

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY, 15TH NOVEMBER, 2016, Times Not Specified**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Claire Kober (Chair), Peray Ahmet, Jason Arthur, Eugene Ayisi, Ali Demirci, Joe Goldberg, Alan Strickland, Bernice Vanier and Elin Weston.**

**Also Present Councillors: Engert, Newton, O'Connor, Tucker, Brabazon, G Bull and Diakides.**

## **106. 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.

## **107. APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence.

## **108. URGENT BUSINESS**

The Leader advised the Cabinet that Overview and Scrutiny Committee had decided at its meeting of 8 November to refer the decision taken by Cabinet on 18 October 2016 "Preferred Bidder to Secure the Future of Hornsey Town Hall" back to Cabinet. The recommendations of Overview & Scrutiny would therefore be dealt with at Agenda item 7.

According to the Call-in Procedure in the Council's Constitution (Part 4 Section H), the Cabinet had five working days to reconsider the Key decision before taking a final decision.

To meet this requirement Cabinet needed to re-consider the Key decision before making a final decision, and the Leader accepted this matter as an item of late urgent business to be considered at item 7 of the agenda. The second pack also included the exempt material considered at the 18<sup>th</sup> of October meeting.

## **109. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest put forward.

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

There were no representations put forward.

**111. MINUTES**

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 18<sup>th</sup> of October 2016 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

Councillor Engert sought an update on the planned public consultation on Cross Rail 2. This had been indicated in the minutes to take place on the 17<sup>th</sup> of November. The Leader provided an update, advising that the nature of the public consultation had now changed following the change in leadership in the Conservative party and their Cabinet. Previously, the consultation was to take place in the affected boroughs but now TFL had been asked by government to complete a strategic outline business case before this was issued for public consultation. This consultation would now likely take place in the spring of 2017.

**112. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Leader invited Councillor Wright to report on the outcome of the Special Overview and Scrutiny meeting which had considered the recommendation of a 'preferred bidder to secure the future of Hornsey Town Hall' following the call-in of this decision.

The Leader set out the process for considering the Overview & Scrutiny recommendations and reconsidering the Key decision on Hornsey Town Hall. Cabinet would first consider the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, set out in the second pack of papers, at page 4, and Councillor Strickland would provide a verbal response to the recommendations.

Given that the Key decision was previously agreed following consideration of the exempt information at the October meeting, and response to the Scrutiny recommendations did not require further reference to the exempt part of the report, Cabinet agreed to reconsider the Key decision on a preferred bidder to secure the future of Hornsey Town Hall, as part of this item, in the open part of the meeting.

After Cllr Strickland's response to the recommendations, Cabinet would also refer to the petition which was handed in from the Hornsey Town Hall Appreciation Society at the October Cabinet meeting and then move to reconsideration of the Key decision which was contained in the minutes, agenda item 6, at section 88, page 15 of the original pack. Cabinet noted that the original Cabinet report recommending the decision was attached from page 27 of the second pack of papers.

Councillor Wright, Chair of Overview and Scrutiny, began presentation of his report and advised that the Overview and Scrutiny call -in meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> of November, had been a long and thorough session lasting 4 hours which had considered two call-in's. The Committee had given full consideration to the decision on Hornsey Town Hall

and received representations from: the Hornsey Town Hall Appreciation Society, the call-in lead signatories and received a petition from Cllr Engert. The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny was also grateful for the Cabinet Member's attendance and officer participation in the meeting.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had agreed that the decision did not fall outside the budget and policy framework and the most appropriate course of action was to refer the decision back to Cabinet to allow for full and detailed consideration. The Committee had agreed ten recommendations which were contained at page 4 in the second pack of papers to be considered and responded to along with original key decision.

Councillor Wright continued to outline the ten recommendations which were mainly concentrated on: safeguarding free access to the square, affordable housing, tailored support for the businesses which have to move, immediate community engagement and involvement, safeguarding the community Arts centre use through the lease, active continual monitoring of the lease, and high standard of design and accessibility.

Councillor Strickland thanked Scrutiny colleagues for their examination of the decision. There was misinformation circulated about proposals, prior to the Cabinet meeting, so the call-in Scrutiny meeting had been helpful in exploring the detail of the proposals and clarifying the issues which colleagues had concerns about.

Councillor Strickland continued to respond to the Overview and Scrutiny recommendations and the Cabinet noted the following:

***Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation A - That the Cabinet consider imposing a legal covenant guaranteeing free public access to the square, running with the land in perpetuity***

Councillor Strickland confirmed that the legal agreements would contain a tenant covenant to maintain public access to the Town Hall square. This corresponded with leasehold arrangements so even with the unlikely event of a future change in operator, this requirement would still apply and bind any future leaseholders. Any failure to comply with the leasehold arrangements, including any unreasonable daily non access to the square, would be a breach of the lease. Therefore the Council would be able to enforce the lease in the required legal way.

***Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation B - That the Cabinet Member explores in conversation with the preferred bidder increasing the amount of affordable housing offered on the site, noting that an increased level of affordable housing cannot be imposed;***

Councillor Strickland advised that he would discuss this with the bidder, as agreed at the Scrutiny meeting. The preferred bidder understood the need and desire for new homes in the borough.

The Cabinet Member stressed that if a new planning application was taken forward by the preferred bidder, then the issue on the number of affordable housing units would be a decision for the Planning Committee as this would not be in the Cabinet's remit.

***Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation C - That the Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning continues to explore possible support from the Mayor of London for increasing the amount of affordable housing offered on the site;***

Councillor Strickland advised that discussions would continue regarding grants for affordable housing with Mayor and he would continue discussing, with the Deputy Mayor for Housing, how assistance may be given and how this might work on this site.

***Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation D - That the Cabinet consider ring-fencing the capital receipt obtained from the transaction for affordable housing, or foregoing a proportion of any capital receipt in order to increase the amount of affordable housing offered on the site;***

Councillor Strickland reminded colleagues that the capital receipt, to be received from developing the land at the rear of the Town Hall for housing, was helping finance the scheme so the Council were not removing this capital receipt and it was retained within the scheme. Separate to this, there was a further capital receipt to be received by the Council and this would be dealt with as part of the agreed capital strategy which provides for General Fund capital receipts to be held for general capital purposes in order to provide funding for the delivery of the Council's priorities.

***Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation E - That the Cabinet consider ring-fencing any overage monies to provide additional affordable housing;***

Cllr Strickland provided a reminder that Overage is capital (not revenue). Also, as set out above, the Council's Capital Strategy provides for General Fund capital receipts to be held for general capital purposes in order to provide funding for the delivery of the Council's priorities.

As set out above - Individual requests for ring-fencing of capital receipts could not be made outside of the wider considerations of the application of capital funds at full Council.

***Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation F - That the Cabinet consider offering a tailored package of support for businesses currently located at Hornsey Town Hall that will be displaced by the proposed development;***

Councillor Strickland advised that the Council had always been clear that the businesses in the Town Hall were there on a temporary basis but recognised that a robust approach was required and committed to organise meetings with the SMEs in Hornsey Town Hall to understand their needs and discuss what level of support they required, Cllr Strickland agreed that the Council would actively seek alternative locations for the SMEs based inside Hornsey Town Hall.

***Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation G - Which the Cabinet ensure the community is engaged with as soon as possible after an agreement is made with the preferred bidder to ensure the community, can be as fully involved as possible. This engagement should not be delayed until the building is reopened;***

Councillor Strickland agreed that early engagement was very important and residents would be involved as soon as possible in helping with shaping designs for the site. Councillor Strickland informed the Cabinet meeting that he had met with FEC and Co Plan representatives, since Overview & Scrutiny Committee and raised this issue with them. They were keen on this too and were starting work on a communications plan and community engagement plan. Councillor Strickland advised that they had reconfirmed commitment to a community hub and would have a staffed presence on site. The preferred bidder would also display progress and plans in this hub and this would be a place where the community can drop in to provide their feedback and communicate directly with representatives of the preferred bidder.

There would also be a community steering group to look at community uses and provide community governance. This would happen later in the process but the Cabinet Member was determined to work with the bidder to ensure this happened as soon as possible. The preferred bidder had confirmed that the community hub would be on site as soon as a decision was made.

***Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation H - That the Cabinet confirm in its negotiations on final terms with the preferred bidder how the community use of the building, including the arts centre, be ensured, particularly in mitigating against potential financial obstacles and the impact of shortfalls or assignment;***

Councillor Strickland reiterated that an OJEU procurement process was chosen as it provided more control for the Council with freeholder protection over the long term, to ensure community use of the Town Hall. Also the legal agreements secured on-going community use of the building. Councillor Strickland re-iterated that the legal agreements were fully enforceable and this had also been confirmed through independent legal advice.

***Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation I - That the Cabinet agree an active method of policing the lease and the use of the building. This could include a requirement for the Cabinet Member and officers to provide an update to Cabinet on the progress of the project, compliance with legal requirements, at least annually and in the event of any proposed material changes;***

Councillor Strickland outlined that there would be regular meetings held with FEC, starting shortly, during the design, planning and construction phases to ensure consistency and progress in line with the commitments made and they are clear on this. There would be a legal/contractual relationship between the Council as landlord and FEC as the tenant. This would be 'policed' through this legal mechanism to enforce the lease where this is a concern and action can be taken.

Any major changes throughout the duration of their lease would require Landlord approval and/or planning approval (depending on the nature of the changes). Significant check and balances in place regarding any change.

The Cabinet Member would be provided with regular updates and the bidder would provide regular programmed updates to the community. Once the Community Steering Group was established this would provide a place of accountability for the community.

Cllr Strickland could not agree to provide annual updates to Cabinet for the continuing 125 years of the lease as this would not really add any transparency to the process nor value.

The Community Steering Group would review the community activity in the building to ensure spaces were kept available and to ensure that these spaces were appealing to the needs of people both locally and beyond Haringey.

***Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation J - That the Cabinet seek to ensure a high standard of design and accessibility in the development of the site, alongside compliance with planning requirements in respect of density, massing and height levels.***

Councillor Strickland advised that FEC were appointing their design team and the Council would ensure accessibility was a key item on their agenda.

It was important to note that there was currently an existing implemented planning permission, which sets the precedent for the site and the quality of design, was controlled through planning. The existing consent had a DDA Statement, which looked to make the building accessible as much as possible. The Council would continue to raise this issue and if there were any further planning applications this would be looked at afresh and disability requirements would be met

Councillor Strickland thanked Councillor Wright for his comprehensive report and helpful recommendations.

Cllr Strickland then referred to the petition handed in at the October Cabinet meeting by the Hornsey Town Hall Appreciation Society which was also tabled. Cllr Strickland thanked the organisation for the petition and commented on the text which had sought signatures opposing the disposal of Hornsey Town Hall to a buyer 'who wants to turn it into a luxury boutique hotel' and this was contrasted in the text against a rejected plan from Tischman's to create an Arts centre. The Cabinet Member challenged this misinformation and referred to the public Cabinet report which made clear that a mixed use scheme was being taken forward, including full restoration of the dilapidated building, with a Hotel alongside an Arts Centre. It was hoped that this misrepresentation would now be resolved given the clarifications provided to the Overview and Scrutiny meeting and the Cabinet meetings. If the recommendation was approved, the preferred bidder aimed to start significant engagement with the community to support shaping the future for the Town Hall.

In response to Cllr Engert's question, Cllr Strickland reiterated that community use and access to the hall, building, and square was guaranteed and there were legal agreements to enshrine this. Cllr Strickland also repeated that the bidder was keen to engage with the community and would have a number of community consultation events planned.

In response to Cllr Gideon Bull's question, the Monitoring Officer advised that it was open to Cabinet to re-affirm the original decision, if this was the chosen way forward, and to take into account the comments already made by Cllr Strickland in response to the Scrutiny recommendations.

The Leader advised that the Cabinet minutes would record what was said in response to each of the ten recommendations. The Leader clarified that a political and common sense approach was being taken forward in considering and responding to the Overview and Scrutiny recommendations whilst re-considering the original Key decision.

In accordance with the Call in procedure, and having heard the responses to the Scrutiny recommendations, the Leader asked Cabinet to refer to the Key Decision which was contained in the Cabinet minutes at agenda item 6, at section 88, in the final paragraph at page 15 of the pack.

After re-considering the matter, **Cabinet unanimously RESOLVED:**

1. To agree to the selection of Far East Consortium International Ltd as the preferred bidder for the HTH site (shown edged red on the plan included in Appendix A) based on the scoring set out in Appendix E and to enter into a Development Agreement for the HTH site with either Far East Consortium International Ltd or a special purpose vehicle set up by Far East Consortium International Ltd and the grant of long leases with such appropriate tenants as agreed with FEC based on the main terms set out in paragraph 6.27 of this report; and that delegated authority be given to the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development after consultation with the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance to agree the final terms of the Development Agreement, long leases and all associated legal agreements
2. This was subject to further commitments made by Cllr Strickland in response to the Scrutiny recommendations.

### **Reasons for Decision**

The Cabinet decision in April 2011 declared the site surplus to the Council's requirements and agreed the principle for a partner to enter into a 125 year lease to operate the building, with the Council retaining the freehold.

The Listed building is on English Heritage's Buildings At Risk Register therefore a solution is required to undertake restoration work to the building and the Council does not have funding available to undertake these works itself.

Options Appraisal work identified that one developer for both the HTH site and building is a preferred approach as it secures both the restoration works and a long term operator for the building and is likely to bring the building back into use at the earliest opportunity. In addition to this a Developer would expect to have control over the works in the town hall as residential units cannot be occupied until essential heritage works have completed in the town hall because of the existing planning condition which links the two elements.

A public sector procurement of this scale must legally be governed by the public procurement regulations; therefore an OJEU process had to be carried out to secure a future for the dilapidating building. Professional advisors and the Council's Legal & Procurement team advised that an OJEU compliant Competitive Dialogue process is

the best way to achieve this outcome and this has been undertaken in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 (as amended) (“Regulations”).

To ensure the town hall building remains open and in use in the long term a partner, with a long term sustainable business plan needs to be appointed.

A timely decision on the future approach to the HTH project is required in order to engage with and exchange contracts with the bidder while they have a strong appetite to progress with the project, avoid further deterioration to the listed building, remove the ongoing liability of the building to the Council at the earliest opportunity and address the longstanding frustrations of the local community at the timeframe for securing a sustainable future for the Town Hall.

### **Alternative options considered**

The alternative options that had been considered for the Hornsey Town Hall project can be defined as follows:

- Option A - Do nothing: Without taking any action to secure a future use and developer/operator for the Town Hall the building condition will continue to deteriorate. The Council remains responsible for the on-going liability for the building and any use of the building by the local community will be limited.
- Option B - Conditional land sale: The Council could sell the HTH site via a conditional land sale agreement, however the Council would have limited control in this option to enable and enforce community access and use.
- Option C - Freehold sale of the site: Sale of the site without retaining any interest would mean the Council is unable to secure community access and use as there are no lease mechanisms to enable this. The Council was not prepared to pursue an option that did not guarantee community access or provide the Council with enough control to ensure that Hornsey Town Hall can support community cohesion and economic dynamism in Crouch End.
- Option D - Dispose of land at the rear and use receipt to refurbish the building: In this scenario it is not expected that the land sale receipt would fully cover all the costs to refurbish and fit out the building for use, the Council’s on-going liability for running costs and maintenance is not removed and a sustainable operator and future use is not secured for the Town Hall.

## **113. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

Noted that a public question had been received in accordance with committee standing orders but would be discussed outside of the meeting with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families.

## **114. MUSWELL HILL LIBRARY - FUTURE AND NEXT STEPS**



The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Customer Services and Libraries introduced the report which set out the results of the 12 week consultation looking at the option of moving Muswell Hill Library to a new location at 54/56 Muswell Hill (the site of the former Green Man pub). Over 1280 responses were received including 775 from the N10 area and the report set out the next steps for exploring the options for Muswell Hill library and 54/56 Muswell Hill. The majority of responses favoured keeping the library in the existing building. There was strength of feeling for the library building but there was a distinction between this and the provision of the actual library service provision. Taking this on board, the Cabinet Member recommended further exploring potential future uses of the Muswell Hill Library building and also the 54-56 Muswell Hill [ Green Man site] to ensure that future recommendations on the location of the library takes into consideration the option for both sites.

In response to the questions from Cllr Engert, it was noted:

- The district valuer had valued both the Greenfields Special School site [Coppets road] and Green Man [54-56 Muswell Hill] site at equal sums; the former was freehold and latter for 999 year lease when the land swap was taken forward. In legal terms there was no significant difference between these legal interests.
- The Greenfields Special School [Coppets road] had a freehold agreement and Green Man site [54-56 Muswell Hill] 999 lease on peppercorn rent.
- The D1 change of use to the ground floor of the Green Man site could include a post office and this should not be a planning obstacle.
- As part of transformation programme for moving customer services centres to Libraries this had required a higher investment in Marcus Garvey and Wood Green Library's.

In response to a question from Councillor Newton:

The Leader advised that space above the Green Man site allowed only one bedroom homes. This was part of a solution to the housing crisis which extends across the spectrum. Given the 6 units would enable an opportunity for people to get on the housing ladder and shared ownership properties were still popular, this allocation contributes to meeting some housing need.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To authorise the Assistant Director for Capital Property and Major Projects, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Customer Services & Culture, to explore potential options for future uses of Muswell Hill Library and 54/56 Muswell Hill to support the decision making process around the best options for both sites, including retention of the library service in the current building, or the ground floor of the new building.

2. Based on the findings of 3.1 above, for the Assistant Directors for Capital Property and Major Projects and for Customer Services & Libraries, to present a Cabinet Report in Spring 2017 which sets out a recommendation on the future location of Muswell Hill Library.

### **Reasons for decision**

The consultation results and comments show that respondents feel strongly about retaining the current library building as a community asset. The consultation results are detailed further in section 6 and in the appendices.

There is a clear theme in the consultation responses around the value of the current library building as a community asset, given its listed status and architectural importance in Muswell Hill.

Given the strength of feeling around the current library building, it is recommended that further consideration is given to the possible future uses of both the current library building, and the new ground floor space at 54/56 Muswell Hill, including retention of the library service in the current building, or the ground floor of the new building.

It is recommended that a further Cabinet Paper be presented in spring 2017 which explores the options so for the current building and for 54/56 Muswell Hill. This means that a decision on the future location of the library can be taken in consideration of these possible options.

### **Alternative options considered**

**Do nothing.** As the consultation results were in favour of leaving the library service in the current building, there is the option of doing nothing and making no changes to the service. However, given the Council have acquired the new space at 54/56 Muswell Hill and the opportunity to move the library service to this location, this option is not recommended at this point. Once full consideration has been given to the possible options for both the current library building and 54/56 Muswell Hill, then a balanced decision can be made on the future location for the library service.

**Make a decision now without knowledge of the future possible options for the current library building or 54/56 Muswell Hill.** It is possible to take a decision at this point on where the library service should be located without consideration for how the current library site or 54/56 Muswell Hill could be used. This is not recommended as it will be preferable to take this decision with full consideration of the options available for both sites, including retention of the library service in the current building, or the ground floor of the new building.

## **115. BUDGET MONITORING 2016/17 QUARTER 2**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Health introduced the report which set out the 2016/17 Period 6 financial position; including Revenue, Capital, Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

The Cabinet Member outlined the significant overspend of £22m in the budget with an improved position of £800k which was positive. However, demand led areas had significant pressures.

Although there was good progress in delivering savings the Council had seen a growth in demand and also challenges to the supply of temporary accommodation, outstripping capacity to keep the budget in line.

The report outlined the corporate actions being undertaken to reduce spend and the significant work underway to bring overspend down in demand areas.

In response to Cllr Engert's questions the following information was noted:

- Likely future consideration of re-profiling of the budget, but underlying principles that had been agreed in the Medium Term Financial Plan in February 2015 such as focusing on growth and regeneration together with supporting independence, prevention and community resilience remain. These principals underpinned the proposed savings plans and remained significant to a future sustainable budget and should be continued even with the parameters change being seen.
- Critical to provide support to all officers, including senior officers, to develop and ensure they have a capacity in a time of substantial change. The Chief Executive advised that the Corporate Leadership Group comprised of 26 senior managers and the senior leadership team members. They had been part of ongoing development programme which had offered individual coaching and development over the past 18 months. The Chief Executive was happy to share details of the programme with the outcomes and benefits to the organisation with Councillor Engert.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the report and the Council's 2016/17 Period 6 financial position in respect of revenue and capital expenditure;

2. To note the risks and mitigating actions, including spend controls identified in this report in the context of the Council's on-going budget management responsibilities;
3. To approve an increase in the capital budgets of £6.3m as set out in section 6.8; and
4. To approve the list of virements set out in **Appendix1**.

### **Reasons for decision**

A strong financial management framework, including oversight by Members and senior management, is an essential part of delivering the Council's priorities and statutory duties.

### **Alternative options considered**

This is the 2016/17 Period 6 Financial Report. As such, there are no alternative options.

## **116. SUPPORTING REFUGEES, ASYLUM SEEKERS AND UNACCOMPANIED ASYLUM SEEKING CHILDREN**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report which set out in a single document the existing and expected support for refugee families and households on No Recourse to Public Funds, in light of humanitarian crisis through the closure of the Calais camp. The report also outlined the Council's support for children that have a right to come to the UK through the Dublin agreement and delegated responsibility to the Deputy Chief Executive for working with the Home Office to resettle 10 Syrian families.

In response to Cllr Engert's questions the following was noted:

- The Council had been speaking with the Home Office for a number of months on the resettlement of refugee families. The actions in relation to the resettlement of refugee families taken by other boroughs did not have Home Office agreed support and it was necessary to have this. It was important to note that there were families that arrive in Haringey, outside of the scheme, as well as number of unaccompanied minors and families that are supported through NRPF by the Council.
- It was important to note that the Council had been part of small number of boroughs that had pursued the resettlement agenda and worked hard to ensure there was Pan London support for this action. The Council recognised this as an emergency but were dependent on the Home Office actions in terms of the timing of re- settling families.

**RESOLVED**

1. To note and endorse the response by the Council and local partners to the ongoing humanitarian crisis caused by conflict in Syria by resettling up to 10 Syrian refugee families in Haringey.
2. To note the support that the Council and local partners are providing to asylum seekers, refugees and unaccompanied asylum seeking children through the schemes that are currently in operation;
3. To delegate responsibility to the Deputy Chief Executive to enter in to an agreement with the Home Office to resettle up to 10 Syrian refugee families in Haringey;
4. To note that officers will continue to work with statutory partners, VCS organisations, and faith and community groups to ensure appropriate support is provided to refugees, asylum seekers and unaccompanied asylum seeking children who resettle in Haringey.

### **Reasons for decision**

To set out in a transparent and accountable way, the support that Haringey Council and local partners have been and will provide to anyone resettling in Haringey through the support schemes that currently operate in the UK.

To set out how we do and will continue to offer asylum seekers, refugees and unaccompanied asylum seeking children a place of safety.

### **Alternative options considered**

The alternative option considered is not to enter into an agreement with the Home Office on the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme. Given the significant migration crisis, it is felt that Haringey should continue and enhance the part it plays in the wider London and UK effort to provide assistance.

## **117. VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS STRATEGY**

The Cabinet Member for Communities introduced the report which sought agreement to a 10 year Violence against Women and Girls Strategy (2016-2026).

The Strategy set out, in detail, the borough's strategic approach to not just improving the health, safety and wellbeing of women and girls in the borough but also ensuring that they can have fulfilling lives. It had been completed alongside community organisations and voluntary sector in the borough and advocated a co-ordinated community response whilst also emphasising the importance of holding perpetrators to account.

The Council drew up the draft strategy with the community and launched a 10 week consultation on the strategy which had elicited over 300 responses. It was important to note that 90% of the young people responding to the consultation were under the age of 18 which helped taking forward the early preventative nature of this work.

In response to Councillor Engert's questions the following information was noted:

- This was an overarching strategy which included all forms of violence against women and girls. A lot of the forms of violence were interconnected and the strategy considered similar causes and how to develop a co-ordinated community response. In terms of FGM, there was a need to consider a co-ordinated response and not have different forms of violence dealt with in different ways.
- Councillor Ayisi clarified that when considering and extrapolating London data, on the forms of violence against women and girls, then there could be 3500 cases of FGM in the borough but this was not an actual factual figure but an estimated assessment. However the strategy did encourage more reporting of all forms of violence which was a positive way forward.
- The Leader advised that the issue of FGM had also been discussed at Health and Wellbeing Board and assured Cllr Engert that dealing with this in a co-ordinated partner approach was a priority that would not be lost sight of.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To consider and take into account the feedback from the consultation and the equalities impact assessment;
2. To approve the Violence against Women and Girls Strategy (2016-2026) and to support the future development of action plans that underpin the work of the Strategy.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Strategy sets out our 10 year ambitions (2016-2026) for addressing and preventing violence against women and girls in Haringey.

The Strategy covers four key priorities: developing a coordinated community response; prevention; support for victim/survivors and holding perpetrators accountable.

The Strategy has been developed in partnership with a wide range of statutory, voluntary and community organisations from across Haringey. We have utilised existing evidence around 'what works' in addressing and preventing violence against women and girls. We will ensure that we co-produce all of our action plans with communities and survivors to ensure that we deliver meaningful change.

We have consulted widely with partners and local residents over a 10 week period to ensure that we have ensured that our approach will work with all stakeholders across the borough (see 6.3).

There is an international, national and regional basis for working towards preventing and addressing violence against women and girls as well as working towards the local priority of 'a clean and safe borough' (see 6.1-6.2).

Violence against women and girls is a serious issue for this borough. Haringey has one of the highest rates of reported domestic abuse across London. In the rolling year to June 2016, there were 5,840 domestic incidents with 2,919 domestic abuse offences reported to the police, representing an 18% increase on the previous year. Haringey also has the second joint highest incident rate per 1000 population (22 per 1000) with Tower Hamlets and Lewisham; Barking and Dagenham has the highest with 27 per 1000. In the same period, 592 sexual offences were recorded which represents a nearly 10% increase in sexual offences from the previous 12 month period.

Violence against women and girls is estimated to cost the borough £27.6 million a year, which does not include the human and emotional costs of £47.6 million. Physical and mental health care are estimated to cost £8.3 million; Social Services £1.4 million, refuges and housing at £0.9 million and lost economic output as £9.2 million. Improving our response to addressing violence against women and girls through a strategic approach will improve women and girls lives and also reduce costs to Haringey.

### **Alternative options considered**

We have considered two alternative options – (1) do not have violence against women and girls strategy and (2) have a strategy but with different strategic objectives. These are set out below.

Alternative Option 1: Do not have a strategy.

We have considered the alternative approach of not having violence against women and girls strategy. However, we believe that there are significant financial and social benefits to enhancing our partnership approach to ending violence against women and girls including:

- Reduction in duplication across directorates
- Reduction in costs to statutory services
- Adherence to statutory safeguarding legislation
- Increased potential for women and girls in Haringey

Although many of these benefits are currently unquantifiable, violence against women and girls is a key issue for Haringey services and having a strategic approach to ending violence against women and girls will have a positive financial and social implications.

Not having a violence against women and girls strategy will mean fragmented services for victim/survivors; duplication of effort across statutory services and voluntary sector partners; inefficiencies in use of resources and a lack of adherence to national and regional approaches will could impact significantly on our ability to attract external funding.

In addition, having a coordinated partnership strategy allows Haringey to comply with safeguarding duties including those set out in the Pan-London Adult Safeguarding policies and procedures as well as the Care Act 2014. It also ensures that we comply with the Pan-London Child Protection procedures as well as the provisions on safeguarding contained within the Children Act 1989 and 2004.

Alternative Option 2: Have a strategy but with different strategic objectives

We have considered having a strategy with different strategic objectives but believe that this would not be in the best interests of Haringey residents and professionals. This strategy has been widely consulted on, both during the development of the strategy and an official 10 week consultation on the draft strategy. None of the data collected during these two processes highlighted that the priorities were not the appropriate priorities; there was broad support for the 4 key strategic objectives. Our proposed approach of having a strategy with the 4 priorities outlined above also fits with national and regional priorities set out in the Government's Violence against Women and Girls Strategy 2016-2019 and also the Mayor of London's 2013-2017 Strategy.

#### **118. AGREEING RENTS AND SERVICE CHARGES FOR THE SHARED FACILITY HOSTEL AT BROADWATER LODGE**

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning introduced the report which sought approval of the proposed rent to be charged for a new shared facility hostel at Broadwater Lodge, Higham Road N17. In addition the report recommended that the rent level proposed for Broadwater Lodge be agreed as the model to be applied to all future shared facility hostels under development.

This report and proposed decision responded to previous concerns about the cost, provision, and quality of temporary accommodation. The Council had an ongoing programme examining Council owned buildings that could be available to provide housing support in the current housing crisis. This was the first building to be converted for TA which the Council can manage and have control on the quality and safety of the accommodation. The rents were in accordance with local housing allowances rates and would be applied to future buildings being converted for similar use. Application of LHA meant that this was affordable for residents on benefits.

#### **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the rent level for shared facility rooms at Broadwater Lodge to be set at the one bedroom Outer North London Broad Rental Market Area rate (Local Housing Allowance subsidy rate). As set out in paragraph 6.6.
2. To approve the rent level for the self contained mobility standard unit at Broadwater Lodge to be set at the two bedroom Outer North London Broad Rental Market Area rate (LHA subsidy rate). As set out in paragraph 6.6.
3. To approve all future shared hostels to have their rent set at the appropriate LHA subsidy rate. As set out in paragraphs 6.6 and 6.9.
4. To approve that all operating models for future hostels ensure the service costs do not exceed the appropriate LHA subsidy rate recoverable. As set out in paragraph 6.7.
5. To approve that any surplus generated from the rental income of hostels is reinvested in the general fund. As set out in paragraph 6.8.

#### **Reasons for decision**



R1 and R2. Setting the rent level for Broadwater Lodge at the Outer North London Broad Rental Market Area rate (LHA subsidy rate). As set out in paragraph 6.6.

- Broadwater Lodge is scheduled to 'go live' in January 2017.
- Rent level setting is an Executive function of Haringey Council and a Key Decision as the income and expenditure will exceed £500,000 (As set out in paragraph 8 Legal comments).
- The proposed rent level is within the permissible LHA subsidy rate and will generate sufficient income to make the facility cost neutral both in terms of day to day running costs and the initial capital set up cost (As set out on the last page of Appendix A).
- As the proposed rent level is within the permissible LHA subsidy rate it represents an affordable option for the clients we are seeking to place in the facility, in the event that the client cannot claim full benefit we will seek a Discretionary Housing Payment where possible (As set out in paragraph 6.7).
- Failure to set a policy by December 2016 will mean the Council cannot open the facility resulting in a requirement to use more first stage private sector accommodation exacerbating the budget issues in this area.

R3 and R4. Approve all future shared hostels to utilise the same operating model and rent setting policy recommended for Broadwater Lodge. As set out in paragraphs 6.6, 6.7 and 6.9.

- Cabinet approving this recommendation will allow Homes for Haringey, on behalf of the Council, to identify and put in place these facilities in the most efficient manner. This assists the Council to meet its statutory requirements to provide first stage emergency accommodation without placing additional budgetary pressure.
- All of these facilities will only be considered and taken forward if they comply with the following principles:
  - The day to day running costs can be funded entirely from within the rental income generated
  - The rent levels do not exceed the Local Housing Allowance subsidy rate claimable
  - The net total of the day to day running cost and initial capital cost to make the facility useable is less than the cost of providing similar accommodation via alternative existing mechanisms (i.e. the facility is at least cost neutral).
- Where required these facilities will be subject to a change of usage application for planning permission.

R5. Any surplus generated from the rental income of hostels is reinvested in the general fund. As set out in paragraph 6.8.

- Reinvesting any surplus generated in the General Fund will assist the Council to manage its finances effectively and, where appropriate, fund more schemes of this nature further easing the budgetary pressure and improving the supply of good quality affordable temporary accommodation.

### **Alternative options considered**

Alternative options in terms of setting the rent outside of the possible Local Housing Allowance subsidy were not considered as this principle was agreed as part of the planning permission granted for Broadwater Lodge.

Various options for what could be claimed via Local Housing Allowance subsidy were considered by the Council's Shared Services Benefits team but were rejected as the accommodation doesn't meet the criteria for the relevant subsidy rate. The options considered included the Outer North London Broad Rental Market Area rate shared room and 2-3 bedroom rates.

The option to procure accommodation of this type has been considered and whilst similar options are available in the private sector it is estimated that putting in place a comparative provision could cost the general fund in the region of £400-500k more per annum than the estimated cost of Broadwater Lodge.

The option to do nothing was not considered as this risked operating costs being generated that couldn't be recouped via the rental income resulting in a deficit for the general fund

#### **119. CONTRACT EXTENSION FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES SUBSTANCE MISUSE SERVICE**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Health introduced the report which sought agreement to the extension of the substance misuse service for children, young people and families substance misuse service. The contract was previously awarded by Cabinet for an initial period of three years, with an option to extend for a further 2 years, the current contract ends in March 2017.

Cabinet noted that this contract met a specific need of young people having problems with substance misuse and it was important to have readymade tailored support which the provider had delivered and was recommended to continue.

#### **RESOLVED**

In accordance with CSO 10.02.2 to agree the extension of the following contract for 2 years.

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Service provided</b>	<b>Total value for life of the contract extensions</b>
CDP Blenheim (Insight Platform)	Children's young people and families substance misuse service	£570,000 (start date 1 April 2017)

#### **Reasons for decision**

In 2014 a contract was awarded by Cabinet for a children’s young people and families substance misuse service. The contract length was for 3 years with the option to extend for a further 2 years.

The service has recently been realigned with the Council’s new children’s services structure and is working in an integrated way with teams.

The service is meeting expected outcomes. To ensure continued service improvement over the next two years, the service will be monitored on a quarterly basis and the public health commissioner will continue to meet with children’s service managers to ensure the service is working closely with the Council’s children’s services.

**Alternative options considered**

There is a competitive market for the provision of adult substance misuse services; however few provide stand alone children’s services. When the service was tendered in 2013/14 there were 3 bidders. Instead of extending the contracts Haringey could have returned to the market by retendering, it took the decisions not to for the following reasons;

Since the last procurement no new market opportunities in terms of technological changes or new providers, have arisen.

- The current provider was the incumbent provider when the service was last tendered and continues to deliver well and to have an excellent relationship with children’s services particularly schools.
- When benchmarked against other Councils this services perform well in terms of outcome and the length of time it takes to complete treatment.
- There is no intention at this stage to radically re-specify the services.

Re tendering creates anxiety within staff and service users, the types of services delivered within this contract rely on a strong stable relationship between service users and their key worker

**120. CONTRACT EXTENSIONS FOR INTEGRATED DRUG AND ALCOHOL RECOVERY SERVICES FOR ADULT RESIDENTS IN HARINGEY**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Health introduced the report which sought agreement from Cabinet to the extension of three public health substance misuse service contracts. The contracts were for adult services that were previously awarded by Cabinet, for an initial period of three years, with an option to extend for a further 2 years. The current 3 year contracts end in December 2016.

**RESOLVED**

In accordance with CSO 10.02.2 to agree the extension of the following contracts for 2 years:

Organisation	Service provided	Total value for life of the contract extensions
HAGA	Alcohol misuse prevention and	£838,000 (start date 1 January 2017)

	community treatment	
Barnet Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust (The Grove)	Drug misuse prevention and treatment plus criminal justice intervention programme	£4,844,000 (start date 1 January 2017)
St Mungo's	Substance misuse recovery services	£1,942,000 (start date 1 January 2017)

### Reasons for decision

In 2013 three contracts were awarded by Cabinet for the provision of adult substance misuse services. The contract length was 3 years with the option to extend for a further 2 years.

The services are meeting expected outcomes (6.4 6.5). To ensure continued service improvement over the next two years, service users are currently conducting a review, the finding of which will be incorporated into an updated specification.

The contract extensions include further budget savings in 2017/18 of £170,000 for HAGA and BEH Mental Health Trust. These services will also help to generate an additional £100,000 in savings through offering more community based services, thus reducing the need for spot purchased residential services.

### Alternative options considered

There is a competitive market for the provision of substance misuse services. This market consists of both NHS and not for profit organisations. When these services were tendered in 2013/14 there was good market engagement, with between 3-5 providers bidding for each service. Instead of extending the contracts Haringey could have returned to the market by retendering, it took the decisions not to for the following reasons;

- Since the last procurement no new market opportunities in terms of technological changes or new providers, have arisen.
- The current providers are delivering as per specification and working with the commissioner to innovate and make savings.
- When benchmarked against other Councils these services perform well in terms of outcome and the length of time it takes to complete treatment.
- The current services have a skills mix of NHS and voluntary sector staff, which provides good, affordable services.
- There is no intention at this stage to radically re-specify the services.
- Re-tendering creates anxiety within staff and service users, the types of services delivered within this contract rely on a strong stable relationship between service users and their key worker.

## 121. SALE OF LAND AT KERSWELL CLOSE N15 5HT

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources introduced the report which sought approval to provide a long lease to Pocket Living of land opposite Kerswell Close, in order to develop 36 housing units subject to planning permission being obtained. The land at Kerswell Close was currently a grassed communal area and car parking area with a retail unit located on it and adjacent to St. Ann's Road and was currently HRA land. The land offers the opportunity to provide a new development of affordable housing in the Borough. There was strong demand for intermediate housing in the area and this site provides an opportunity for 36 affordable home ownership units to be built subject to approval of the planning scheme.

In response to Cllr Engert's question, the planning application decision would take account of priorities for provision of green spaces.

In response to Councillor Tucker's request for Cabinet to postpone the decision:

- The Leader responded that it was important to take account of London as a rapidly growing city with an increasing population and understanding the difficulties in being able to provide housing when conditions were stacked against the Councils. This would mean re- considering the density of housing in the whole of London and not just in Haringey. The Council were striving continually for affordable housing to meet the scale of housing demand and considering sites that had not been used for housing before.
- Also in terms of the quality and space provided by Pocket homes, the Leader advised visiting the Pocket Living website to gain an understanding on quality of the homes that they have provided in boroughs such as Camden and Lambeth.

Councillor Strickland continued to respond to the issues raised on planning, consultation with the local community and affordability of housing.

- In relation to the concerns about the protection of green space and the potential impact of the proposed building on the look and feel of the area, these would be part of Planning's committee's consideration. Once plans for the site were submitted to planning, by Pocket Living, there would be full public consultation instigated allowing these issues/ concerns to come forward prior to consideration of this application at Planning committee.
- In relation to concerns about the realistic affordability of these homes and the expected income levels of people that would be able to afford these homes, the Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning referred to the evidence base of the recently agreed intermediate housing strategy which pointed to a demand for this type of housing. Also the Housing strategy approved by Cabinet in October and proceeding to full Council on the 21 November, includes an increase in intermediate housing. Therefore the Council policy was clear on this.
- Councillor Strickland outlined that shared ownership had a valuable role in the borough and in Tottenham. It was important to note that pocket homes would

remain affordable in perpetuity which guarantees this type of housing remains affordable in the future and is attractive option when considering development on Council land.

- Councillor Strickland advised that all the normal building regulations and rules would apply in the planning process even though Pocket Homes had a prescribed design.
- In terms of the affordability of these homes, these would be in the average salary range of a key worker and there was a desperate need for intermediate housing as evidenced by the 'First Steps' website which indicated that 2300 people in Haringey had registered interest in one bedroom homes, demonstrating clear demand.
- It was important to note that intermediate housing was part of the housing solution mix and not 'instead' of affordable housing.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To declare surplus to requirements the land at Kerswell Close (and edged red on the attached plan in Appendix A).
2. To authorise the disposal of the land on a long lease and based on the heads of terms set out in Appendix B of the land to Pocket Living LLP for the sum of £1,000,000. This will be subject to providing 36 units of intermediate housing which is also subject to planning.
3. To delegate the authority to agree the final price and heads of terms to the Director Regeneration Planning and Development after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing Regeneration and Planning and S151 officer.
4. To note that the retail unit on the site will be disposed of with a loss of £8,000 pa and that budgets be aligned to reflect this.

### **Reasons for decision**

Pocket Living specialises in affordable housing developments and is in a position to deliver a scheme that will maximise the number of units on the site. This supports the Council's Corporate Plan and housing priorities for the Borough.

### **Alternative options considered**

The Council could retain the land. However this would limit the opportunity for development and it is unlikely that the number of affordable units would be delivered on the site as proposed by Pocket Living.

The Council could dispose to a Registered Provider. However a number of other potential Council development sites will shortly be considered for disposal via this route and Pocket Living will provide a diversity of affordable tenure within this portfolio with their affordable sale product.

**122. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

**RESOLVED**

To note the minutes of the following:

- Cabinet Member Signing 7 October 2016
- Cabinet Member Signing 14 October 2016
- Cabinet Member Signing 31 October 2016
- Cabinet Member Signing 1 November 2016

**123. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

**RESOLVED**

To note the significant and delegated actions taken by directors in October.

**124. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None

**125. 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.

**126. SALE OF LAND AT KERSWELL CLOSE N15 5HT**

As per item 121.

**127. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS**

As per item 112.

CHAIR: Councillor Claire Kober

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....