

# **MINUTES OF MEETING CABINET HELD ON Tuesday, 16th January, 2018, 6.30pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Claire Kober (Chair), Eugene Ayisi, Ali Demirci, Joe Goldberg, Alan Strickland, Elin Weston, Joseph Ejiofor and Peter Mitchell**

## **ALSO ATTENDING:**

**Councillors: Engert, Carter, Newton, Ibrahim, Ahmet, Gallagher**

### **137. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Leader referred to agenda item 1, as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at the meeting and Members noted this information.

### **138. APOLOGIES**

- Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillor Vanier and Councillor Arthur.
- Apologies for lateness was noted for Councillor Goldberg.

### **139. URGENT BUSINESS**

The Leader had accepted, as late business, an addendum to consider with item 10. This contained the minutes of Regulatory Committee meeting and proposed officer updates to the Wood Green Area Action Plan following publication. The Regulatory Committee had met on the 8<sup>th</sup> of January after publication of the Cabinet papers, and Cabinet was required to consider these comments in accordance with Part three of the Council constitution, section B, and paragraph D of the Constitution.

### **140. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest put forward.

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

There are no representations relating to items on the exempt part of the agenda.

### **142. MINUTES**

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 12<sup>th</sup> of December were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

Councillor Carter had a question on a matter arising from the minutes and the Leader advised him to direct his question to the appropriate Cabinet Member after the Cabinet meeting.

#### **143. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

The Leader advised the meeting that one public question and three deputations had been put forward for consideration. The public question was put forward by Mr Guy Levy.

The Leader further advised that Mr Levy was, unfortunately, unable to attend the meeting and she would read out his public question and the Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning would provide the response.

##### Public Question - Mr Guy Levy

Mr Levy claimed that that costs awards for unreasonable behaviour in planning appeals have been made against the Council. Mr Levy felt that such behaviour was a drain on the Council's finances and the local economy. He asked, how the Council intended to reduce damages caused by the unreasonable behaviour of its planning and planning enforcement officers?

##### The Cabinet Member responded as follows:

For the period 2015 to 2018, out of the 286 decided planning appeals, less than 10 have resulted in successful costs claims against the Council. For the same period, from the 104 decided (or withdrawn) planning enforcement appeals, only two had resulted in costs awards against the Council. During the same period, the Council made four successful costs claims against appellants.

There was no discernible trend that the planning and planning enforcement officers are exhibiting unreasonable behaviours in the execution of their duties. The Council did not consider that it was a waste of officer's time taken up defending appeals and cost applications.

The appeal process in both planning and planning enforcement was part of the development management function as enshrined in the planning legislation and formed part of the Planning Officers' job description. Whilst the payment of costs was always regrettable, it was important that the Council defended the amenities of its residents.

##### Jacob Secker representing the Broadwater Farm Residents Association, standing in for Mr Blasebalk who was unable to attend - Deputation 1

Mr Secker spoke as a representative of the Broadwater Farm Residents Association. He, as well as the Haringey Leaseholders Association which Mr Blasebalk had been due to represent, had been involved in the consultation on the Housing Management Agreement with Homes for Haringey.

Mr Secker outlined that the consultation on the Management Agreement with Homes for Haringey had had to be re-run, as the first consultation was deemed unsatisfactory, following a judicial review.

In Mr Secker's view, the second consultation had not been adequately run as well with mainly online access to consultation documents, some door knocking and telephone calls to tenants, meaning a full reflection of tenants views had not been gathered.

In Mr Secker's view, the consultation had only highlighted the benefits of the ALMO and had, crucially, not highlighted that the management agreement with the ALMO would cost £500k more than keeping the service in-house. Mr Secker contended that the consultation was biased towards the ALMO and therefore invalid.

Mr Secker claimed that the ALMO option was only favoured by residents, participating in the consultation, because of the commitment to tenant participation panels. However, these had now reduced, in number, from 7 panels to 3, meaning there was a miss-conception about the future level of resident participation. Community representatives were not being invited to these Panels and they also did not involve the leaseholders. They needed representation and did not want their umbrella organisation [ HLA] to be de-recognised.

Mr Secker concluded, by advising the Cabinet, that the management agreement with Homes for Haringey should not be agreed as the consultation was not carried out in a fair unbiased way.

Councillor Strickland, Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning responded to the issues raised by Mr Secker.

- The consultation was not only available online, but thousands of letters were sent out to tenants, with questionnaires also posted and drop in events organised. This was set out in the report at item 9 on the agenda.
- In relation to the £500k, the Future Housing Review which included a tenant representative, came to a unanimous decision to award the contract to Homes for Haringey with the quality of services to tenants, the main consideration. The financial difference between the two models was a small element. The figure of £500k was now also out of date, due to the housing reforms and the package of housing service changes that had taken place since 2015 to limit duplication and improve operational services.
- It was important to note that out of the 1200 responses, 80% of tenants supported the proposals and the questions in the consultation had been straightforward. It was also important to recognise that the Council manages 17000 properties so there will be a complexity of views among tenants to be considered but the claim that the ALMO was only supported due to tenant consultation panels was unfounded and not backed by the consultation results.

Given the consultation, for a second time, supported the arrangement with the ALMO, the Cabinet Member recommended to Cabinet that the Council enter a new management agreement with Homes for Haringey. This would be with amended

terms, as set out in the report, reflecting the expectation of a strong and sustained performance for tenants.

Deputation 2 – Paul Burnham - Defend Council Housing [ considered on the arrival of Cllr Goldberg at 6.50pm]

Mr Burnham introduced the deputation and spoke against approval of the recommendations, concerning the Wood Green Area Action Plan. He raised the following issues:

- There were affordable homes in the AAP, planned for demolition. These were Housing Association homes providing social rent and secure tenancies in Sky City and Page's High. Mr Burnham contended that if there was to be demolition of these homes, there needed to be a Yes/No ballot available to residents.
- The Council needed to work with the landlords to ensure investment happens in this housing association estates and ensure joined up services in these areas such as youth programmes. It was important for the Council to find services to put into these estates.
- The Right of Return was not believed by residents in these estates and there was instead a need for the Council to invest and keep the estates that it had.
- Although 6400 new homes were planned, in Mr Burnham's view, none were really affordable for people on average or low incomes given the current average affordable rent prices for London and Haringey outlined.
- Developers working with the Council were ultimately businesses interested in financial gain. Reference was made to the Hornsey Gasworks site where there was only 10% affordable housing.

Mr Burnham concluded that the Wood Green Area Action Plan would, in his view, lead to social cleansing and a new Council office building which was not needed.

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Sustainability responded as follows:

- Affordable housing policy was set out in the London Plan, Local Plan and Housing Strategy, the Wood Green AAP cannot set new policy for affordable housing.
- London faced a housing crisis which affected all boroughs including Haringey. The Council's aim was to deliver the maximum number of good quality affordable homes across the borough – in the Housing Strategy and planning policy, the Council had a target that 40% of new homes built should be affordable housing, as well as more detailed descriptions of the different kinds of affordable housing that the Council will particularly prioritise in different parts of the borough.

- Households in Sky City, Page High, Caxton and Mayes Road were specifically contacted during the consultation with visits to each house in person (with approximately 50% of people answered the doors), calling cards, workshops and face to face meetings. The Cabinet Member spoke to residents, himself, about their concerns and their need for improved properties.
- The Cabinet Member acknowledged that response to the proposed redevelopment of The Mall (and Sky City) and Bury Road Car Park (and Page High) was mixed, with some tenants saying they did not want to move and others saying that they would consider moving if they were able to move into a new home which was acceptable to them.
- Haringey had recently adopted a revised Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy (ERRPP) which provided a set of commitments to residents whose properties would be demolished as part of a renewal scheme, including a guaranteed right to return to a replacement home in the new development. Should a scheme come forward, the Council had already made a commitment that the Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy (ERRPP) would be extended to housing association tenants in Sky City and Page High at the point which a scheme to develop the Mall and Bury Road Car Park site is brought forward.
- There had been significant opposition to the proposed inclusion of Victorian terraces on Coburg, Caxton and Mayes Road in the AAP. In response to this, the Council had reviewed whether alternative approaches suggested during the consultation may be possible, and had concluded that the vision and objectives of the plan could still be achieved if these Victorian terraces remain. Therefore, the next draft of the Wood Green Area Action plan had removed Caxton, Mayes and Coburg homes from the site allocations.
- Cllr Goldberg refuted that this was a social cleansing scheme. In his view, it would be unfair to residents, that need housing, to maintain ownership of the Civic Centre which was one of the highest value properties in Wood Green Town Centre. There was a proven model, followed already by other neighbouring Councils, where moving Council buildings helps drive regeneration in less central areas. It made more sense to realise the value of the Civic Centre site and other Council owned sites in Wood Green and to use the sites for much needed affordable housing and employment space.
- 

### Deputation 3 – Mr James Davies Haringey Aquatics

Mr Davies made representations for a third swimming pool to be included in the Wood Green AAP. He spoke on behalf of Haringey Aquatics club for children and young

people which worked across the borough with bases at Tottenham Green and Park Road, including programmes at Northumberland Park.

The swimming activities and water sports activities run by the club were described by Mr Davies, involving all levels of abilities. This was also a London club that had recently put forward representatives to the UK Swimming nationals. This was also a club providing opportunities for all children to fulfil their swimming and water sport ambitions.

The membership and range of swimming activities provided in the borough was outlined. Mr Davies advised that there was not enough pool time to accommodate the full demand for swimming, diving and water polo team activities in the borough.

Mr Davies welcomed the Wood Green AAP which recognised the swimming community's aspiration for a third pool. Although this was constrained by cost, Mr Davies argued that if the pool was not part of the AAP Plan, then there was unlikely to be another opportunity to build a much required third pool.

Mr Davies spoke about the economic benefits and job opportunities provided by the potential of additional provision of swimming and swimming sports in the borough.

Mr Davies, concluded by asking Cabinet to support swimming facilities and for a new pool to be confirmed in the AAP.

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Sustainability, responded to the deputation and highlighted the importance of creating an Area Action Plan with optionality for the Council going forward.

The difficulties with confirming a third pool in the AAP were outlined as follows:

- Site of the pool was unknown
- It was not known, for certain, if the Council could be the developer of a pool or whether it would be able to develop a swimming pool in partnership with a third party
- The cost of running a pool is high and usually requires a high level of subsidy environmental cost. Choices need to be made around allocation of funding to a pool when funding is also required for other infrastructure and affordable housing The Cabinet Member expressed that there was recognition in the Plan on the need for a pool and it may be that Fusion could take this forward, within or outside the realms of the AAP.

The Cabinet Member had also had a recent conversation with Alexandra Palace about an open water offer through the development of the filter beds, potentially to be called the Palace Ponds. Although this idea was not in a site allocation document, the concept of using the Park and improving the connection to Wood Green with imaginative use of the outdoor space was felt to be a positive way forward. It was acknowledged that this idea may not solve the issue of a third pool.

The Cabinet Member concluded by advising the deputation that, although the Wood Green AAP did not exclude the option of a pool, the Council would need to look at the cost implications carefully.

It would also need to be recognised that the Council could not currently commit to a pool on its own sites as this could affect the viability of providing affordable housing on those sites.

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

Cabinet considered the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel's review on Street Sweeping and the Cabinet response to the review recommendations.

##### **(a) Cabinet Response to the Scrutiny Review of Street Sweeping**

Councillor Gallagher introduced the Scrutiny review on Street Sweeping and thanked the Scrutiny Panel and Scrutiny Officer for their work on the review. The instigation of the review was following concern about the reduction in residential street sweeping from twice a week to once a week, agreed via a Cabinet Member signing in 2016.

There was concern that this was leading to a deterioration in standards and unbalanced street cleanliness across the borough. A range of evidence was considered by the Panel and the overarching recommendation was to switch from a uniformed service across the borough to a flexible service which took account of need and enabled an outcomes based service.

Cllr Gallagher was pleased that this recommendation was 'partially agreed' and understood more work was needed on agreeing the specific actions in relation to this recommendation. This had been left to officers, with specific expertise, to provide the technical detail on the actions to be completed.

The Cabinet Member for Environment welcomed the report and thanked the Panel for their work. Cuts to the budget had meant difficult choices for the Council but cleanliness was important for residents and the Council would still need to respond to these concerns.

The Cabinet Member expressed that the Scrutiny review provided useful evidence of approaches to street sweeping from different authorities and there were lessons to be learned. Given the budget constraints, the Cabinet response recognised that there was more work to be completed on examining the implications of the recommendations.

In relation to recommendation 1, the overarching recommendation outlined by Cllr Gallagher on moving to a flexible service, there would be further detailed modelling and a report brought back to Cabinet in due course

In response to recommendation 2, that further engagement work be undertaken with residents to develop additional means for them to provide feedback on cleanliness and encourage them to report issues in their area, the Cabinet Member for Environment proposed that Cabinet agree to amend this from 'Not agreed' to "Partially agreed".

The Cabinet Member expressed that, in principle, the Council wanted to maximise resident engagement and input. Officers would review the existing means of engagement to make sure they were effective. There was a limited communications budget within the overall integrated waste contract for communications. This was largely focussed on ensuring residents knew how to dispose of their waste correctly in turn increasing the recycling rate in order to reduce disposal costs. Officers would also look at means for feedback to Veolia and the Council on the performance of the contract, via formal enquiries and complaints procedures, the OurHaringey app, and through social media.

In relation to the final recommendation on extending the use of mechanical sweepers, this would be looked at in conjunction with the modelling of different options.

In response to Cllr Ejiogor's question on suggestions by the Scrutiny Panel to improve communication on street sweeping, Cllr Gallagher explained that this arose as a result of considering Camden's experience of a flexible street sweeping schedule. If Haringey adopted a similar schedule, there needed to be a greater level of communication to accompany an adjustment.

Cabinet agreed the amendment of the response to recommendation 2, as outlined above by Councillor Mitchell and,

**RESOLVED:**

1. To note the Scrutiny Review into Street Sweeping set out in the Appendix 2.
2. Cabinet agree the response to the recommendations of the review set out in the Appendix 1.

**145. HOMES FOR HARINGEY MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning and provided the results of the second consultation on the proposal to enter into a new Management Agreement with Homes for Haringey. There were almost 1,200 responses to the statutory consultation with secure tenants, of whom 81% agreed with the proposal to enter into a new Management Agreement with Homes for Haringey. In the non-statutory consultation with leaseholders, there were just over 200 responses and 49% agreed with the proposal.

In light of the results of the statutory consultation, which were in favour of the proposal to enter into a new Management Agreement with Homes for Haringey, as well as the reasons set out in the Future of Housing Review, the report recommended that Cabinet agreed to enter into a new Management Agreement and that officers proceed to seek approval of that Agreement from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA). Based on the results of the consultation and the feedback given by residents, it was also proposed that some changes are made to the Management Agreement considered by Cabinet in March 2016. These are set out in section eight, and the proposed Management Agreement was attached at appendix two.

In response to a question from Cllr Engert:



- The Cabinet Member expressed that the Council was keen to listen to voice of leaseholders and had included them in this consultation and the previous consultation when there was no requirement to do so.
- The levels of leaseholder dis-ratification with services was not good enough and the Cabinet Member had raised this with officers.
- The Homes for Haringey Executive Director for Operations was leading a project on improving services to leaseholders as well as providing more simplified and easy to understand information on service charges. The Cabinet Member was happy to arrange a meeting between Cllr Engert and The Homes for Haringey Executive Director or provide a briefing note on the activities to support leaseholders.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the outcome of the consultation carried out with Council tenants pursuant to section 105 of the Housing Act 1985, and the non-statutory consultation with Council leaseholders, as summarised in section seven of this report and set out in detail in appendix one.
2. Having regard to the results of this consultation, and subject to the approval of the Homes and Communities Agency, to agree that the Council enters into a new Management Agreement with Homes for Haringey, and that this new Management Agreement runs until 2026, subject to the Council's right to terminate the Agreement earlier following review on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021.
3. To approve the proposed Management Agreement attached at appendix two.
4. To agree to an application being made by officers to the Homes and Communities Agency pursuant to section 27 of the Housing Act 1985 to seek approval for the new Management Agreement.
5. To delegate authority to the Strategic Director for Regeneration, Planning and Development, to be exercised in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning, to make amendments to, finalise and implement the new Management Agreement.
6. To note the existing extension of 2011 Management Agreement until such approval is received and the new Management Agreement commences, as set out in section six.

## **Reasons for decision**

Cabinet has previously decided that the Council should retain Homes for Haringey, and a further decision is now required following consultation with Council tenants and leaseholders on the proposal.

## **Alternative options considered**

The Future of Housing review reported to Cabinet in September 2015 and considered in-depth the options for the future management of the Council's housing stock. The options regarding the ongoing management of the housing stock considered by the review were:

**The Council transfers the housing stock in whole or part to another organisation** – this option was ruled out, as there was little support amongst tenants and it was considered that this option was also not in the Council's strategic or financial interest.

**The Council brings the management of housing services back into the Council** – this option was not recommended by the review, as it found that there was no compelling evidence that this option would improve housing services or resident satisfaction, nor significantly improve the overall Housing Revenue Account financial position.

**Uses the existing ALMO model to deliver housing services** – this option was recommended by the review, based on the results of the test of opinion and on Homes for Haringey's improvement in performance as well as the savings it has delivered.

The review therefore ruled out a stock transfer, and did not recommend the option of bringing management back into the Council. Based on the test of tenant opinion and other considerations – such as the Council's financial position – the Future of Housing Review instead recommended that Homes for Haringey be retained until 2026, and Cabinet accepted this recommendation at its meeting on 15 September 2015

## **146. WOOD GREEN AREA ACTION PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Sustainability introduced the report which set out the response to consultation on the previous 'preferred option' AAP consultation, how these have informed the revised draft AAP, and the key changes between the current and the previous version. Cabinet approval was sought to publish the revised 'preferred option' draft for a further round of consultation (Regulation 18) prior to confirming the final draft of the AAP (Regulation 19) to take forward for independent examination.

The Cabinet Member further clarified the following:

- The Wood Green Area Action Plan set out the vision for the local area, responding to resident's aspirations and was not predicated on the HDV coming forward.
- The Challenge facing all town centres due to changing shopping patterns means the shopping centre needs to change to remain competitive in a changing market.
- The Wood Green Area Action Plan was different to Tottenham Area Action Plan and focussed on an economic development plan to bring jobs and work spaces to the borough.

In response to questions from Councillors: Strickland, Ibrahim, Ahmet, Engert, and Carter the following information was provided by the Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Sustainability.

- In relation to arranging a meeting with Page High Residents Association to discuss the future of the estate and to help work up options with the residents; Cllr Goldberg was happy to facilitate the meeting with officers. It was Important to hear residents' concerns when discussing change. The Caxton Road changes demonstrated how the Council had listened to resident's views and carried out further studies, and in this case, concluded that the vision could still be achieved without including these homes in the plan. The Plan had been revised accordingly and put forward for further consultation as a result of this action.
- The Cabinet Member reiterated that Sky City and Page's High housing estates would be treated separately and the Council would work with the Housing Association landlords and their residents to find the right solution for each family. It was further important for all stakeholders/ partners in Wood Green to work with residents on plans going forward.
- Priority should be given to the provision of affordable housing rather than retaining the Civic Centre site for Council use in Wood Green Town Centre.
- It was important to read the Wood Green Strategic Regeneration Framework in conjunction with AAP as this set out the economic benefit of the AAP for residents. This document responds to challenges on: liveability in Wood Green, the fear of crime in the area, need to increase public spaces and job opportunities for people in the local area.
- People wanted better homes and jobs and the Council were listening to the residents of Noel Park. There was currently £23m investment in decent homes
- No meetings with organisations or resident's groups in Wood Green had been refused. It was important to note that the AAP was not a plan for demolition but a Plan to enable development to come forward.
- Any future development/refurbishment plans for the Mall or Sky City and Page High would follow statutory planning requirements and will involve consultation with residents.
- It was important to keep in mind that the AAP and SRF was designed to set out what the best future looks like for Wood Green. It creates a framework for Planning Committee to act within and a framework for developers to engage with and understand the Council's expectations of Wood Green, including the priority for investment in people.
- The Council had consulted properly on the Wood Green AAP and the Cabinet Member would continue to go to consultation events and have discussion with

residents, as the AAP process continues. It was important to note that this was a staged process with discussion and review.

- It was correct for the Council to be ambitious, in relation to Crossrail 2, and have a plan that responds to external scrutiny. This also enabled a minimum threshold of housing to be included and not put jobs at risk. The Plan enables the Council to increase housing and job numbers whether or not Crossrail 2 comes forward.
- Agreed that the cost of running the second round of consultation, be provided to Cllr Engert outside of the meeting.
- Wood Green is a metropolitan town centre and residents have been clear about the need for a better choice of retail and leisure. There was potential, through the AAP, to have a change in retail offer in Wood Green and see new and old brands come back to the area, alongside office space to support this retail offer.
- The opportunity to deck over the bus garage is identified in the AAP, there are precedents for this happening elsewhere and would potentially deliver significant housing and job opportunities.
- Agree that there are opportunities for water sports on the filter beds, the SRF includes a proposal for an outdoor swimming offer.
- With regards to de-culverting the Moselle brook, deculverting is an ambition in the Local Plan but not a requirement, deculverting can only take place where it is feasible and viable on sites.

In considering the recommendations, the Cabinet noted the comments of the Regulatory Committee and agreed the officer updates proposed to the Wood Green Area Action Plan, since publication, as set out in the attached addendum.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the findings of the February 2017 'preferred option' consultation on the Wood Green Area Action Plan ("AAP"), as set out in the consultation report at Appendix A.
2. To note the key changes between the previous and the revised 'preferred option' versions of the AAP, as set out at paragraphs 6.6 and 6.7.
3. To approve the revised "preferred option" Wood Green AAP, as set out in Appendix B, for publication for public consultation.
4. To revoke the now out of date Haringey Heartlands Development Framework (2005).

## **Reasons for decision**

The AAP is required to provide the planning framework needed to clearly articulate how the Council intends to regenerate Wood Green, ensuring public and private development and investment decisions are coordinated and deliver the strategic objectives sought.

Once adopted, the AAP will:

- Revitalise the town centre and surrounding area through the provision of development providing 4,000 new jobs and 6,400 new homes;
- Safeguard Wood Green's Metropolitan town centre status, by enabling an expansion of town centre floor space and uses, particularly for comparison retail, expanded and enhanced leisure, and the creation of an improved evening economy;
- Enhance Haringey's economy through new floor space for office and creative industries;
- Enable a range of urban realm improvements including the creation of a new town square to provide the central focus of community life in Wood Green;
- Optimise the use of Council-owned land to provide a catalyst for wider regeneration and to facilitate comprehensive development;
- Secure enhanced east-west and north-south connections through the centre, making it more accessible and pedestrian friendly;
- Co-ordinate new infrastructure in the regenerated town centre, to support the area's increasing population;
- Establish a set of Wood Green specific planning policies to ensure the right type of development comes forwards in the right locations to achieve the community's aspirations for the future of Wood Green.

It was anticipated that Government would make a positive announcement about supporting Crossrail 2 in the last year. Unfortunately, neither the 2017 Conservative manifesto or successive budget statements have provided any certainty that Crossrail 2 will be funded. As a result, it is not possible or appropriate for the AAP to rely on the increased transport capacity that Crossrail 2 would provide that in turn would allow for increased development densities.

Since the growth assumptions (both the amount and mix of development proposed) in the previous 'preferred option' draft were predicated on the provision of Crossrail 2 serving the Wood Green area, it is not possible to progress to a Pre-submission (Regulation 19) version of the AAP without further consulting the community on the consequences for the Plan of not relying upon this strategic transport improvement. To do so would risk the AAP being found 'unsound' at the examination in public stage, resulting in reputational harm and significant delay and additional costs in bring forward this much needed planning framework. For these reasons, a further 'preferred option' round of consultation is necessary.

## **Alternative options considered**

As set out in Section 4 above, it is not possible to progress straight to a Pre-submission (Regulation 19) version of the Wood Green AAP based on the 2017 'preferred option' draft for the reasons outlined. This option is therefore dismissed.

An alternative option is to rely on the existing Local Plan to manage growth and change in Wood Green, in preference to preparing an AAP for the area. This option would see implementation of the proposals already set out in the Site Allocations DPD, which allocates the majority of development sites proposed in the AAP, making provision for 4,300 net additional homes. However, these site allocations in themselves do not provide the overarching framework needed to secure coordinated improvements and regeneration benefits across the wider Wood Green area. In this respect, initial consultation on the Wood Green AAP - the 2016 Issues & Options consultation - elicited significant public support for a high level of intervention and significant growth where this would secure a rejuvenated High Street, with a better shopping offer and improved pedestrian connections, more housing, including affordable homes, and greater local job opportunities. Given development in accordance with the existing site allocations are unlikely to deliver the community's aspirations for the future of Wood Green, this option is not preferred.

#### **147. WOOD GREEN STRATEGIC REGENERATION FRAMEWORK**

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Sustainability introduced the Strategic Regeneration Framework, which set out the overarching vision and objectives for Wood Green and will underpin current and future documents.

The report was for consideration in conjunction with the Wood Green Area Action Plan Report. This was about the people, businesses, homes in the area and what needs to happen in Wood Green to make it a better place to live and work in.

The Cabinet Member continued to outline key underpinning pillars of the framework which were:

- Better range of employment opportunities with educational offers aligned to this, to enable local residents to have the capacity to apply for a range of job opportunities.
- Supporting Wood Green as a business destination.
- Revitalising the town centre to draw people from Haringey and beyond.
- Maintaining the authenticity of London in Wood Green.
- Strong cultural offer with supplementary evening economy as well
- Sustainability in regeneration and drive to becoming a zero carbon borough by 2050.

In response to a question from Cllr Engert, the Cabinet Member outlined that the AAP set out the principle of moving the Civic Centre and Council office accommodation outside the Town Centre to drive regeneration.

- The potential savings in the annual office budget and the economic gain in moving needed to be considered, instead of just the immediate cost. Agreed these figures be provided to Cllr Engert.

- The Leader reiterated that moves concerning the Civic Centre and Library have been in the Local Plan for some time.

## **RESOLVED**

To agree and adopt the Wood Green Strategic Regeneration Framework included at Appendix1, for publication in March 2018.

### **Reasons for decision**

Wood Green has a number of strategic brownfield and regeneration sites and prime town centre redevelopment sites, offering significant potential for new jobs and homes, a better choice of retail and leisure and better east west connectivity.

Since 2014 officers have been developing an Investment Framework for Wood Green comprising several strategic and delivery documents. The intention is that the Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) sets the direction for the regeneration of Wood Green with a clear vision and objectives, aligning goals and strategies for physical change with those for wider social and economic improvements.

Major landowners are already developing proposals for sites in Wood Green, including Clarendon Square (the former gas works site) which already has planning permission for over 1,000 homes, and Planning Applications have now been received for three sites in Heartlands area totalling 2,000 homes (including a new Planning Application for Clarendon Square for 1,600 homes). Haringey is in Pre Application for a further four sites in the growth area.

By adopting the plan Cabinet are endorsing the overarching ambition for the regeneration of Wood Green. This will ensure a clear set of priorities which can be communicated to stakeholders and partners. The SRF will be used to communicate the vision and priorities with residents, businesses, landowners/ developers and statutory partners. The SRF is also an essential tool for fund raising and lobbying.

### **Alternative options considered**

The Council has previously approved for submission a set of Site Allocations for Wood Green totalling approximately 4,300 net additional homes, now adopted as the Local Plan.

Since this baseline a number of different “options” for the redevelopment of Wood Green have also been considered, and consulted upon, including the “Issues and Options Report” where four options for growth were consulted upon and there was support for a high level of intervention, supporting co-ordinated and significant growth in Wood Green.

The vision and objectives for Wood Green have evolved since 2014 as the programme has progressed. The previous draft of the AAP (January 2017 Regulation 18) contained a vision and objectives relating to spatial regeneration policies, though much of the response to the consultation related to the existing communities who would be directly impacted by the proposals.

In order to ensure that the regeneration programme encompasses social and economic change it is necessary to embed an overarching set of objectives which related to the social and economic change as well as physical. This will ensure that local people benefit and that change is sustainable in its broadest sense.

#### **148. SHARED DIGITAL GOVERNANCE MODEL REVIEW INCLUDING STAFFING IMPLICATIONS**

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources introduced the report which sought approval for the Joint Committee model to be refined to address the issues set out in paragraph 5.4 and that the service be governed under a 'lean' Joint Committee model.

The interim 'secondment' arrangement for the shared service currently in place, comprising Camden, Islington and Haringey Councils Digital and ICT services was not considered sustainable in the long term and would not establish a high-performing single team that retained and attracted the best Digital and ICT staff.

The 'do nothing' option was not recommended for the reasons set out in paragraph 5.4 below.

The Shared Digital Governance review model was being considered by all three boroughs involved in sharing Digital and ICT services. Islington Council had agreed the report at their meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup> of January 2018 and Camden Council were due to consider the attached report at their meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> of January.

The following decisions, which were by necessity technical in nature, would in summary, for all three Councils, achieve the following:

- Transfer the ICT function of both Haringey and Islington to Camden including staff who will TUPE on 1 April 2018.
- Transfer the decision making for the ICT functions for Haringey, Islington and Camden to either a new and reconstituted lean Joint Committee or via Camden's usual delegation arrangement to the Executive Director Corporate Services to be undertaken by the Chief Digital and Information Officer.
- To approve the underlying consultative management arrangements noting that these will develop as the service itself develops.
- Delegate authority to allow the necessary further supporting documentation to be completed in support of the arrangements.

Therefore, and further to the recommendations from the Shared Digital Joint Committee at Appendix 3, the Cabinet,

**RESOLVED:**



1. To note the options set out in the detailed 'Shared Digital Governance Model Options' report at Appendix 1 prepared by Activist Group following extensive work since March 2017 with Councillors and senior officers.
2. To approve the adoption of the governance model for Shared Digital set out as Option 1 (a 'lean' Joint Committee model in paragraphs 4.5 to 4.14 of this report and paragraphs 4.5 – 4.9 of Appendix 1) based on the outcomes framework at Table 2.4, paragraph 2.26 of Appendix 1 with a commencement date of 1 April 2018 (throughout this report 'the Commencement Date' means 1 April 2018).
3. To approve, pursuant to Regulations 9 and 11 of the Local Authorities (Arrangements for the Discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2012 ('the Regulations'), that as from the Commencement Date:
  - (i) those parts of Haringey's ICT service and function (including the procurement of ICT related services, equipment and software) specified in paragraphs 6 to 16 of the attached terms of reference set out at Appendix 4 be jointly exercised with the London Boroughs of Islington, Haringey and Camden by a Joint Committee
  - (ii) that the current Joint Committee be reconstituted with the terms of reference at Appendix 4 with effect from the Commencement Date
  - (iii) that the Joint Committee will consist of two elected Executive/ Cabinet Members from each Council, normally for an annual term, with the term and appointment to be decided by the Leader.
4. To approve, pursuant to Regulation 5 of the Regulations that those parts of the executive function of Haringey's ICT not transferred to the Joint arrangements specified in paragraph 3.5(I) above and Appendix 4 be delegated to and discharged by the Executive of the London Borough of Camden as from the Commencement Date subject to the arrangements set out in paragraph 4.7.
5. To approve Camden as the host Council and note the impact on the proposed staffing arrangements set out in section 4.16 of this report as a result of the decisions at paragraphs 3.4 to 3.6 above namely that Haringey and Islington ICT staff will transfer to Camden (as the host authority) under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE) and to agree that as a result Camden will be responsible for employing staff engaged to deliver the Shared ICT service.
6. To approve the creation of a Shared Digital Management Board, accountable to the Shared Digital Joint Committee, to manage the service, with an appointed Director from each Council amongst other key members of staff to be appointed from each Council and the Chief Digital and Information Officer (or suitable alternative). Terms of reference for the Shared Digital Management Board set out in Appendix 6.
7. To give due regard to the equalities implications as summarised in paragraph 8.16 – 8.18.

8. To note that the Cabinet of Camden are considering a recommendation to be the primary host authority in the Shared Service, and to accept the delegation from Haringey and Islington. The Executive of Islington are also considering a recommendation to delegate to Camden (as the primary host authority in the Shared Service) the delivery of ICT services in like terms and that the recommendations set out in this report, if agreed, will only be implemented if the Camden Cabinet and Islington Executive agree the equivalent and related recommendations that they are considering.
9. To note that a memorandum of understanding will accompany the Inter-Authority Agreement and will set out the boroughs commitments to partnership working behaviours and to note the shared ICT service success factors in Table 0.1 of Appendix 1. The Inter-Authority Agreement and memorandum of understanding will be in keeping with the intentions and agreements of this report and appendices.
10. To delegate authority to the Director, Transformation and Resources, in consultation with the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance/ Monitoring Officer, to take all necessary steps to put arrangements for the new governance model into effect as set out in this report including but not limited to finalising the terms of the inter-authority agreement and any changes to it and for the operation of the 3 way Shared Digital service.
11. Further to recommendation in paragraph 3.5 (iii) above, the Leader is asked to appoint the Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources and the Cabinet Member Finance and Health to the reconstituted Shared Digital Joint Committee from the commencement date of 1 April 2018 until the end of the 2017/18 Municipal Year.

## **Reasons for decision**

Camden, Haringey and Islington Councils recognise that sharing their Digital and ICT services efficiently and effectively will bring many benefits, including saving money, improving performance and resilience, and sharing learning to support better digital services to citizens and residents.

Shared Digital was established using a Joint Committee governance structure. The terms of reference for the Shared Digital Joint Committee required that the Joint Committee, by October/ November 2017, receive and consider a detailed report setting out Governance Model Options for Shared Digital and to make recommendations to the Cabinet/ Executive of each of the Councils in respect of the report. Options to be evaluated to include the Joint Committee model as well as company models.

The current governance of Shared Digital is underpinned by a legal agreement and terms of reference for the Shared Digital Joint Committee. The legal agreement works within the framework of the Local Government Acts 1972 and 2000, and the Localism Act 2011, which give Local Authorities powers to delegate the discharge of functions to another Local Authority or to a Joint Committee, and to make staff available ('place'

staff) in order to discharge the functions in accordance with s113 Local Government Act 1972. Section 113 of the Local Government Act 1972 enables staff of local authorities to be placed at disposal of other local authorities, subject to consultation. Staff are essentially shared by a form of secondment, in which staff remain employees of their original authority for employment and superannuation purposes, but may also take delegated decisions on behalf of the authority they have been seconded to. At the inception of Shared Digital, ICT staff in the Councils were issued with a Section 113 notice and have received recent confirmation that this arrangement continues indefinitely pending any further decision stemming from the conclusion of the review undertaken by the Joint Committee or change to the shared service which impacts on this arrangement.

From March 2017, a Governance Model Review Project was set up to fulfil the commitment to find the right governance model for Shared Digital in two phases:

Phase 1 was completed in July, and focused on exploring the future and helping the three partner boroughs to develop a shared understanding of the options available for the governance of their shared service, and to confirm their future ambitions (narrowing down options for detailed review in the options report).

Phase 2 has investigated the options from Phase 1, and set out in detail an assessment of the two main options (a 'lean' Joint Committee and a public service company) for the Joint Committee to consider. This is set out in the discussion report attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

On 30 October 2017, the Joint Committee considered the report attached as Appendix 1 and agreed to recommend the more efficient and effective lean joint committee model to the Camden, Haringey and Islington Cabinets and Executive. The implications of this are set out in the paragraphs that follow.

In this model Haringey and Islington will directly delegate their Digital and ICT services to Camden as 'host' authority under s101 of the Local Government Act 1972 (this is the model used by Brent, Lewisham and Southwark for their shared ICT service) but with strategic matters and high value procurements reserved to the Joint Committee as set out in the recommended terms of reference in Appendix 4. Haringey and Islington delegating their ICT service to Camden under s101 will trigger the transfer of staff, and TUPE will ensure that staff rights are protected in the transfer. An example of how this might work is shown in Appendix 2 (How typical decisions will be taken, and how responsibilities will work in the proposed governance model).

This delegation would include managing the service and making day-to-day operational decisions about the service subject to strategic direction by the Joint Committee and result in staff being employed by Camden as a result of the application of TUPE. The operational and day-to-day management of the service would fall to Camden, and would be managed as such. The delegation of the Councils' ICT services to Camden would be subject to Camden's cabinet agreeing to delegate responsibility for day to day management, operation, delivery of the shared ICT service and procurements not reserved to the joint committee, at the levels set out in paragraph 4.8 to the CDIO, via the Executive Director Corporate Services to whom the CDIO reports. Decisions on the delegated ICT functions will therefore be taken by

the CDIO rather than by the Camden Cabinet or individual Camden Cabinet member. Camden would be required to exercise the delegated ICT function in accordance with the business plan, work plan and ICT strategy agreed by the Joint Committee and in accordance with the agreed budget for the Shared ICT service.

The delegation to the Joint Committee by Camden, Haringey and Islington has no financial ceiling. Digital or IT spend exceeding £2m for any one Council, or exceeding £6m for the three Councils (whether capital or revenue), is reserved for the Joint Committee. In the 2017/18 financial year 4 contracts are expected to exceed these thresholds. The governance proposed and set out in Appendix 4 would mean based on current levels 4 procurement strategy reports and 4 contract award reports for the Joint Committee to consider. Spend below £2m for any one Council, or below £6m for the three Councils, would be delegated to the CDIO and generally would not be a key decision under Camden's constitution.

Staff would be transferred to Camden under TUPE Regulations and their existing terms and conditions will be protected under this arrangement. Pension fund arrangements will need to be examined and addressed by the three Councils as part of the transfer due diligence.

The arrangements would be underpinned by an inter-authority agreement which, amongst other matters sets out service descriptions and the roles and responsibilities of Camden as host authority, Haringey and Islington and the Joint Committee and mutual expectations generally.

The Joint Committee would approve business plans and strategies; monitoring high-level progress against the business plans and financial budgets.

Re-casting the arrangements to include consistent and specific delegations to Camden as the host authority and to the Joint Committee would streamline decision-making while retaining transparency and accountability. The principles of a governance framework to support the 'lean' Joint Committee are set out Table 4.1, paragraph 4.7 of Appendix 1.

The governance framework aligned with the lean Joint Committee is made-up of four key elements (see the graphical representation in Appendix 5):

- i. The Shared Digital Joint Committee approves the service budgets, business plans and strategy. It monitors progress against the business plan and takes strategic decisions about the service and high value procurement decisions at a level to be decided by the three Boroughs. It maintains democratic accountability and oversight, avoiding the need for the service to work through three decision-making processes. It will be decision making.
- ii. The Shared Digital Management Board is the strategic interface to the three Councils, advocating for the shared service and ensuring that key priorities are reflected and optimised in the portfolio. It is the portfolio board for shared programmes,

resolving conflict and ensuring that transformation effort is focused and delivering effectively. The Shared Digital Management Board will support the development of the service and its strategies and decisions, ensuring borough interests are represented and responded to. It will oversee the realisation of savings and consider investment plans, ensuring that the CDIO has the support and resources needed to succeed. It is a consultative board which shall be informative to the CDIO and Shared Digital Joint Committee, where decisions will rest.

- iii. Priority shared digital transformation themes/ programme boards for each of the key transformation themes. These are each jointly chaired by a senior officer from each of the three Councils. These boards will ensure that demand is managed and prioritised, and that service and digital resource is effectively allocated to the projects that matter most. The co-chaired programme boards ensure that sponsorship of each programme is distributed across the three Councils.
- iv. The Shared Digital Senior Leadership Team is responsible for day-to-day delivery of transformation programmes and operational ICT services. The SLT reports operational matters to the Shared Digital Management Board on an exceptional basis, and coordinates regular monthly highlight reports for the Shared Digital portfolio to report to the Shared Digital Management Board. The SLT acts as a first point of escalation for programme boards.

Based on work undertaken with stakeholders across the Councils as part of the early Shared Digital engagement sessions, and refined through the Governance Model Review work led by Activist Group, primary and secondary outcomes were identified as shown in paragraph 2.26 (Table 2.4) of Appendix 1. These will shape the priorities for the service for the next 2 to 3 years.

### **What are the key impacts/ risks? How will they be addressed?**

If the recommendation to adopt Option 1 is approved by the Cabinet/ Executive of the Councils, then Camden will be responsible for employing staff engaged to deliver the Shared ICT service. As a result of the delegation of the service under this model, as stated in paragraph 4.9, Haringey and Islington ICT staff will transfer to Camden (as the host authority) under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE), (as amended). Pension arrangements and liabilities arising from transferring staff will need to be determined. Camden, Haringey, and Islington will be required to comply with their obligations under the TUPE regulations. The Council's respective procedures on managing change and informing and consulting with departments, staff and the respective unions will be followed in respect of all affected staff where applicable.

An increase in the number of stakeholders for the service can reduce the effectiveness and speed of decision making. The recommendation in this report is intended to counter this risk by proposing a governance model that balances transparency and oversight with simplified decision-making processes.

Differences in organisation strategies and priorities will limit the benefits that shared services can deliver. Early indications show that there is a high level of alignment across Camden, Haringey and Islington. The proposed theme boards will encourage closer working across service areas to support alignment, shared thinking and learning.

Different organisation cultures and a loss of local identity/ control of the service can result in increased intervention, reducing the efficiency of the service and compromising benefits. By opting for a Joint Committee model, and a layered governance approach, shared strategic leadership of the service is emphasised. Ongoing relationship development will, over time, strengthen ties and build trust.

The risk of a future change in direction from any of the boroughs would mean needing to untangle all or part of the shared service arrangement. This risk could be mitigated by moving to a 'Shared Digital Late' model, where the Councils share core infrastructure and commodity ICT, repatriating strategic Digital and transformation elements of the service.

What actions will be taken and when following the decision and how will this be monitored?

Camden and Islington officers are presenting reports to their respective Cabinets in relation to this delegation and future Shared ICT service. Subject to their approval steps will be taken to implement the lean joint committee with the implications set out in paragraph 4.5 to 4.14.

The report recommends the Cabinet delegate authority to the Director, Transformation and Resources, in consultation with the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance / Monitoring Officer, to take the necessary steps to put the arrangements into effect including but not limited to finalising the terms of the inter-authority agreement and any changes to it and for the operation of the 3 way Shared Digital service.

The Council's respective procedures on managing change and consulting with departments, staff and the respective unions will be followed in respect of all affected staff where applicable.

If the recommendation to approve Option 1 is not agreed by the three Councils, then the status quo will be maintained as set out in paragraph 5.4 below.

## Alternative options considered

There are three options, to adopt one of the two models: a 'lean' Joint Committee model or a company model as identified and evaluated in the detailed report (Appendix 1), or to maintain the status quo.

Option 1: to approve the recommendations of the Joint Committee and adopt a 'lean' Joint Committee, similar to the current arrangements, with some streamlining – see the following paragraphs of Appendix 1 for more detail:

- discussed in paragraphs 3.7 to 3.14
- specific detail on the model in paragraphs 4.5 to 4.8
- evaluation in paragraphs 4.9

Option 1 is **recommended** as set out in paragraphs 4.5 to 4.14.

Option 2: not to approve the recommendations of the Joint Committee and instead opt for a public service company that would be jointly owned by the three partners – see paragraph 4.10 of Appendix 1 for more detail.

Options 2 is not recommended at this time as it is considered on balance that the lean JC model will be able to satisfactorily develop this project at this time.

Should the Councils wish to trade services in the future, a trading arm could be established to facilitate that. The three Councils could set up a publicly owned company (without requiring a procurement exercise providing they all take part in the control of the company (this is often called the 'Teckal exemption')).

The company could offer a proportion of its services commercially to external customers up to a maximum of 20% of its turnover. If that threshold is exceeded the company will lose its Teckal exemption and the work undertaken by the company on behalf of its owning bodies will need to be put out to tender by those owning bodies in line with public procurement regulations.

Legal arrangements for a company owned by local authority partners would need to be put in place and a board of directors would need to be established.

Option 3: do not approve the recommendations of the Joint Committee and maintain the current governance model.

Option 3 is not recommended. The current model cannot address the three fundamental issues that have been identified and which need to be resolved if the shared service is to meet the Councils' ambitions (see Table 2.3, paragraph 2.25, of Appendix 1), i.e.:

**Complex decision-making:** current decision-making processes and delegations are complex and introduce unnecessary risks and delays.

**Constitutional differences:** there is currently a divergence in views as to the operation of the arrangements and some ambiguity over some of the provisions which should be addressed by the recommended option.

**Diffuse employment arrangements:** the current arrangements for employment (with three employers) adds complexity and impedes the formation of a cohesive and focussed organisation.

To meet the Councils' ambitions, and provide stability for staff in the service, a new governance model is needed.

## **149. INTERMEDIATE HOUSING POLICY**

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning introduced the report which set out a new Intermediate Housing Policy Statement. This expanded on the policy for consultation, taking into account the results of the consultation. It also reflected changes in the policy environment, in particular the new Mayor's Draft Housing Strategy.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning Member emphasised that where intermediate homes are built in the borough, the policy ensures that Haringey residents are first in line to benefit from them.

The Council also wanted to ensure that intermediate homes are offered first to those on lower incomes, so that intermediate housing goes to those residents who will benefit from it most.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the Intermediate Housing Policy Statement set out at appendix 1.
2. To agree the changes to Appendix C of the Housing Strategy set out at appendix 2, and minor amendments to other appendices as set out at paragraph 6.16 of this report, and recommend that they be adopted by Full Council.

### **To recommended that Council:**

3. Agree and adopt the changes to Appendix C of the Housing Strategy set out in appendix 2, and the minor amendments to other appendices as set out at paragraph 6.16 of this report.

### **Reasons for decision**

Intermediate housing is becoming an increasingly important part of the housing offer, as provided for in Haringey's Housing Strategy. However, at present, the Council has no formal policy for prioritising who gets these intermediate homes, either for sale or for rent, neither does it have clearly articulated expectations on the types of products and affordability of these products that it would like to see.



This policy statement allows the Council to set out clear guidance on all these issues, in particular on local eligibility criteria, priority matrix, marketing requirements, tenure mix and products.

### **Alternative options considered**

An alternative option would be not to set a priority matrix or marketing arrangements for intermediate housing. This option was rejected to ensure that intermediate housing is offered in the first place to those who will benefit from this most, and for whom market housing is most difficult to access. It also provides for Haringey residents to have greater priority access for intermediate housing products.

A separate alternative option would be not to amend Appendix C of the Housing Strategy. This was rejected partly since much of the content has been superseded by the Mayor's Housing Strategy and partly because it is not fully aligned with the outcomes of the consultation on this policy.

## **150. UPDATE ON THE HOUSING SUPPORT TRANSFORMATION**

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning introduced the report which set out the Supported Housing Tenants and Residents Charter. The creation of a Charter was one of the recommendations of the Supported Housing Review, whose recommendations were approved by Cabinet in March 2017 in the form of the Housing Support Transformation Programme. The aim of the Charter was to codify the Council's commitments to supported housing tenants, who may be affected by changes to housing support as a result of the programme.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the draft Supported Housing Tenants and Residents Charter at appendix 1.
2. To note and consider the update of the Housing Support Transformation programme set out in this report.

### **Reasons for decision**

It was considered appropriate that Cabinet approve the Supported Housing Tenants and Resident Charter, a key element of the Housing Support Transformation programme, recommended by the Supported Housing Review in March 2017.

Approval is anticipated to support the delivery of the Council's strategic priorities for vulnerable adults as part of the Corporate Plan (2015-18) and commitments made in the Medium Term Financial Strategy (2017/18).

Approval is anticipated to address the issues, gaps and opportunities identified by the Supported Housing Review, as approved by Cabinet in March 2017.

### **Alternative options considered**

The Council already has a range of charters, pledges and commitments to tenants and residents which it could apply to this programme of change. However, the Housing Support Transformation programme was approved on the basis that it would make a commitment to co-production, transparency and partnership in order to deliver the recommendations of the Supported Housing Review. With a number of challenging decisions to make about our supported housing provision, and in recognition of the particular housing and support circumstances of residents living in supported housing, making generalised commitments does not reflect the importance of the programme or the population it involves.

Alternatively, the Council could move forward without a Supported Housing Tenants and Residents Charter as there is no statutory requirement for a local authority to produce one. However, having a coherent commissioning framework and approach, founded in co-production, transparency and partnership with vulnerable residents is considered best practice. As with the option presented in 5.1, with a number of challenging decisions to make about our supported housing provision, making no commitment to those who may be affected is clearly not an option.

The draft Supported Housing Tenants and Residents Charter has been co-produced with supported housing tenants and residents through a series of workshops and meetings. It outlines six pledges to vulnerable residents who receive housing support, specifically in reference to changes to housing support that may arise out of the Housing Support Transformation programme. The Charter commits to involving, valuing and recognising the contributions of supported housing tenants in delivering the required changes as well as making commitments to those people who may be individually affected by change. Alternative options were discounted where they:

- Would not be consistent with the data and intelligence about housing support need in the borough
- Would not have been consistent with the general tenor of feedback and engagement with service users, service providers and technical specialists
- Did not comply with current and forthcoming government legislation
- Would have represented policy choices that are unachievable given known and likely constraints

## **151. DISABLED FACILITIES GRANT POLICY FOR ADAPTATIONS AND ASSISTANCE IN HARINGEY**

The Leader introduced the report which outlined Haringey Council's approach to the delivery of its service to customers who require adaptations to their home.

The draft policy (Appendix 1) was based on the legislation which governed the implementation of major adaptations via Disabled Facilities Grants under the Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996 and other assistance under the Regulatory Reform (Housing Assistance) (England and Wales) Order 2002.

In response to Cllr Carter's question, there would be enough Occupational Therapist assessors made available to complete the required assessments for adaptations.

The Cabinet Member was strongly pursuing the issue of reducing waiting times for adaptations and there was a plan to reduce waiting times from 52 weeks to 3 months. It was still important to recognise the complexity of this work. However, Cllr Carter could also be provided with assurance of the Cabinet Member's commitment to this work by referring to the improved waiting times in Customer Services as an example.

## **RESOLVED**

To approve the draft Policy: Grant and assistance regime for housing adaptations for disabled persons in Haringey, attached at appendix 1.

### **Reasons for decision**

Having a policy will clearly set out and define what services we are able to provide and a clear pathway for accessing services, increase the range of services and scope the Council are able to provide to maximise service user's independence. Thereby, providing clarity and consistency for all service users across Haringey regardless of tenure.

It will provide us with ability to use the DFG funding in innovative ways that will:

- reduce the bureaucracy in administering grants for residents
- simplify the application and adaptation process
- rapidly deal with inaccessible housing
- award grants to excess of mandatory grant limit, currently £30 000, to meet eligible needs larger grants to meet needs,
- complete adaptations in a timely manner therefore potential reduce package of care spend,
- capitalise staffing costs and procurement to manage demand

The Council will pilot for a 12-month period from January 2018 removing the test of resources. This will reduce the bureaucracy in administering grants for residents, simplify the application and adaptation process and enable the LA to complete adaptations in a timely manner therefore potential reduce package of care spend.

Since 2014 to date we have assessed 40 residents as requiring to make a client contribution and the total value received is £36,133.64. Therefore, the financial risk to the LA is minimal. We employ x2 FTE Assessment Officers to administer the test of Resources. The current process to complete the Test of Resources is also reported on average to take 3-6 months.

### **Alternative options considered**

The contents of the Policy reflected the wider strategic aims of the Council to give all children the best start in life and empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives and also the ever closer integration of health and social care. The option of maintaining the current model for adaptations was considered to not fully meeting these wider strategic aims.

## **152. LONDON BUSINESS RATES RETENTION PILOT - 2018-19**

The Leader introduced the report which set out participation by the London Borough of Haringey in the London-wide Business Rates Retention Pilot for the financial year 2018/19. Participation in this Pilot, had been agreed by London's Councils and similar reports were being considered by all London Boroughs.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the designation of the London Borough of Haringey by the Secretary of State as an authority within the London Business Rates Pilot Pool pursuant to paragraph 34(7) of Schedule 7B Local Government Finance Act 1988 and;
2. To agree that the London Borough of Haringey participate in the London Business Rates Pilot Pool with effect from 1 April 2018 (to 31 March 2019);
3. To delegate the authority's administrative functions as a billing authority pursuant to the Non-Domestic Rating (Rates Retention) Regulations 2013 to the City of London Corporation ("Colic") acting as the Lead Authority;
4. To authorise the Lead Authority to sub-contract certain ancillary administrative functions (regarding the financial transactions (payment of tariffs and top-ups) within the Pool to the GLA as it considers expedient;
5. To delegate authority to the Chief Financial Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance & Health, to agree the operational details of the pooling arrangements with the participating authorities;
6. To enter into such Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the participating authorities to implement and/or regulate the pool and delegate authority to the Chief Financial Officer (in consultation with the Assistant Director Corporate Governance) to negotiate, finalise and execute the same on behalf of the authority;
7. To authorise the Leader of the Council to represent the authority in relation to consultations regarding the London Business Rates Pilot Pool as may be undertaken by the Lead Authority pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding;
8. To delegate to the Chief Financial Officer, the authority to consider such consultative reports as the Lead Authority may circulate and to respond on behalf of the authority with regard to any recommendations and in particular, proposals for projects to be approved for funding from the Strategic Investment Pot;

9. To delegate to the Lead Authority the functions of assessment, due consultation and the approval of projects eligible for funding from the Pool's Strategic Investment Pot following consultation with the participating authorities (provided that at least two thirds of such participating London Boroughs (including the city of London Corporation) and the Mayor of London are in favour of the relevant recommendation, and that no entire sub-region is in disagreement with the decision on such terms and conditions as shall ensure value for money and compliance with the law.
10. To notify Full Council at its meeting on 26 February 2018 of Cabinet's approval to the above resolutions.

### **Reasons for decision**

The underlying drive to create a pool is to generate a net financial benefit for London which is not available under the current individual authority scheme.

As outlined in section 6 below, joining the Pilot for 2018/19 offers the potential to generate additional Business Rates income to Haringey above the level forecast if Haringey continued to operate as a single authority. It also offers Haringey the chance to propose strategic investment bids which would be funded from a top slice of any net benefit achieved across the whole pool. A clear guarantee on entry is that no Borough will suffer financial detriment as a result of participation in the Pool.

Furthermore, as a consequence of the establishment of the Pool, central Government will commit to exploring other funding changes which could be beneficial to Haringey and London as a whole.

### **Alternative options considered**

The alternative option would be to formally opt out of participating in the pilot meaning that the Pan-London pilot would not go ahead as it requires all Boroughs listed in the agreement to participate.

As part of Central Government consultation on 100% business rates retention earlier in 2017, Haringey expressed a preference for the creation of a pilot scheme for London and would not consider opting out unless the proposed operation appeared detrimental to Haringey; this is not the case.

## **153. PROVISION OF INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICES**

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources introduced the report which recommended entering into a contract with Croydon Council, by means of their Audit Services Framework Agreement, from 1 April 2018 for six years to provide audit resources to deliver the Internal Audit service for Haringey Council at a total cost of £1.5m over the duration of the contract.

### **RESOLVED**

1. That the Council enter into contract with Croydon Council, by means of their Audit Services Framework Agreement, from 1 April 2018 for six years to provide audit resources to deliver the Internal Audit service for Haringey Council at a total cost of £1.5m over the duration of the contract; and
2. That if the Croydon Council framework contract is extended in compliance with the EU regulations (up to a maximum of two years), and satisfactory contract performance is maintained, agreed that the Council extends its contract with Croydon Council and associated framework agreement up to a maximum of two years, subject to compliance with Haringey Council's Constitution. The total value of the contract for the 8-year period would be £2m.

### **Reasons for decision**

The current internal audit contract commenced on 1 April 2012 and is due to expire on 31 March 2018. Internal audit is a statutory function which Haringey Council is required to maintain. It is therefore necessary to ensure that an appropriate internal audit service is in place from 1 April 2018, to ensure ongoing compliance with statutory requirements.

### **Alternative options considered**

Five options have been considered and these are set out below.

It should be noted that experience has proved that it is highly unlikely that an in-house resource could be recruited and retained to deliver the Council's internal audit service in its entirety. All London boroughs have outsourced their internal audit service to some extent and none are looking to bring this service fully back in-house due to the ongoing costs of recruitment, retention and specialist audit training required.

#### **Option 1 – OJEU Open Tender**

The potential contract values involved for this length of contract would require a full re-tender following European procurement legislation, commonly known as the OJEU rules, unless an acceptable alternative procurement route is used e.g. an appropriate framework agreement. The full open tender approach by Haringey alone is not recommended as taking an independent procurement route in this way would be resource-intensive and unlikely to achieve better results in terms of value for money than the other options available.

#### **Option 2 – Crown Commercial Services (CCS)**

This is a framework agreement established by central government for the provision of internal audit services under their Management Consultancy Framework. Although geared towards provision within Central Government, local authorities are included in the list of organisations eligible to use the framework. The framework includes the provision of services from all the main providers of Local Government internal audit, namely: BDO LLP, Deloitte LLP, Ernst & Young LLP, Grant Thornton LLP, KPMG LLP, Mazars LLP, PWC LLP, and RSM Tax and Accounting PLC.

To utilise the framework, it would be necessary to conduct a ‘mini-competition’ between the contractors. While this option would ensure that the market is tested, it is considered that, as with the full tender (option 1 above), it is unlikely that the relatively small number of audit days Haringey would require would attract better rates than those available under the Croydon Council Framework. The current indicative standard daily rates quoted by each of the contractors within the overall government framework are higher than those currently paid by the Council under the Croydon Council Framework.

### **Option 3 – Shared Service with another local authority**

A number of London boroughs have entered into shared service arrangements to deliver their statutory internal audit service in recent years. Some of these arrangements form part of large shared arrangements covering a range of different Council services, while others only cover internal audit arrangements.

In the longer term, it might be beneficial for the Council to consider shared service arrangements if issues with the existing and contractual delivery of internal audit services are identified. In such circumstances, shared service arrangements might provide:

- **Improved resilience** – less reliance on the external audit delivery partner to provide audit resources to the Council;
- **Access to specialist internal auditors** – most Councils would not have sufficient work to justify employing these to work solely at one authority;
- **Contract options** – explore alternative arrangements, including other frameworks, shared services etc.;
- **Career opportunities** – developing and retaining in-house audit staff to avoid reliance on external contractors; offering experience and training across one or more Councils may attract higher calibre candidates;
- **Savings opportunities** – ongoing financial constraints mean Councils look to review how services are delivered; exploring alternative arrangements may reduce overall costs across authorities.

A small number of the shared service arrangements have since reverted back to stand-alone internal audit services for their respective authorities; this has been for various reasons including: a recognition that the Head of the Shared Internal Audit Service had less capacity to be involved in corporate projects than in the past; service delivery arrangements had not met expectations; and strategic arrangements had changed.

At a time when Haringey Council is undergoing significant organisational and service changes, the level of risk exposure is increased and therefore it is critical that an adequate level of internal audit work maintained to ensure new working systems and processes are implemented effectively across the organisation and relevant assurance is provided; and that sufficient senior level audit resources are available to support officers and members.

### **Option 4 – Alternative Framework contract**

There is another framework agreement established by a London authority in 2014/15 for the provision of internal audit services and other local authorities are included in the list of organisations eligible to use the framework. The framework is delivered by another private sector contractor, but the daily rates quoted are substantially higher than those paid by the Council under the London Borough of Croydon framework contract. This alternative framework is due to end in 2018/19 and no information is available at present on what arrangements will be in place following the end of its current term. For these reasons, use of this framework has not been considered as part of this evaluation.

### **Option 5 – Croydon Council Framework Agreement**

This option involves the Council using the framework agreement procured by Croydon Council. Croydon Council tendered for a single supplier framework agreement to take effect from 1 April 2018. The tender process was run as an OJEU open procedure (ref: 279176-2017); Croydon Council has confirmed that the framework agreement has been tendered in compliance with EU Procurement Regulations. Croydon Council's framework agreement is delivered by a single supplier, Mazars Public Sector Audit Limited (Mazars), Haringey's current supplier. Haringey Council's Legal Services and Corporate Procurement Services have reviewed the OJEU notice to confirm that Haringey Council would be able to participate in the Croydon Council framework agreement.

This is a shared services model, whereby Croydon Council is the contracting authority (and therefore the service provider) and will call off a contract on behalf of the authorities which participate in the framework agreement. The framework agreement is structured to provide cheaper daily rates for audit services as more authorities join the framework. The contract is structured as a call-off and, as such, offers Haringey Council maximum flexibility in terms of the number of days purchased in any year, with no requirement to purchase a minimum number of days.

The framework agreement rates are based on different daily rates for the various audit areas such as IT; Contract; and General audit (including Schools). This is in line with the Council's current contract. The daily rate costs in the new framework are higher than the current costs: general audit by 11.7% and ICT audit days by 3.8%. It should be noted that the existing framework rates have remained largely unchanged over its 10-year duration and general audit day rates are only 0.8% higher than they were at the start. The proposed daily rates still represent good value for money for the Council.

The framework agreement rates will be subject to review and a Retail Prices Index-linked increase in April each year. Over the six-year period, the contract value is expected to be £1.5m for Haringey Council. The internal audit service for Homes for Haringey is provided via the current framework contract and Homes for Haringey have confirmed that they wish to retain the current arrangements for the new framework contract. Additional audit days delivered to Homes for Haringey will be subject to a formal Service Level Agreement; these days will be in addition to those provided to the Council.



There are clear administrative benefits in retaining the services of our existing supplier as they are fully conversant with the Council's operational arrangements, systems and processes as well as the standard of work the Council expects and will therefore provide staff with the requisite skills.

As stated at 5.7.2 above, the contract for the internal audit service would be between Haringey Council and Croydon Council; it is being recommended that Haringey Council enter into a contract for a six-year period from 1 April 2018, with the option to extend for a further two years' subject to compliance with EU regulations and satisfactory contract performance.

The framework agreement, whilst in theory being 'managed' by Croydon Council, is delivered through Mazars, the Council's current provider. It is considered highly likely, although not guaranteed, that the current provider would continue to utilise staff working on the existing Haringey contract, thus retaining their accumulated knowledge about the Council.

Contract payment and monitoring arrangements. Croydon Council will invoice Haringey Council for the audit work completed in accordance with the framework agreement's daily rates and Haringey Council will undertake regular contract monitoring and review meetings with Croydon Council. Regular group meetings of the existing framework users already take place and it is envisaged that these will continue under the new framework agreement to ensure service developments and operational arrangements are satisfactory. Monthly contract monitoring review meetings take place under the current contract to ensure compliance with terms and conditions of the contract, including performance and output standards; and locally agreed performance and reporting arrangements. These meetings will continue under the proposed new contract.

The following outlines the contractual arrangements which would be in place if the Council were to use the Croydon Council framework agreement:

a) Croydon Council and Mazars

This is the framework agreement onto which Croydon Council appointed Mazars following a full tender process for the provision of internal audit and anti-fraud services. This framework agreement is due to commence on 1 April 2018 and run for six years, with an option to extend for a further two years.

b) Contract between Haringey and Croydon Council

A contract will be established between Haringey and Croydon Councils, whereby Croydon would undertake to provide Haringey with a number of audit days as per its requirement/ specification. Croydon Council would be responsible for delivering the services by calling-off a sub-contract from their framework agreement with Mazars. Croydon Council would charge Haringey at the same contract day rates for any work they undertake in managing and monitoring this contract (the number of days would be agreed in advance each year).

c) Letter of engagement between Haringey Council and Mazars

This agreement is necessary to ensure that the process remains as streamlined as possible at the operational level and allows existing working practices to continue as far as is required. This agreement would enable Mazars to issue all audit reports direct to Haringey Council, rather than via Croydon Council.

#### **154. THE COUNCIL'S CORPORATE INSURANCE ARRANGEMENTS**

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources introduced the report which informed Cabinet of the procurement process undertaken, via the Insurance London Consortium (ILC), and further sought approval to appoint a provider(s) for Motor Fleet Insurance; Property Insurance Services for Commercial Properties; provision of the Engineering Inspection Programme; Fidelity Guarantee (Crime) Insurance; and School Journey Insurance with effect from 1 April 2018, for a period of three years with the option to extend for two further periods of one year each.

Further to considering the exempt information contained at item 23,

#### **RESOLVED**

To approve the award of the contracts for the provision of the Insurance Services and Engineering Inspections via the ILC, effective from 1 April 2018, for a period of three years with the option to extend for two further periods of one year each (i.e. 3+1+1) to the following providers:

- Motor Fleet (Lot 1) to Zurich Municipal;
- Property Insurance Services for Commercial Properties (Lot 2) to Zurich Municipal;
- Engineering Inspection Programme (Lot 3) to Zurich Municipal;
- Fidelity Guarantee (Crime) Insurance (Lot 4) to Risk Management Partners; and
- School Journey Insurance (Lot 6) to Risk Management Partners.

#### **Reasons for decision**

The current insurance and inspection contracts commenced on 1 April 2013 and were based on a three-year agreement with an option to extend by a further two years. No further extensions are available; therefore, a new procurement process was required. It is necessary to ensure that the new contracts are in place from 1 April 2018, to avoid any gap in insurance cover for the Council.

#### **Alternative options considered**

Purchasing stand-alone cover for the Council, using agreed procurement processes. This was not considered appropriate because:

- Haringey Council's membership of the ILC has enabled it to benefit from significant economies of scale in procuring policies for a number

- of local authorities; these economies of scale would not be available if the Council were to opt for a single authority procurement route;
- Membership of the ILC has also allowed the Council to share best practice on insurance and risk management practices, which would not be available on a stand-alone basis; and
  - The insurance market for local authority risks has historically had a limited number of competitors. Procuring through the ILC has previously increased the number of providers willing to respond and resulted in reduced policy rates.

Using another framework agreement to run a mini-competition for services. The Government's Crown Commercial Services (CCS) has an insurance framework in place which the ILC has used in a previous procurement exercise in 2014. Using the CCS framework resulted in fewer respondents, decreased competition and lower value for money for the ILC and Haringey Council. Using the CCS framework was considered prior to the start of the procurement process, but discounted based on previous outcomes achieved.

#### **155. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

##### **RESOLVED**

To note the following minutes :

- Cabinet Member Signing on 30 November 2017
- Cabinet Member Signing 15 December 2017
- Cabinet Member Signing 20 December 2017
- Leader's Signing 4<sup>th</sup> January 2018

#### **156. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

##### **RESOLVED:**

To note the delegated and significant actions taken by Directors in December.

#### **157. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

#### **158. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

##### **RESOLVED**

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as agenda item 23[ minute 159 ]contained exempt information, as defined under paragraph, 3 Part 1, schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

**159. THE COUNCIL'S CORPORATE INSURANCE ARRANGEMENTS**

As per item 154.

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

None

CHAIR: Councillor Claire Kober

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....