet specific outcomes based on identified need. The new model for delivering Children's Centres in Haringey will build on the current mixed commissioning model, establishing a more consistent approach across the borough and one that is based on needs, assets and resources.

Implementing this approach will mean that we will:

- Commission for outcomes
- Commission for Children's Centre integration within a wider early help locality model
- Commission in a way that builds the engagement of families and strengthens community and individual resilience
- Commission for sustainability
- Commission to engage with, and benefit from, the wider opportunities of closer joint working with health, education, employment and other providers

We are seeking to introduce a more consistent approach to the commissioning of Children's Centre service delivery and build in greater degrees of flexibility, enabling the model to adapt to changing needs over time. The emphasis will

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

be less on buildings and more on the network of services that will operate across an area in a range of locations and delivered by both community and professional partners.

Financial Impact

The overall early year's budget for 2014/2015 was £4.145m. The need to find savings of £1.440m between the financial years 2015/16 and 2018/19 means an overall reduction of 35%.

In 2014/15, the £4.145m was allocated across early years services as follows:

Budget Area	2014/15 Early Years Budget Allocation (£)	Percentage of the overall early years budget
Children's Centres	2,400,766	58%
Haringey's Early Years Central Teams costs	733,000	18%
Early Years Commissioned Services	1,012,100	24%

If the savings had been apportioned to each service area in line with the budget then it would have been necessary to take £835K from Children's Centres. However, during our engagement process, the importance of maintaining a strong network of outcome focused Children's Centres services to complement other commissioned services became clear and an alternative approach was therefore taken. Work was undertaken by officers to build up a new model for Children's Centres service delivery informed by our strategic objectives and feedback from stakeholders, as well as the need to find savings. This produced a very different profile of savings across the early year's budget.

Area of early years expenditure	2014/15 budget (£)	Total reduction by 2018/19 (£)	Overall reduction to 2014/15 budget
Children's Centres	2,400,766	545,000	23%
Haringey's Early Years Central Teams costs	733,000	399,000	54%
Commissioned services	1,012,100	496,000	49%
TOTAL	4,145,866	1,440,000	

The full year cost of the recommended proposals is **£1.86m**, contributing a financial saving of **£545,000** in the early year's expenditure by 2018-19. Specifically, the budget for commissioning the future Children's Centre delivery model will be targeted at maintaining a core Children's Centre offer that we believe can be sustained in the longer term.

The recommendations will enable a continuation of Children's Centre services with reduced funding and ensure that the active participation and engagement of parents/carers and the community will play a significant part in shaping the

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

Children's Centre offer over the next three years.

The recommendations will also enable the Council to ensure that limited resources are targeted to best effect and that we believe can be sustained over the next two years.

Despite the fact that the Council is proposing to close Children's Centres, we do not believe the outcomes for children, particularly the most disadvantaged, would be adversely affected for these reasons:

The integration of health visiting into the Children's Centre delivery model which will ensure universal contact with all 0-5 year olds in the borough and the early identification of the most vulnerable

The embedding of the Early Help Locality Model and implementation of the Early Help Assessment Framework which will strengthen the early identification and response to more vulnerable children and their families
Integrated outreach will be delivered in partnership across health, Children's Centre and voluntary and community sector staff which will enable greater capacity to meet identified need

Despite the fact that the Council is proposing to close Children's Centres, we believe that this will not compromise our duty to have sufficient Children's Centres to meet local need, for the following reasons:

Children's Centres remain universally accessible, strengthened by a core universal offer, outreach and targeted services, which ensures that the proposed network of Children's Centres is accessible to all families with young children in the borough

Having taken into account accessibility and transport links as part of developing the proposals, we believe that Children's Centres and their services will be within reasonable reach of all families with young children in the borough taking into account distance and availability of transport

The proposed offer as set out in s. 6.15.6.6 reflects our joint approach with local commissioners of health, employment and other services to ensure that we can support those families who need services to access t

Alongside the universal offer, we will ensure targeted Children's Centres services are accessible to young children and families in the area who are at risk of poor outcomes

The proposals build stronger links between Children's Centre staff and health visiting, early help and voluntary and community sector providers in order to reach all local children and families, supported by effective tracking and information sharing. Our performance management processes will have a particular focus on reach and outcomes for disadvantaged groups

As far as is reasonably practicable, the proposals seek to develop opening times which meet the needs of service users

The main criticisms of the proposals raised in the consultation process can be summarised as:

- a) The closure of Children's Centres would lead to lack of service coverage, overcrowding at the Centres that remained and

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p>further travel for families to access services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Closure of particular Children’s Centres would lead to a loss of qualified, experienced and high quality staff for the delivery of Children’s Centre services c) There would be a reduction in choice for residents and Children’s Centre users d) The increased levels of activity at the Children’s Centres remaining open, could mean a lack of capacity to identify and respond to safeguarding issues at the earliest opportunity e) The Community Access Points would lead to a stretching of resources and would lead to a lack of clarity over accountability and governance for service delivery <p>For further details of respondent’s views on the proposals, see pages 68 -288 of Changes to Haringey’s Children’s Centres: summary report of responses at Appendix I.</p> <p>Officers believe, as set out in more detail in ss. 6.15 – 6.17 of this report, that the design of the future model responds to these criticisms and that the Equalities Impact Assessment further details how mitigating actions will be taken. In summary, the proposals set out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased levels of outreach • stronger partnership arrangements to ensure commissioned services can contribute to support for children and families • the confirmation of an equitable and transparent restructure process across all Children’s Centre sites and of a Children’s Centre manager for each Children’s Centre site • the core universal and targeted offer to be in place at each Centre • designated Social Worker, Health Visitor and Family Support Worker arrangements for each Children’s Centre • increased family support early intervention capacity at each Children’s Centre • withdrawal of the proposal to establish Community Access Points in order to focus resources on designated Children’s Centres 	
<p>CAB110</p>	<p>EDUCATION EXCELLENCE POLICY</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced the report which set out the policy for how the Council will work with all schools in the borough both in a statutory and non statutory setting. The policy further outlined how the Council will not only support schools to ensure their pupils reach their potential, but also how it will support Haringey’s family of schools to support each other. Cllr Waters emphasised that championing excellence and supporting school improvement was key to delivering the borough’s ambitious aim to ensure all children and young people are able to access an outstanding education in Haringey, leading to employment and greater opportunities for young people.</p> <p>With the changing educational landscape now including a diverse range of schools in the borough it was also a good time for a policy to set out the expectation and responsibilities of both the Council and Schools for safeguarding which this policy also did.</p> <p>Following a vote of Cabinet Members -</p> <p>RESOLVED</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p>To adopt the Education Excellence Policy which sets out the statutory role of the authority and lies at the core of the relationship between the Council and schools, academies, academy sponsors, multi-academy trusts, free schools the Council’s Diocesan partners, the Department for Education (DfE) and the Greater London Authority (GLA) on our improvement agenda.</p> <p>To note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the diverse and changing education landscape; • the legislation setting out the statutory role of local authorities; • the non-statutory and statutory interventions to support school improvement. <p>Alternative options considered A school improvement strategy was considered. Following guidance last year this was superseded by an Education Excellence Policy which was written to set down the shape of our relationship with schools, academies, multi-academy trusts, free schools, the DfE and the GLA.</p> <p>Recognition is given to new legislation being developed this year – the Education and Adoption Bill- which will bring about enforced academisation for schools judged by Ofsted as requiring improvement, those in special measures and also for schools considered by the Secretary of State as “coasting”.</p> <p>Reasons for decision In a diverse education landscape with changing roles and responsibilities for the Council it is important to recognise the role of ‘champion’ and define the relationship with schools, academies, multi-academy trusts, free schools. Our role is now of influence, commissioning, brokering and acting as a constructive partner.</p> <p>To achieve our vision and create a world class system the way forward is to develop partnership, collaborative models and effective networks where schools work together to spread best practice and help all schools become good or better schools.</p>	<p>Deputy CE/ Interim AD Schools & Learning</p>
<p>CAB111</p>	<p>BUDGET MONITORING - UPDATE REPORT</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture introduced the report which provided an update on the Council’s budget position since the previous monitoring report considered at the October meeting. The overspend had increased from £14.3m to £14.8m due to increasing costs for temporary accommodation.</p> <p>The report further set out the budget reduction strategy was being taken forward, use of reserves , together with the actions being undertaken to reduce the overspend and longer term savings plans. There would be £2.9m released from treasury management activities to tackle the overspend and a further £5m was earmarked to be drawn down to respond to the overspend. This action highlighted that reserves were not enough to support services to deal with changes in demographics and rising demand.</p> <p>In response to Cllr Engert's question about the increase in the overspend and expected use of reserves until the end of the financial year, it was noted that</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

the £6.9m overspend was a challenge but all officers were working hard to reduce the deficit to deter further use of the reserves.

There were specific star chamber meetings to analyse and compile actions for overspending areas. A meeting had been held with Adults and Children's service and there would be activities going forward to get grip on overspending Children's budget and a review of care packages which would have an impact of the spend currently.

The Leader remarked on the how this report illustrated the difficult financial context which the Council was working in, entailing difficult decisions to limit calls on reserves. Further reductions to local government finance were still expected with the government announcement this week of a 30% cut to the DCLG budget, of which a percentage would inevitably be passed on to local government. Cllr Arthur informed Cabinet that there was also a 6.2% cut to the Public Health grant which would see a £1.2m in year cut to the Council's health budget.

The Cabinet Member for Economy, Sustainability, and Social inclusion highlighted the high level risk to reserves if the Council continued to spend at current levels.

RESOLVED

To note the updated budget management position and the proposed actions to address the 2015/16 position.

Alternative options considered

In addition to the approach set out in this paper there are a number of alternatives that could be taken. A passive approach could be adopted with the position being dealt with at the end of the financial year; in that event, and to the extent that there remained an overspend position; there would be a call on the Council's reserves.

The option of requiring alternative or additional budget savings has also been considered however at this stage it has been discounted as the evidence suggests that the approved savings should continue to be delivered albeit that slippage is occurring. In addition there are no indications that any alternative savings have a greater chance of success; this is particularly true given the time that would be needed to develop, approve and implement them.

Further, more aggressive management action could be taken to limit spending above those already being pursued in the Deficit Recovery Plan: for example all vacancies could be 'frozen', or there could be embargoes on spending. In practice these require significant management attention which at this stages it is considered would detract from the key task of implementing the approved savings proposals. Instead a recruitment panel of senior offices considers the business case for all vacancy and temporary staffing requests and relevant spending trends are closely monitored.

None of these options have been discounted lightly and they are all available should they become necessary later; it is therefore important that members understand the alternative actions and keep the Council's financial position under close review.

Reasons for decision

Members set the approved budget in February 2015 alongside the three year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). The overspend position apparent at this stage of the 2015/16 financial year requires members to consider the

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p>options for bringing the budget back into balance over the remainder of the financial year.</p>	
<p>CAB112</p>	<p>HARINGEY DEVELOPMENT VEHICLE</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report which sought agreement to the establishment of a Development Vehicle for Haringey to deliver regeneration and achieve new housing, jobs and social and economic benefits for the borough. A business case was presented supporting this and approval was sought to commence a procurement process under the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 using the Competitive Dialogue procedure to procure an investment partner.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member explained how important it was to take forward a social dividend scheme for Haringey residents and put forward the approval for developing a joint venture company to help the Council's ambition for increasing jobs, and homes at a time when the Council did not have the financial resources to do this as a lone venture nor the wide range of skills and expertise needed for this future wide scale regeneration.</p> <p>The report sought agreement to begin the procurement process for seeking a partner for the joint venture vehicle.</p> <p>In response to Councillor Engert's question, it was noted that new build projects under the joint venture vehicle would not have Right to Buy applied. However, given the current housing policy activities of the Government, an absolute assurance could not be provided that this policy would remain as is.</p> <p>In response to Cllr Engert's question about the inclusion of Wood Green Library site in the categories of assets to be included in the vehicle, it was noted that there was further consultation with residents in the next few weeks on the development of Wood Green.</p> <p>The funding for the procurement of the partner would be met from the Urban Renewal reserves.</p> <p>Following a vote of Cabinet Members -</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To approve the Business Case attached as Appendix A1, and as referred to in the exempt report, for the establishment of the 'Haringey Development Vehicle'. 2. To agrees that Option 6 as set out in paragraphs 7.40-7.42 of this report (the Overarching Vehicle) is the most appropriate structure for Haringey. 3. To the commencement of a Competitive Dialogue Procedure under the Public Contracts Regulations 2015, to procure an investment partner, with whom to set up a vehicle as set out in Option 6, subject to this matter being brought back to Cabinet for the selection of the preferred 	<p>Dir Planning Regen and Develop ment /AD Regen</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

bidder and approval of the final documentation as set out in recommendation 5 below.

4. To provide delegated Authority to the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development, after consultation with the Leader of the Council, to agree all documentation required to support the procurement process.
5. To provide delegated Authority to the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development, after consultation with the Leader of the Council, to deselect bidders, in line with the evaluation criteria, throughout the procurement process and to return to Cabinet for approval of the preferred bidder following the conclusion of the procurement process.
6. That the list of properties or sites set out in paragraph 7.54 be included in the procurement as Category 1 Land owned by the Council that it is intended will be transferred into the vehicle', subject to satisfaction of the appropriate conditions precedent and obtaining necessary consents where applicable.
7. That the Category 2 properties listed in paragraph 7.54 be included in the procurement process as they may potentially be transferred into the vehicle in future. Cabinet will receive a further report at the appropriate time should it be intended to transfer these into the vehicle.
8. To note that the Council may wish to transfer into the vehicle at a future time additional currently unidentified strategic, vacant or surplus sites or assets, located in the Borough and owned by the Council, that are suitable to deliver the regeneration and socio-economic aspirations of the Council, These are referred to as Category 3 Properties in paragraph 7.54 of this report and Cabinet is requested to agree that these be included in the procurement. These may be Housing Revenue Account or General Fund sites and should these be brought forward Cabinet will receive a further report on the potential disposal of these assets to the vehicle.
9. That the initial procurement brief as set out at Appendix 7, indicating in outline the priority areas of regeneration, social and economic benefits that the Council is seeking be taken forward and that delegated authority be given to the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Place, after consultation with the Leader of the Council to make any necessary amendments during the procurement process.
10. That additional funding of £547,000 from the Urban Renewal Reserve be provided to carry out the procurement process, as set out in paragraph 8.8.

Alternative options considered

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

The potential alternative options are considered in detail in the business case attached a Appendix A1, and referred to in the exempt report, and covered in the main report.

REASONS FOR DECISION

The Council has set out in its Corporate Plan and associated strategies, a set of challenging social, economic and regeneration objectives. It also has challenging economic and housing growth targets from the London plan, as well as a need to maintain its existing housing stock and carry out major estate renewal. It has neither the resources nor the capacity to achieve these alone.

In the autumn of 2014, Turnberry examined the market on the Council's behalf to see if there was an appetite for partnership with the Council to deliver these social and economic objectives; deliver new housing and economic growth. On confirming that there was interest, the Council commissioned detailed work into the options for delivering the objectives, which is included in the Business Case at Appendix A1 and considered in detail below.

In summary, the site by site disposal of land will not deliver the required social and economic benefits or the renewal of estates as the level of up front funding required by the private sector, particularly for estate renewal, will prevent them being developed, and where it is possible to move development forward will reduce returns and inhibit the delivery of social and economic benefits.

For the Council to establish a wholly owned company and carry out the work itself, would mean a commitment to a level of borrowing that is impossible for the Council to sustain, and a level of risk that would not be prudent.

Accordingly the option recommended is that the Council should seek through open procurement a private sector partner with whom to deliver the objectives in partnership.

The Council accepts a degree of risk in that it will commit its commercial portfolio to the vehicle, and will, subject to the satisfaction of relevant pre-existing conditions, also commit land. It has also to bear the costs of the procurement and establishment of the vehicle, and some limited development risk. However, in return, the contribution to its Corporate Plan objectives, including high quality new jobs, new homes including affordable homes and economic and social benefits, will be at a scale and pace that would otherwise be unachievable. The Council also receives a financial return that it can reinvest in the fulfilment of its statutory functions, and particularly in measures to achieve such socio-economic objectives (as more particularly described in paragraph 7 below and Appendix 7) or, as appropriate, such other strategic outcomes under the Corporate Plan.

The development partner, who continues to bear funding risk and the consequent development risk, enters a long term partnership with a non – commercial partner in a political environment, making it essential for them to maintain relationships. However, they obtain a long term pipeline of development work, in an area of London with rising land values, and with a stable partner.

It is not feasible for the Council to continue to operate as it has done previously and the approach outlined will help deliver wider social and economic benefits, as well as the housing and jobs outlined in the Council's plans. It should be noted, however, that this report does not recommend a decision to establish a vehicle, but simply to open a procurement process with a view to establishing one; the decision to establish will come back to Cabinet in due course.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

CAB113	<p>WARDS CORNER COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2015[SEVEN SISTERS REGENERATION, TOTTENHAM - COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2016 - "LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY (WARDS CORNER REGENERATION PROJECT) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2016".</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report which sought approval from Cabinet for the Council to use its Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) powers to acquire the land required for the Wards Corner development. The report further included the rationale and reasons for Cabinet authorising the CPO of this key regeneration site in Tottenham.</p> <p>Cabinet had already agreed, in July 2014, to the principal of the CPO, subject to pre – conditions being met. The Cabinet Member reiterated that this was a critical development for Tottenham delivering housing and employment.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration further drew Cabinet’s attention to an addendum to be considered with this report. This included an updated Statement of Reasons and corresponding updated recommendations, following the recent DCLG guidance on CPO’s produced in late October. This had been produced after the report was finalised and it was necessary to now consider the updated statement of reasons to ensure the Council were complying with the latest government guidance.</p> <p>A deputation request from the Wards Corner Coalition had been received after the constitutional deadline and therefore had not been accepted .They had put forward further written representations which were tabled for Cabinet member’s consideration.</p> <p>Councillor Strickland continued to respond to the issues raised in the deputation letter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Wards Corner Coalition contended that they had not been communicated with about the likelihood of a CPO decision going forward to Cabinet in November. In response to this, the Cabinet Member advised that there had been a previous indication of the CPO decision in the earlier report to Cabinet in July 2014 and this key decision had been notified on the 1st of October in the Council’s published Forward Plan.• The public benefit of the CPO, the case was made within the report and the Statement of Reasons and would be tested at a public enquiry, if necessary.• Lack of engagement with them about this process - Cllr Strickland explained that at this stage of the process the Council were not required to engage with the Collation. There would be stakeholder engagement as part of the CPO process.• The CPO process was a statutory process and people were free to oppose this through the set statutory process. Councillor Strickland outlined that the EQIA at Appendix 5 of the report pack also identified the existing social and economic value of the site in relation to protected characteristics. It concluded that any negative equality impacts of the CPO will be mitigated by the measures outlined in the S106 Agreement, including further engagement with the affected stakeholders.	
---------------	---	--

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

- Representation of the Ward's Corner Coalition community plan in the report, there was a clear reference to the plan and objective assessment made in section 8. This was clear that the Coalition's community plan does not deliver the regeneration needed in this area.
- Community value – ASV was not dismissed and dealt with in the draft Statement of Reasons.
- Cabinet was not required to consider likelihood that CPO will be opposed.
- The opposition by London Underground was noted. Cllr Strickland advised that this was being completed as a protective measure by London Underground and prior to them settling terms with Grainger. This was clearly not viewed as an action contrary to the proposed scheme and there was not an opposition to the overall scheme and objective for this area which was increased housing and jobs.
- Assurance was further given by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration that points raised by the Collation have been covered in the report.

Cllr McNamara reminded Cabinet of the previous efforts of the Planning Committee in ensuring the improvement to the design of the scheme and preservation of the physical heritage aspects. Issues with access points had previously also been resolved.

In response to Cllr Carter's question, it was noted that the provision for the existing market had been dealt with in the section 106 agreement and they had protected funding to relocate. There was not previously affordable housing included in the approved development following the viability assessment of the scheme.

Following a vote of Cabinet Members -

RESOLVED

1. To note that the pre-conditions for the CPO as set out in the Cabinet Resolution of 12th July 2014 have been met and complied with and that Grainger has confirmed that the pre-conditions contained within the Development Agreement of the 3rd August 2007 (as varied) have either been met and complied with, or can be met and complied with (as set out in paragraphs 6.11 to 6.29 of the Cabinet Report).
2. That (whether or not the pre-conditions for the CPO as set out in the Cabinet Resolution of July 2014 have been complied with) Cabinet resolve (taking account of the Guidance and both the Cabinet Report and the Addendum) to make a Compulsory Purchase Order to acquire all land and rights within the Site shown edged red on the plan in Appendix 1 for planning purposes pursuant to Section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to enable Grainger to implement its planning permission on the basis that this will facilitate the redevelopment of the Site and promote or improve the economic,

**Dir
Planning
Regen
and
Develop
ment**

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

social and environmental well being of the area.

3. That delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Director of Property and Capital Projects (i) to make any necessary changes, if appropriate, to the draft Statement of Reasons consequent upon Full Council's consideration of the emerging planning policy papers and Regulation 19 approval for publication and submission thereof and (ii) on receipt of the Developer's Stage 2 Notice (as defined in the CPO indemnity agreement dated 23 January 2015) to make, serve and implement the London Borough of Haringey (Wards Corner Regeneration Project) Compulsory Purchase Order 2016, including dealing with consultation with landowners and objections to the CPO, and preparation for and representation at any public inquiry.

4. That delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director of Property and Capital Projects to serve the requisite Demolition Notices as set out in paragraphs 8.9 to 8.11 of the Cabinet Report on 12 Suffield Road.

Alternative options considered

Not to support the Wards Corner development with the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers (business as usual).

The implications of this option are that Grainger would be unlikely to be able to acquire the land needed through negotiation with individual land owners alone, and therefore will not be able to progress the development and the regeneration objectives for the Seven Sisters area will not be achieved. The additional houses and jobs will not be provided and the opportunity to create a significant and landmark development at the Seven Sisters transport interchange will be missed.

The alternative planning permission for part of the site, obtained by the Wards Corner Coalition (WCC), could, with the necessary landowner consent and funding, come forward should the CPO not be made. This scheme does not provide any increase in housing or employment space on the site and is likely to compromise the comprehensive development of the rest of the wider site which makes up the Order Land (Appendix 1). As a result the capacity of the site to provide new houses, commercial space and jobs and to help to achieve the regeneration objectives for the Seven Sisters area would not be met.

There are also significant concerns about the deliverability of the WCC scheme, as there is no evidence that the development could be funded and the landowner, London Underground Limited, has entered into negotiations with Grainger regarding the disposal of their interest.

Reason for decision

Dealing with each recommendation in turn, the reasons for decision are as follows:

The Cabinet resolution of 15th July 2014 which agreed in principle to the use of compulsory purchase powers in regards to the Wards Corner development site was subject to Grainger complying with a number of pre-conditions which were

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p>set out in the same Cabinet Report. It is therefore required that the Cabinet note that Grainger have complied with these pre-conditions as set out in sections 6.8 – 6.9 of this Cabinet Report. This is the reason for the recommendation at 3.1 of this Report.</p> <p>Grainger have been unable to acquire all of the outstanding third party land interests in the proposed Wards Corner development site through agreement and is unlikely to be able to without the use of a CPO. To enable the delivery of the Seven Sisters Regeneration Project and the economic, social and environmental benefits that this will bring to the area, the Cabinet is asked to resolve to make a Compulsory Purchase Order to acquire all land and rights within the Site. The Council is satisfied that there is a compelling reason in the public interest to make the CPO for the reasons set out in this Cabinet Report and the Statement of Reasons (see Appendix 3). This is the reason for the recommendation at 3.2 of this report.</p> <p>A number of further steps will need to be taken to issue, serve and implement this Compulsory Purchase Order. In order to expedite this process the Cabinet is also asked to grant delegated authority to the relevant officers to undertake the actions required. This is the reason for the recommendation at 3.3 and 3.4 of this report.</p>	
<p>CAB114</p>	<p>TOTTENHAM HALE REGENERATION, – BP SITE ACQUISITION</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report which sought agreement to a key strategic site in Tottenham Hale located on Hale Road, Tottenham Hale and known as the BP Petrol Station site.</p> <p>In response to Councillor Carter’s question, the acquisition would help deliver more housing in an area which was expected to be part of the Housing Zone in Tottenham Hale.</p> <p>Following a vote of Cabinet Members -</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To purchase the land known as the BP Petrol Station site, Tottenham and shown outlined in red on the plan located at Appendix B for planning purposes and for the sum as stated in the Exempt part of the report; and subject to the detailed Heads of Terms outlined in Appendix D in the Exempt part of the report.</p> <p>Alternative options considered</p> <p><u>Option 1 – Do Nothing/maintain the current situation</u></p> <p>The implications of doing nothing would mean that the Council would miss the opportunity of purchasing the site and thus realising the ambitions of the District Centre Framework to take forward the development of the District Centre in a coordinated manner. This option results in significant risk that the site would not come forward for redevelopment. It is worth noting that this site did not come forward for redevelopment under the Council’s Transforming Tottenham Hale Supplementary Planning Document (2006). The failure to acquire this site would therefore reduce likelihood of the site coming forward and there are significant risks that the quality of the resulting development would not be in line with the Council’s ambitions to regenerate Tottenham Hale.</p> <p><u>Option 2 – The Council purchases the site alongside other sites</u></p>	<p>Dir Planning Regen and Develop ment</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p>The Council could purchase the site, as part of a wider strategy to bring together small sites into a coherent package. This option would see greater Council influence over the process and would ensure that key sites come forward for development in a timely and coordinated fashion.</p> <p>Option 2 has been identified as the option which best supports the regeneration of Tottenham Hale.</p> <p>Reasons for decision This report asks Cabinet to approve the purchase of the identified site currently owned freehold by BP, at the agreed price (see exempt report). The purpose of obtaining this key site is to help realise the ambitions of the District Centre Framework and meet the Council’s ambitions for the regeneration of Tottenham Hale.</p>	
<p>CAB115</p>	<p>SALE OF THE OLYMPIA TRADING ESTATE The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report which sought agreement to sell the freehold of land known as Olympia Trading Estate to St William Homes LLP. This was key Heartlands regeneration site which would provide more homes and jobs to the borough.</p> <p>In response to Cllr Carter’s question, the rental income for the site from the GLA would continue until there was an exchange of contracts which would likely take place in this calendar year.</p> <p>Following a vote of Cabinet Members -</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To sell the freehold of the land known as the Olympia Trading Estate and edged red on the plan in Appendix A to either St.William Homes LLP or the GLA for the estimated sum set out in the exempt part of this report. 2. That the disposal be according to the draft Heads of Terms, set out in the exempt part of this report. 3. That delegated authority be given to the Director of Regeneration Planning and Development in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration and Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture to agree the final terms (including the final sale price) for the disposal. <p>Alternative options considered Members have already approved that the Council enter into an option to sell the freehold of the Olympia Trading Estate.</p> <p>The alternative option is not to agree the sale of the freehold interest in the Olympia Trading Estate to St.William. This would result in delaying the development of the Clarendon Square development and the implementation of the current planning consent for the site.</p> <p>Reasons for decision Cabinet has previously agreed to an option to sell the freehold of the Olympia Trading Estate to the GLA but it has now been agreed that the disposal be</p>	<p>Dir Planning Regen and Develop ment</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p>through a straight sale either to St William or the GLA as this will be more tax efficient.</p> <p>The Olympia Trading Estate forms part of Clarendon Square a key regeneration area in Wood Green. The sale of the freehold of the estate to St.William will help enable the development and take it to the next stage.</p> <p>The deal with the GLA and St.William will reflect current market conditions and reflect best consideration.</p>	
<p>CAB116</p>	<p>ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION FOR CHANGES OF USE FROM B8 (STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION) TO C3 (DWELLING HOUSES)</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Planning introduced the report which set out the making of a non-immediate Article 4 Direction to withdraw the temporary permitted development right within the designated employment areas of the Borough, as shown on the plan at Appendix A. The objective in making the Article 4 Direction was to ensure planning applications are considered on their planning merit on a case-by-case basis against the relevant policies of the Local Plan, which seek to retain these key employment sites in employment use, and ensure the achievement of managed growth delivering both new housing and jobs.</p> <p>Following a vote of Cabinet Members -</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The making of and consultation (for a six-week period in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement) on a non-immediate Article 4 Direction under the Town and Country (General Permitted Development Order) 2015, to come into effect 12 months after it comes into operation, withdrawing permitted development rights to convert buildings of less than 500sqm in Use Class B8 (Storage and Distribution) to Use Class C3 (Dwellinghouse) for the areas of the Borough outlined in bold on the plan at Appendix 1. 2. To delegate authority to the Director for Planning, Regeneration and Development, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, to formally confirm the non-immediate Article 4 Direction following (1. the expiry of the six week consultation period; 2. the expiry of a minimum statutory 28 day confirmation period), if having fully considered all representations made during the consultation period, they are of the opinion that the Article 4 Direction should be made. <p>Alternative options considered</p> <p>The only alternative option is not to introduce an Article 4 Direction and to allow the new permitted development right to be exercised across the Borough (i.e. the 'do nothing' option).</p> <p>While the do nothing option would include a requirement to monitor the up-take and impact of this change on employment locations, this option runs the risk of significantly undermining the strategic objectives of the Local Plan to strike a sustainable balance between the delivery of both housing and employment growth. In the longer-term it may also compromise the ability of the Council to retain its main employment areas in an employment designation, which is</p>	<p>Dir Planning Regen and Develop ment</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p>considered essential in achieving sustainable development and growth within an urban London borough like Haringey. For these reasons, the do nothing option can be dismissed.</p> <p>An Article 4 Direction would enable the Council to safeguard the main strategic, homogenous and economically important employment areas within the Borough, ensuring these are not compromised by incremental residential development, the effect of which is likely to undermine business confidence and investment, and result in reverse sensitivities and pressure to respond by the new tenants of these homes to reallocate surrounding employment land and buildings to either residential or more residential compatible mixed uses.</p> <p>The Regulation allow the Council discretion as to when the Direction will come into force, which must be at least 28 days, but not longer than 2 years, after the end of the consultation period. In addition, there are compensation provisions that apply in circumstances where an application for planning permission, for an application formally permitted, is made before the end of the period of 12 months beginning with the date on which the Article 4 came into operation. Accordingly, the Council would wish to minimise its exposure to this compensation provision and a 12 month notification period is recommended.</p> <p>Reasons for decision</p> <p>The Council considers that this new permitted development right, and the effect of the prior approval process, significantly dilutes its planned and managed approach to meeting local employment needs and demands, and does very little to facilitate proper sustainable place-making, on-going business confidence and the delivery of sustainable development, including jobs growth. Having regard to local circumstances, it is not considered that the adverse effects likely to arise as a result of this change to permitted development rights would be offset by the positive benefits the new rights would bring in terms of the potential delivering of any new housing.</p> <p>The making of this Article 4 Direction is therefore seen as crucial to ensuring the proper long-term planning of the area and to protect local wellbeing, in particular the Council's ability to prevent the loss of uses which contribute to local jobs and the wider strategic aims for the area. The Council considers it appropriate that proponents of schemes to convert warehouses in B8 use to residential use, should submitted a planning application to be considered on its merits on a case-by-case basis in the usual way.</p>	
<p>CAB117</p>	<p>NOEL PARK CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Planning introduced the Noel Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. It was produced following guidance published by Historic England and covered the historical context of the area and provided an assessment of the area's character and special interest. It addressed planning policy and development management issues and provides design guidance. It also included a review of the boundaries of the conservation area and a recommendation that the boundaries of both the conservation area and Article 4 Direction were extended. It was proposed to take forward a six week consultation on the Appraisal and management plan to understand if there was residents' support for the two recommendations. Separate processes to be followed to extend the conservation area boundary as well as the Article 4 direction. Cabinet will receive a further report about this in due course.</p> <p>In response to Cllr Engert's question on the enforcement action required, the Cabinet Member spoke about the how the appraisal will provide residents in the</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p>area with the tools for working together with the Council to improve their area.</p> <p>Following a vote of Cabinet Members -</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To approve the draft Noel Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, attached at Appendix 1, for a six-week public consultation.</p> <p>Alternative options considered</p> <p>The draft Appraisal explores the possibility of leaving the boundaries of the conservation area and the area covered by the Article 4 Direction as they currently are. Given the fact that the area proposed to be included is contemporary with the Noel Park Estate and has the same architectural and historic significance, it was considered that it should be recommended to be a part of the conservation area and given the same protection as the rest of the area. In addition, given the cumulative impact of the loss of architectural detailing, it is imperative that a consistent control over such alterations is implemented across the whole of the conservation area. It is, therefore, recommended to extend the Article 4 direction (which removes permitted development rights to alterations to the front of the property only).</p> <p>It should be noted that if the proposal for extension of the conservation area and the extension of Article 4 directions is taken forward, Cabinet approval would be sought to undertake the respective legal processes.</p> <p>Reasons for decision</p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to ensure that conservation areas are preserved or enhanced and publish policies for the implementation of the same. The various insensitive alterations within the area have resulted in the conservation area being included in Historic England's 'At Risk' register. It is therefore important that the Council publishes this appraisal along with the management plan to ensure that the significance of the area is preserved or enhanced.</p>	<p>Dir Planning Regen and Develop ment</p>
<p>CAB118</p>	<p>ADOPTION OF REVISED GAMBLING POLICY -</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Environment introduced the report which put forward an updated Gambling policy for adoption by full Council on the 23rd November. The Cabinet Member for Environment asked Members to note the implications for the next review in 2016, where it will be a requirement in future to create Local Area Profiles. These profiles will provide a good evidence base of gambling in the local area and help identify any future risks, which will inform the decision making process.</p> <p>Following a vote of Cabinet Members -</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To note and agree the responses to the consultation as set out in paragraphs 6.9 -6.12 and at Appendix 2. 2. That the draft Statement of Gambling Policy at Appendix 1 be 	<p>Chief Operating Officer</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p>recommended to Full Council for adoption.</p> <p>3. To take into account the EQIA set out at Appendix 3.</p> <p>Alternative options considered No alternatives were considered. It is a legislative requirement that the policy be reviewed at least every three years, and that a public consultation is carried out. Failure to review and adopt the Statement of Gambling Policy would result in the Council failing to comply with legislation.</p> <p>Reasons for decision The Council is obliged to review and adopt a statement every three years; the current policy will expire in January 2016. Therefore a new policy has to be adopted.</p>	
<p>CAB119</p>	<p>AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR THE ALCOHOL SUPPORT SERVICE</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing introduced the report which proposed single commissioning and service approach to the delivery of alcohol support services in the borough, with its important emphasis both on prevention and early intervention and on wrap around support. The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing advised that the risk of homelessness for people with alcohol needs can be high without the appropriate support and the outreach and engagement interventions set out in this report will help to minimise wider harm from alcohol use and to support abstinence.</p> <p>Following a vote of Cabinet Members -</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To award the contract to the successful tenderer, Haringey Advisory Group on Alcohol, in accordance with Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.06.1(d), for £969,691.00 for an initial term of 2 years and 9 months with an option to extend for a further period(s) of up to two years for a further value of up to £706,342 over two full years.</p> <p>Alternative options considered</p> <p>Three alternative options were considered but were deemed unsuitable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To continue with existing arrangements: this was not deemed viable as a longer term holistic approach is needed to provide stability for the service offer and more closely align the service outcomes with the Council's Corporate Plan, Building A Stronger Haringey Together. 2. To recommission separately the different parts of the alcohol service: it was recognised that existing contracting arrangements and separate recommissioning would achieve neither the desired outcomes for users and their carers nor the savings set out in the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy which could be delivered through a whole service commission and competitive tender process. 3. To decommission the alcohol service: needs assessment and service user and stakeholder consultation evidence the need for this type of 	<p>Dir PH</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p>service provision in Haringey. This, in conjunction with the Council's duty in relation to wellbeing under the Care Act 2014, precluded decommissioning.</p> <p>Reasons for decision Although the existing alcohol support service in its current form was delivered as one service, it was funded through a number of separately agreed contracts across Housing and Adults Commissioning.</p> <p>A review of the service provision identified cross cutting themes and outcomes across the two commissioning areas and the potential to improve outcomes for service users and deliver savings through joint commissioning and a competitive process.</p> <p>As a result of the procurement exercise, which has been carried out in accordance with the Council's Contract Standing Orders and the Procurement Code of Practice, it is necessary to award the contract to the successful tenderer as outlined in paragraph 3.1 in accordance with CSO 9.06.1(d).</p>	
<p>CAB120</p>	<p>COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME (CTRS) FOR 2016/17</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture introduced the report which set out the recommendations for Haringey's Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) for 2016/17, taking into account the outcomes of an Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA).</p> <p>The Cabinet member for Resources and Culture explained that the Council must approve the final scheme by 31st January 2016 ready for implementation on the 1st April 2016. The purpose of this report was to seek approval from Cabinet to take the recommendations forward to Full Council at its meeting on 23rd November 2016. The recommended CTRS was a continuation of the current CTRS without revision or amendment.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources also put forward an additional recommendation to the Cabinet which was to provide the Chief Operating Officer, in consultation with him, to make some final amendments to appendix C and D before submission to Full Council. The amendments to appendix C were required to ensure that the scheme was up to date with the latest regulations from Government. These were minor and do not affect the principles of the scheme in any way. Amendments to appendix D were required to make the justification for not extending the scheme to other groups clearer and for the financial information in the section on, options to protect specific groups, to be enhanced.</p> <p>Following a vote of Cabinet Members -</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To make the following recommendations to full Council for consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That having taken into account the Equalities Impact Assessment at Appendix B, the Council resolve not to revise the Council Tax Reduction Scheme agreed for 2015/16 and to continue this scheme for 2016/17; 	<p>Chief Operating Officer</p>

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

2. That accordingly, the scheme which is summarised in **Appendix A** and set out in full at **Appendix C** continues to be implemented for 2016/17. The principles of this are that:

(a) pensioners remain protected from any increase in the amount of Council Tax which they are liable to pay following the abolition of Council Tax Benefit (as prescribed by Central Government). Pensioners will continue to receive the same level of support for the payment of Council Tax as compared with 2012/2013 and the original Council Tax benefit.

(b) those in receipt of certain disability benefits are protected from any increase in the amount of Council Tax which they are liable to pay following the abolition of Council Tax Benefit. Those in receipt of certain disability benefits will continue to receive the same level of support for the payment of Council Tax as compared with 2012/2013 and the original Council Tax benefit.

(c) all remaining working age claimants not covered by (b) above will continue to have their Council Tax Support capped at 80.2% of Council Tax liability. In other words, working age claimants will continue to receive the same level of Council Tax Support as 2015/16, this amount representing a 19.8% reduction in the level of Council Tax Support available.

3. That the Council is asked to give authority to the Chief Operating Officer and Head of Shared Services to take all appropriate steps to implement and administer the Scheme.

Chief
Operating
Officer

4. That delegated authority be provided to the Chief Operating Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture to make amendments to appendices C and D as outlined in the final paragraph of CAB 120 before submission to full Council.

Chief
Operating
Officer

Alternative Options Considered

In accordance with paragraph 5 of Schedule 1A to the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (the 1992 Act), each financial year the Council is required to consider whether to revise or replace its scheme. One option for the Council is to continue with the scheme in place for the current financial year. Another option is to revise the scheme, which may be done in a variety of ways, for example, the Council could choose to increase or decrease the amount of financial support available under the scheme. Options should be considered in the light of the knowledge gained during both the current year and the implementation of the scheme over previous years.

The options for changing the current scheme that have been considered are listed below. Some of these considerations were informed by the original consultation undertaken prior to adopting the 2013/14 scheme.

- Increase the level of financial support so all customers pay less
- Decrease the level of financial support so all customers pay more

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

- Absorb the full shortfall into the Council budget by providing financial support up to the level previously funded by Central Government as part of Council Tax Benefit.
- Protect certain vulnerable groups in addition to those in receipt of certain disability benefits, these include but are not limited to:
 - Households with children
 - Households with a child under one
 - Households with a child under five
 - Households with more than three children
 - Households with a lone parent
- Protect band A-C properties
- Protect claimants on current maximum entitlement
- Protect claimants who are working but on low income.
- Protect claimants in receipt of Single Person's Discount
- Increase Council Tax

A breakdown of these options with accompanying financial data is provided in **Appendix D**. Appendix D further sets out the potential advantages and disadvantages of each option together with rationale to explain why these alternative options have not been favoured at this time.

Having regard to the detailed points set out at Appendix D, it is recommended that none of these options for change are taken forward. This is because

- (i) Any option which would require the Council to increase levels of support for Council Tax payments would need to be directly funded by the Council and given the competing demands on the Council's limited budget, increasing support for Council Tax funding would require the Council to find reductions elsewhere, cut services, utilise reserves or increase Council Tax,
- (ii) Any option which would require the Council to increase levels of support for particular groups of people could have a disproportionate impact on some claimant groups over others,
- (iii) In addition, the majority of the options do not support the Central Government initiative of encouraging people back to work
- (iv) The Council do not consider that it is appropriate to

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

	<p style="text-align: center;">increase Council Tax.</p> <p>In his Summer budget in July 2015, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced a range of reforms to the national welfare budget, aimed at reducing the cost of welfare to the government. This includes freezing benefit rates, restricting backdating rules, reductions in Tax Credits, reduction of the Benefit Cap, and curbs on the number of children that support can be provided for. Some of these changes are effective from April 2016, others will be implemented later. It is not proposed to revise the Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2016/17, as the government has not yet given any information regarding the possible financial effect of these changes. We will monitor the effect of these changes in the 2016/17 year. It is possible that we may seek to revise our scheme for 2017/18, to consider these changes.</p> <p>The Council also recognises that one further option to be considered in the future is to undertake a more comprehensive overhaul of the scheme so that Council Tax Support falls under Council Tax legislation as a discount, similar to the existing Single Person Discount. This may make administration more straight forward. However, the Council is not proposing to undertake such an overhaul at this stage, nor does it consider that this is an option for the 2016/17 scheme. If a decision is made to take forward consideration of this possibility for the future (i.e. from 2017/18 onwards), then depending on the nature of the changes, consultation and financial modelling to identify implications to the Council Tax Band may need to take place, in addition to full consultation on any changes to Scheme itself.</p> <p>Reasons for Decision The recommendation to retain the current scheme continues to support the Government’s initiative of work incentives and pays due regard to the challenging financial climate we are currently in.</p> <p>In recognition of the vulnerable sectors of society, we have supportive measures in place. It is proposed that these continue into 2016/17. Maintaining the current scheme ensures that these protected claimants will not be further disadvantaged.</p> <p>There remains a shortfall in collection. The Council relies on all Council Tax income to fund the services it provides.</p>	
<p>CAB121</p>	<p>MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To note the minutes of the following: Cabinet Member signing 26th October 2015 Cabinet member signing 29th October 2015</p>	
<p>CAB122</p>	<p>SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To note the delegated decisions taken by Directors in October.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

CAB123	NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS None	
CAB124	EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC RESOLVED: That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as the items below contain exempt information, as defined under paragraph 3, Part 1, schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972	
CAB125	HARINGEY DEVELOPMENT VEHICLE As per item 112.	
CAB126	WARDS CORNER COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2015[SEVEN SISTERS REGENERATION, TOTTENHAM - COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2016 - "LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY (WARDS CORNER REGENERATION PROJECT) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2016". As per item 113.	
CAB127	TOTTENHAM HALE REGENERATION, - BP SITE ACQUISITION As per item 114	
CAB128	SALE OF THE OLYMPIA TRADING ESTATE As per item 115	
CAB129	NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS None	

Councillor Claire Kober

Chair