

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY, 13TH NOVEMBER, 2018, 6.30pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Joseph Ejiofor (Chair), Emine Ibrahim (Vice-Chair), Charles Adje, Peray Ahmet, Patrick Berryman, Mark Blake, Zena Brabazon, Kirsten Hearn, Noah Tucker and Elin Weston**

**Also Present: Councillors: Barnes, Gordon, Bevan, das Neves.**

### **1. 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.

### **2. APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **3. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest put forward.

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

There were no representations received at the agenda publication stage in relation to the exempt items on the agenda.

### **6. MINUTES**

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 9<sup>th</sup> of October 2018 were agreed as an accurate record.

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

There were no Overview and Scrutiny matters for consideration by Cabinet.

## 8. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

A deputation had been received from the Broadwater Farm Resident's Association, in relation to item 9 of the Agenda – Broadwater Farm.

Mr Jacob Secker, Secretary for the Broadwater Farm Resident's Association, was invited by the Leader to put forward his deputation to Cabinet.

Mr Secker was speaking as the representative of the Association, and Tangmere block resident with right of return, and introduced fellow deputation party members, Archbishop Frimpong who was a previous tenant at Tangmere with right of return, and Alan Goodall who was a resident at Northolt block.

Mr Secker began his representation by reiterating that the Association was demanding a ballot under Greater London Authority (GLA) rules for Tangmere and Northolt residents. He contended that this ballot should be on the question of whether the estate blocks should be strengthened or demolished and rebuilt. The Association felt that without the ballot, there could be no guarantee that the Council would abide by its commitment to re-provide the same number of Council homes at Council rent.

Mr Secker had observed in the consultation forms, a clearly stated commitment to residents of an equal number of Council homes at Council rent with more family sized accommodation for Northolt Block. However, Mr Secker argued this commitment for provision of an equal number of homes was not included in the report presented to Cabinet. The report advised at paragraph 6.61 that 'any' Council homes demolished would be re-provided, and the deputation felt that the term 'any' could be open to interpretation and called for the report be amended. There was a need make clear that the number of homes demolished would be equally re-provided otherwise this would make the consultation null and void.

With regard to Northolt, Mr Secker claimed that residents had been informed, in the consultation documentation, that when they were moved into a new home, if they did not like it then they would be allowed to request a move to another home. This commitment was also not included in the report and Mr Secker argued that if this commitment was also not adhered to, then the consultation would be deemed invalid.

Mr Secker continued to reiterate the importance of the ballot as the deputation party felt without this process there was no guarantee for residents that promises about re-provision of homes at Council rents would not be kept to.

Mr Secker conceded that, in the context of tower block safety across London, the safety issues with the blocks at Broadwater Farm was a relatively serious safety issue. He re-iterated that GLA rules stipulated that where there were reasonable alternative solutions to demolition, then there had to be a ballot. Mr Secker noted the Council's own surveyors stated the blocks could be strengthened, demonstrating there was a reasonable alternative to demolition, in his view, cheaper than the demolition, therefore, meeting the requirements of a ballot.

Mr Secker concluded his deputation by asserting that the reason the Council were not balloting residents was because there was not the intention to stick to its promises made during consultation with residents.

Following the deputation, the Leader invited Cabinet Members to ask questions.

Cllr Adje thanked the deputation and disputed their view that the report was not clear on equal numbers of re- provided Council homes. He referred to the report which stated at paragraph 6.61 – *'The Council was committed to replacing any Council homes which were demolished with new Council homes on the estate'* .Mr Secker reiterated that the use of the word *'any'* was ambiguous and could mean any number of homes instead of the equal number of Council homes to those that were demolished.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal responded to the deputation and stressed that the fundamental concern of the Council was for the safety of the residents at Tangmere and Northolt and they had always been the priority. The Cabinet Member made the following points:

- Disputed Mr Secker's claim that the safety concerns were 'relative' and advised they were serious, especially in the aftermath of Grenfell. It was not appropriate to discuss level of concern that should be attributed to the safety of the blocks but accept the seriousness and duty to safeguard tenants and leaseholders in the two blocks.
- There were current mitigations in place to ensure the tenants were safe at Tangmere and Northolt but these were not long term sustainable solutions and the Council therefore needed to make a decision about how to resolve the serious structural issues at the two blocks. Other blocks on Broadwater Farm had been assessed and were being strengthened but this was not considered a reasonable option for Tangmere or Northolt.
- In June 2018, Cabinet considered the options available to it, decided that rebuilding the blocks would be the most suitable option, and consulted tenants with this preferred option put forward. There had been a significant response from residents, with 90% of those replying from Tangmere agreeing with the proposal and 80% of those replying from Northolt agreeing with the proposal.
- The report before Cabinet at this meeting recommended agreeing to demolish the Tangmere and Northolt blocks.
- An earlier Cabinet report made clear the Council's guarantee to rebuild the same number of social rent tenancies following the demolition of the two blocks.
- The wording of the report would be changed so that *'any'* at paragraph 6.61 became *'all'* so that there was no doubt that all homes demolished, as part of this decision, would be replaced with the same number of Council rented tenancies, on the same terms. Every resident is guaranteed his or her right of return to the estate **when** the blocks were rebuilt.
- In terms of the funding, the Council had provisionally allocated part of the GLA Building Council Homes for Londoners funding allocation from the Mayor to rebuild the blocks. Due to the safety issues of the block, there was an urgent

need to rehouse residents of Tangmere before the Cadent deadline. To complete a compliant ballot would have taken time, which was not available given the safety issue concerns. The Council were in discussion with the GLA for the application of an exemption and continue to work with them.

- Irrespective of any exemption granted by the GLA, and based on Council policy, there was always a commitment to holding a ballot as part of the engagement undertaken on the next phase of work, which would be developing proposals for the new homes on the estate. This ballot would be of residents across the whole Broadwater Farm estate, including those former tenants of Tangmere and Northolt who have relocated as a result of the issues discovered.

The Cabinet Member further confirmed that all of the existing social rented Council homes on the Broadwater Farm estate would be replaced.

The Leader thanked the deputation party at which point Archbishop Frimpong responded to note that he had full confidence in the Cabinet to keep their commitments. Cabinet continued to consider the Cabinet report on Broadwater Farm.

## **9. BROADWATER FARM**

Following the deputation, the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal formally introduced the report on Broadwater Farm. The Cabinet Member informed the meeting that once the structural issues became known, substantial work had been done across the estate to ensure the safety of residents. The nine medium rise blocks had had their individual gas supplies removed with heating and hot water provided initially by temporary oil fired boilers.

The Cabinet Member continued to outline that all these blocks would be connected to a modern district energy network by summer 2019, at a cost of £13m. In addition, strengthening and refurbishment works were being designed for the medium-rise blocks on Broadwater Farm. Kenley Tower, which passed the required safety tests, would also receive upgrade works, including new heating and hot water systems and associated works.

The Cabinet Member reminded the meeting of the purpose of the attached report, arising from the fact that two of the blocks on Broadwater Farm – Tangmere and Northolt - had failed the lower of the safety tests for buildings of their type. In June Cabinet had taken a number of difficult decisions about the future of these two blocks. At that meeting Cabinet had considered the options available to address the structural issues affecting Tangmere and Northolt. All the options would have required residents to be rehoused from the two blocks so there had been no option for the residents to remain in their homes.

The rehousing of Tangmere residents had been more urgent due to the deadline for gas to be removed from all the blocks on Broadwater Farm. The process of rehousing Northolt residents has not started as this block did not have piped gas.

At its meeting in June Cabinet assessed that the strengthening works required to make the blocks safe were prohibitively expensive and did not represent value for money when compared to the other options. Consideration was also given to the type of building in question and its likely life span even if strengthening works were carried out.

Having considered the options in June, Cabinet decided that its preferred option was to demolish Tangmere and Northolt and then to build new, high quality replacement Council homes on Broadwater Farm. Consequently, residents had been consulted on this preferred option, and the results of the consultation for both blocks was that a very clear majority of residents agreed with the Council's proposal. This was 90% of residents in Tangmere and 80% of residents in Northolt in favour of this preferred option.

The Cabinet Member further informed Cabinet of the need to approve a rehousing policy setting out its commitment to the residents of these two blocks. This included a guaranteed right to return for Tangmere and Northolt tenants to the new homes when they were built. If Cabinet agreed the recommendations in the attached report, more detailed work would start on the proposals for the new homes and this would be done in consultation with residents of the estate.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged the decision to demolish Tangmere and Northolt was not an easy decision given some residents had been living in their homes for a number of years. However, it was clear that a large majority of those residents consulted at the two blocks supported the decision.

The Cabinet Member further put forward an amendment to the Rehousing and Payments Policy to ensure the wording of the policy properly reflected the Council's aims, following feedback from tenants. This amendment was to make clear that all tenants who move out of Tangmere or Northolt under the Policy or the Tangmere Priority Rehousing Scheme will be eligible for a second transfer with Band A priority following their first move out of the block. This would be regardless of whether their first move was through choice based lettings or through a direct offer, and this second move can be made at any time until either the tenant was offered one of the new replacement homes on the estate or s/he decides s/he does not wish to return.

The Cabinet Member sought agreement from Cabinet colleagues for an additional recommendation to delegate authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and planning to amend the Rehousing and Payments Policy to allow all tenants to have second moves as set out above.

Following questions from Cllrs Berryman & Brabazon, the following information was noted:

- That paragraph 6.61 would be amended by replacing the word, '*any*' with '*all*'.
- The Cabinet Member and officers had advised the BWF residents Association, a few months ago, of the Council's application to the GLA for an exemption from the requirement to ballot.

- In reference to a ballot noted at paragraph 6.62 and whether this was the same (GLA) ballot that had been mentioned by the deputation, the Cabinet Member confirmed it was a different ballot. Due to the health and safety concerns, the situation in Tangmere and Northolt was pressing and there was not enough time to work with residents to prepare a redevelopment plan, and ballot residents on it, before taking a decision about whether to demolish the blocks. When the Council had such a plan for the rebuild, it was the intention to ballot the whole estate.

Following questions from Cllr Barnes, the following was noted:

- As soon as the Cabinet became aware of the serious structural risks posed by Tangmere and Northolt, they had acted swiftly and decisively to ensure the safety of its tenants. The Cabinet Member emphasised that Cabinet were not aware of any pre-existing concerns about the structural integrity of the tower blocks from the 1970s. If it was suggested that the Council knew of these structural issues then this was a fundamentally different question to the report in consideration, and would need to be explored. The Cabinet Member had no reason to believe that the Council knew of these structural issues from the 1970's.
- If future proposed plans were rejected in a ballot, the Cabinet Member advised that the Council would need to consider what to do next at that stage but it was clear that proposals could only be progressed when a ballot was successful.
- The remaining properties at Broadwater Farm were due to have refurbishment works and would also be connected to the new district heating network. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that it would be a challenging time for residents in the next few years. However, there was a need to make sure the work was carried out to bring the homes back up to standard. Officers further clarified that the medium-rise blocks were due to have strengthening works completed and this provided the opportunity to complete long overdue internal improvement works.
- It was further clarified that the future ballot would be a ballot of the whole estate and would entail prior conversations with residents living on the whole estate (including those who had moved out of Tangmere and Northolt because of the problems). Therefore it was not prudent, at this stage, to speculate on a potential outcome to the ballot but have full discussions with residents beforehand.

The Leader highlighted the additional recommendation put forward by the Cabinet Member for Housing & estate renewal at paragraph 9 above,

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note and considers the outcome of the consultation carried out with Council tenants living in Tangmere pursuant to section 105 of the Housing Act 1985,

and the non-statutory consultation with the Council leaseholders of Tangmere, as summarised in section 6.20 – 6.26 of this report and set out in detail in appendix 1.

2. Having regard to the results of this consultation, to agree that Tangmere should be demolished and authorises the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to serve the initial demolition notice on the secure tenants of Tangmere and to decide the timing of any final demolition notice that needs to be served.
3. To note and considers the outcome of the consultation carried out with Council tenants living in Northolt pursuant to section 105 of the Housing Act 1985, and the non-statutory consultation with the Council leaseholders of Northolt, as summarised in section 6.27 – 6.33 of this report and set out in detail in appendix 1.
4. Having regard to the results of this consultation, to agree that Northolt should be demolished and authorises the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to serve the initial demolition notice on the secure tenants of Northolt and to decide the timing of any final demolition notice that needs to be served.
5. Having considered the results of the consultation on the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy as set out in section 6.40, to approve the final Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy attached at appendix 2.
6. Having considered the results of the consultation on the Broadwater Farm Local Lettings Policy as set out in section 6.52, to approve the Local Lettings Policy attached at appendix 3.
7. To agree that the rehousing of tenants and leaseholders from Northolt should commence as soon as practicable, and delegates authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to determine the exact date that the rehousing of Northolt commences. The rehousing will be carried out under the Rehousing and Payments Policy recommended to Cabinet in 3.5 above.
8. To approve as required by Section 1 – Financial Regulations paragraph 5.23 (b) within the Housing Revenue Account a virement of £1.2m from the HRA Building Regulations Review budget to a new budget 'Northolt Rehousing Costs'.
9. To delegate authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to amend the Rehousing and Payments Policy to allow all tenants who moved out of Tangmere and Northolt under the Policy or the Tangmere Priority Rehousing Scheme to be eligible for a second transfer with Band A priority following their first move out of the block. This would be regardless of whether their first move was through choice based lettings or through a direct offer, and this second move could be made at any time until either the tenant was offered one of the new replacement homes on the estate or he/she decides he/she does not wish to return.

## Reason for decision

The Council has identified risks in a number of blocks on Broadwater Farm. Surveys have identified that Tangmere and Northolt have failed both the tests relating to Large Panel System (LPS) buildings, which means that there is a risk of progressive collapse caused by a force equivalent to a vehicle strike or bottled gas explosion. These risks have been mitigated through the introduction of measures set out in section six of this report, including:

- In Tangmere, which has piped gas, the replacement of gas cookers with electric cookers and the installation of gas interrupter valves, which will switch off the gas if a leak is detected. Northolt does not have piped gas.
- In both Tangmere and Northolt, a 24-hour concierge and a programme of home visits to reduce the risk that items such as bottled gas are taken into the building.

These mitigations reduce the risks, but do not remove them entirely. Further decisions are needed on how to address the structural problems identified in both blocks so that there is no risk of progressive collapse. In June Cabinet agreed, having considered the options that its preferred option was to demolish both blocks and replace them with high quality, new Council homes built on the estate. It further agreed that officers should consult residents of Tangmere and Northolt on the options for both blocks. This consultation took place between 12 September and 10 October and in the case of Council tenants was a statutory consultation under section 105 of the Housing Act 1985. The results of the consultation are set in sections 6.18 to 6.33 of this report, and show clear support for the Council's preferred option. Cabinet can therefore now make a decision on the future of both blocks in light of the results of the consultation alongside consideration of the technical and financial information presented in this report and the report to Cabinet of 26th June.

Because the Council was already aware of the requirement to rehouse residents of both Tangmere and Northolt (as all options to address the structural issues required each building to be emptied), in June Cabinet also agreed a draft Rehousing and Payments Policy for consultation. This consultation has now taken place, and a final Rehousing and Payments Policy is presented for approval. The key commitments of the policy include:

- Guaranteed rights of return to the estate for all Council tenants and resident leaseholders who need to move out of Tangmere or Northolt.
- This includes a right to return to new build homes on the estate when they are built.
- Equity loans for resident leaseholders, to enable them to buy a new home in the borough with financial assistance from the Council.

In order to give residents who move out of Tangmere and Northolt the ability to return to Broadwater Farm more quickly if they want to, it is also proposed that a Local Lettings Policy is adopted. This will prioritise future lets on Broadwater Farm to these residents. The Council consulted on this proposed policy, and found clear support.



If Cabinet agrees that one or both blocks should be demolished, then demolition notices under Sections 138A and 138B of the Housing Act 1985 will need to be served on the secure tenants in those blocks.

### **Alternative options considered**

The alternative options for rectifying the structural defects in Tangmere and Northolt were considered in detail in the report considered by Cabinet in June, and were explained in the consultation with residents.

Doing nothing is not an option, as both blocks have failed structural tests. The risks posed by the structural defects have been mitigated, but the blocks cannot remain occupied long-term as they are.

The main alternative option considered was to carry out major strengthening works to both blocks. Retrospective strengthening works would require the joints where walls, floors and ceilings meet to be strengthened. Windows would need to be removed to allow the strengthening materials to be fitted. The cost of these works to Tangmere is estimated at £13m while the cost of these works to Northolt is estimated at £12.5m. The works cannot be done while the residents remain in occupation.

In June, Cabinet decided, having considered the technical feasibility and the cost of the strengthening work that its preferred option is to demolish both blocks and replace them with high quality, new Council homes built on the estate. The consultation shows that a clear majority of residents agree with the Council's proposals.

## **10. HOUSING STRATEGY**

The Leader invited Mr Nicolson to put forward his deputation to the Cabinet.

Mr Nicolson was representing the TAG[Temporary Accommodation Group] Love Lane resident's group and putting forward their concerns about: the future demolition of the Love Lane estate, their rights as residents in temporary accommodation, the need for permanent housing with affordable rent and how the development of the estate was taking place around them, causing distress.

The Sedley principles were referred to and the deputation were seeking an assurance that any consultation on the 'Landlord Offer' on Love Lane estate would follow these principles and that all families in temporary accommodation on Love Lane estate would be allowed to respond to the consultation, and to vote in any related ballot and would be moved into permanent accommodation.

The TAG Love Lane group was seeking accommodation that was both permanent and affordable. The group was concerned that Councillors had not given due consideration to:

- The circumstances of the 172 homeless families whom the Council had moved into temporary accommodation in the Love Lane estate, after the permanent tenants were moved out, and who were likely to be moved on yet again before demolition. It was not felt right for one family to already have been moved three

times in the past nine months or for children to be moving homes, schools and friends six or seven times throughout ten years of their education. The deputation party felt that one move into decent temporary accommodation ought to be enough. Being moved into a noisy building site only to be moved off it again was compulsory move too many.

- The damage to the health and well-being of low-income families caused by significant increased rents as these families would likely need to move out of £90 a week for two bed Council rented accommodation to take private rented permanent accommodation at a minimum of £300 a week in N17 or £400 in N6. This was being done under the threat of "intentional homelessness". The deputation asserted that the Council paying the difference to landlords for four years did not result in permanent secure affordable accommodation for a career teacher or nurse or anyone else seeking to move to a community

The deputation further contended that none of the definitions of affordable housing in Appendix C was truly affordable. It was not only the rent that mattered but consideration should also be given to the health and wellbeing of low-income families and the minimum household income must be enough to buy a healthy diet, water, fuel, clothes, transport, participation in the community and other necessities, after the rent, Council and income taxes are paid.

The deputation referred to the new London Living rent policy being developed by the Mayor of London, which was one third of local rents, in which Council tax must be included if it is not abolished. The deputation spoke about the remaining two thirds of income being equally important and considered in the development of this policy. The remaining two thirds must be enough to buy a healthy diet, water, fuel, clothes, transport, participation in the community and other necessities. The necessary research about human needs was available from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and distributed to the Council.

The deputation explained that if a family takes on housing benefit simultaneously with being forced into private sector rents then their rents can push the family's benefits over the government's £442.31 a week London benefit cap, leaving rent unpaid and to be paid out of that vital two thirds of income needed for essentials. That, and everything else about the circumstances of tenants in temporary accommodations, was profoundly unfair.

The Cabinet Member for Civic Services invited a member of the deputation to outline his experiences.

A member of the deputation party spoke from personal experience of living on Love Lane estate for the past 3 years and they perceived there to be a lack of transparency, by the Council on what the future holds for them, post demolition. This uncertainty was causing health issues, stress and anxiety as they had yet to receive a guarantee of permanent accommodation, post demolition. The consultation on the Landlord offer had yet to even start and this was previously promised in October.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal wanted to hear from the members of the deputation that lived on the Love Lane estate and offered them the opportunity to ask her questions.

The current uncertainty on permanent accommodation and the demolition works taking place in the outside space was further reiterated. A member of the deputation spoke from personal experience about the conditions her family were living in. This was especially difficult with two older children studying for GCSE's whilst living in TA, and living on a demolition site. This situation had ruined the mental health of her family, and they were suffering through the uncertainty of not having a home. The deputation member highlighted that a majority of people living in temporary accommodation, on the Love Lane estate, worked but were on low incomes. If they were moved to private accommodation with higher rents, there was no hope to give their children of a better home and quality of life.

The Cabinet Member responded and noted that there will be a process followed for the ballot. Officers would explain the detail of this. The Cabinet Member appreciated that the deputation highlighted the stark housing issues that people in London face and which was due to the impact of a housing crisis. The Cabinet Member acknowledged this situation and commented on the many people coming to her surgery with similar issues or living in temporary or overcrowded accommodation. The Cabinet Member further commented on the high number of one-bedroom properties in the borough which were housing families of up to 4 and 5 people which she understood could not be acceptable. There were currently over 50,000 homeless households in London living in temporary accommodation, and around 3,000 of those were Haringey households.

The Cabinet Member described the mismatch between the demand and supply for social rented housing. This situation meant that households in Band B and where a housing duty was accepted, were waiting for significant periods to obtain permanent housing. The Cabinet Member explained that in Haringey some families were waiting for a 3-bedroom property for up to 11 years and she understood the detrimental impact this could have on schooling and family life.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the only way to address this mismatch was by building more social rented homes. This was why the Council was committed to providing 1,000 new Council homes and seeking to increase the number of affordable and social rented homes.

There were decisions being made to tackle this issue, including the changes to the Housing Strategy and the plans for housing delivery via the Wholly Owned Company. Although, it was accepted that the promise of 1000 new social homes was not enough, it was important to start somewhere. The Cabinet Member further reiterated her commitment to deliver 1000 homes and provide safe and secure temporary accommodation.

The Interim Director for Housing, Planning and Regeneration advised the deputation that the Council did not push ahead with the Love Lane ballot in October as there was more time needed to talk to residents on the estate and improve the offer. The ballot

would likely take place early next year to allow these early discussions and conversations. The Council were further seeking to obtain additional funding and so it could improve that offer to local people. She advised that the consultation included residents living in temporary accommodation and they would have a say in the ballot. She reiterated that the Council would work with the tenants to make a proper local offer.

The Leader thanked the deputation party for putting forward their representations

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Renewal continued to introduce the Cabinet report which put forward revisions to the Haringey's Housing Strategy, including proposed amendments to appendix C and deletion of appendix D.

The administration had been elected in May on a manifesto that recognised the importance in Housing and set out 5 pledges including: 1000 new Council homes, a review of planning targets, ensuring housing is genuinely affordable, expanding the landlord licensing scheme, ensuring that new housing for sale was available to Haringey residents first, and to reduce homelessness in Haringey by 2022.

The two key pledges being focused on in this report was housing affordability and Council social rents.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the Council had last published a Housing Strategy in 2016. Since then, as well as having a new administration with new priorities and ways of working, there had been important changes to Housing policy at the national and regional level, which the existing strategy was increasingly out of touch with. The Government had abandoned a number of its most contested proposed housing policies and there has been a renewed focus on social housing prompted in part by the Grenfell tragedy. There had been a further lifting of the HRA borrowing cap and significant funding from the GLA for Council housing to transform and develop this.

It was necessary to make changes to appendix C to reflect the preference of the administration on affordability and social rented homes. The conversation on a new overall Council Housing strategy would continue, but in meantime there was a need to make changes to appendix to deliver some of the commitments as soon as possible.

In response to questions from the Leader, Cllr Barnes and Cllr Gordon, the following information was noted:

- The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal fully agreed with the Leader on the commitment to the housing target of 50 % affordable on housing developments and the split of 70% social rented and 30% intermediate. It was her understanding that this target was the direction of travel but that there would need to be a separate statutory planning process followed, in order to achieve that. There were decisions that could be made today to the policy for consultation such as changes to the Housing mix and the document more fully demonstrating the Council's preferences for social rents, to Council tenancies and London affordable rent.
- The Cabinet Member appreciated the concern that there was not reference to this manifesto and previously scrutiny recommended affordable housing target, included in appendix C. However, it was not presently legally and practicably

possible to include this target as this would need to be agreed through the Local Plan and Tottenham AAP and the timelines for this were separate. It was important to make the amendments that could be completed currently and gain the benefits of this for residents.

- The Assistant Director for Planning confirmed that the Housing affordability target of 50% could not be changed through Housing Strategy as this could only be done through a review of the Local Plan. This would be a long process and would require compilation of an evidence base that could satisfy the Planning inspector that the affordability target was deliverable. The Planning service were gearing up to complete this review. However, they could not begin this process until the London Mayor has adopted the London Plan in October 2019. The current draft London Plan did include the 50% affordable housing figure and if adopted by the Mayor, would supersede the Council's target. The Council were looking to review the Local Plan to make this and other changes. However, due to the statutory nature of the process with required consultations, a revised Local plan would not be ready for implementation until at least 2021.
- Further to a clarification sought by the Leader, the Assistant Director for Planning agreed that, should the 50% affordable target be agreed by the Mayor in October 2019, then the Council could also implement this new increased target before 2021.
- The Cabinet Member confirmed that the target of 1000 new homes did not include the replacement homes that would be built on Broadwater Farm and would be a net gain.
- In relation to ending street homelessness, there was a need to have clear aspiration and work with partners to achieve this. It was accepted that this was not an easy task to achieve but there was a need to set a clear target .The Managing Director for Homes for Haringey spoke about the challenge of street homelessness and outlined that this was more related to multi agency support to the individual rather than housing provision as there were the required beds available in the borough to house homeless people. The Council would also be completing a count of the number of homelessness people in the borough, in the coming weeks.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the proposed changes to Appendix C of the Housing Strategy set out at appendix 1 of this report, and the deletion of Appendix D of the Housing Strategy.
2. To agree to officers conducting a consultation exercise on the proposed changes and deletion, as detailed at paragraph 6.36.
3. To note the proposed direction for a new Housing Strategy for Haringey, and the proposed process for developing the new strategy, as detailed at paragraph 6.29.

## **Reasons for decision**

Haringey's Housing Strategy 2017-2022 was adopted in November 2016. Since then there have been significant changes to national and regional housing policy, as discussed at paragraphs 6.7-6.12 below.

Haringey's administration was elected in May 2018 on a manifesto, which included a number of housing commitments, including:

- delivering 1,000 Council homes for families on the Council's waiting list
- bringing 95% of Council homes up to decent homes standard
- expanding the landlord licensing scheme
- aiming to end street homelessness

In addition, decisions taken since May 2018 have fundamentally altered the Council's approach to housing, notably:

- The decision not to proceed with the Haringey Development Vehicle
- The decision to set up a wholly owned company to help deliver 1,000 Council homes at Council rents

This means that the existing strategy, adopted in November 2016, is no longer a good fit with the ambitions of the new administration and there is a need to produce a new strategy to better reflect these. In advance of the development, consultation, and publication of this new housing strategy, it is proposed that Appendix C of the existing strategy is amended and Appendix D deleted to ensure the Council's housing policy framework reflects this changed environment, and the Council's new priorities.

### **Alternative options considered**

An alternative option would be not to develop a new housing strategy. This was rejected since the local, regional and national context has changed to the extent that aspects of the former strategy have been rendered out of date.

Another alternative option is to develop a new housing strategy but not to amend Appendix C and delete Appendix D of the existing strategy. This was rejected since amending, and deleting, the appendices allows certain changes to take effect sooner, and because the Housing Strategy 2017-2022 was deliberately drafted in order to allow for these appendices to be amended during the course of the strategy so as to account for policy changes.

## **11. REPORT ON THE PROGRESS OF ESTABLISHING A WHOLLY OWNED COMPANY FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AND VARIOUS DECISIONS REQUIRED TO FACILITATE THE COUNCIL'S HOUSING DELIVERY PROGRAMME**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report and reiterated the Labour administration's manifesto commitment to deliver at least 1,000

new Council homes at Council rents by 2022. This was the latest report putting in place the programme to deliver these homes.

The Cabinet Member outlined the Labour Administration's stated preference in the Manifesto to build Council housing directly through a company it fully owned. However, this was at a time when the GLA funding was not available and was before the announcement, in the October budget, of the scrapping of the HRA borrowing cap. Time was now needed to consider what those changes meant for housing delivery in the borough, the role that the proposed Company could best play in making that delivery happen and the extent to which the HRA could now support the house building programme, before Cabinet finalised any decisions on forming the Company. Proposals on the Company would be presented in the 2019 but, in the meantime, the Council sought to continue with work on the Company.

This report sought Cabinet to make some key decisions to get started on the Council housing development programme. It identified the first sites to come forward with the GLA funding, including bringing back sites that the last administration had passed over to a Housing Association to build shared ownership and Affordable Rent homes, on which instead would be built Council homes at Council rents. It also provided the initial funding necessary to start work on those first sites and asked Cabinet to agree to accept over £62m of GLA housing grant to help the Council deliver 848 affordable homes over the next four years.

The Cabinet Member concluded her introduction by stating the GLA funding was a major vote of confidence in the Council and its capacity to deliver its housing programme and would be key to funding the bulk of the 1,000 new Council homes that were pledged.

Following questions from Cllr Barnes, the following information was noted:

- In relation to whether paragraph 4.4 of the report meant that right to buy receipts would only be spent on affordable housing and not rebuilding replacement Council homes, Officers advised that the point of that paragraph was to identify that this would stop the Council losing receipts back to the government. It would be up to the Council to determine how it spent the money generated from those right to buy receipts.
- With regards to the size of the sites in the report and the query on whether the Council under the Company scheme would build large housing sites, Officers informed the meeting that the Company would have small to medium sized sites with between 20 and 150 units. It was not within the capacity of the Council to develop larger housing sites. However, overall programme could provide a total of 848 homes.
- Officers responded that they were on course to put forward a further report with decisions on housing development sites to instigate the delivery of the additional homes; this is currently on the forward plan for January 2019 Cabinet.

**RESOLVED**

1. To note progress made in setting up the Company as set out in paragraphs 6.1 -6.3 of this report and that the recommendations in the Cabinet report of 17 July 2018 which were to come back to Cabinet later in 2018, will now come back to Cabinet in early 2019.
2. To note the Government's announcement in the 2018 Budget to lift the cap on borrowing in the Housing Revenue Account and that officers will bring back a revised HRA Business Plan identifying the opportunities this presents for new housing development.
3. To note the six Council owned sites identified as priority 1 sites in the GLA grant funded programme detailed in paragraph 6.8 and that business cases will be brought to Cabinet on the development of these sites, including whether to proceed on these via the Company or within the HRA.
4. To establish a Housing development programme budget of £4.4m to continue with the development of sites with the budget to be funded from the resources set out below.
5. To approve that for 2018/19 the S106 funding of £1.516m previously allocated for delivery of schemes through Sanctuary Housing Association, as set out in paragraph 6.9, is added to the HRA capital programme to fund the Council's housing development programme budget and to pay Sanctuary Housing Association £0.339m.
6. To approve the virement of £1.5m in 2018/19 from the HRA Stock Acquisition budget to the Housing development programme budget in accordance with Standing Order 5.32(b).
7. To approve the virement of £1.4m in 2018/19 from the HRA - P5 Homes for Haringey (HFH) budget to the Housing development programme budget in accordance with Standing Order 5.32(b).
8. To accept the GLA offer of £62.858m housing grant and add that sum to the capital programme.
9. To delegate the detail of negotiating the grant agreements is delegated to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning after consultation with the Director of Finance and the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal.
10. To agree, in principle, to the Council signing-up to the Mayor of London's proposal to enable the Council to access the proposed ring fence of right to buy receipts, as set out in paragraph 6.25 of this report.
11. To agree to reverse the Cabinet Member decision of 23 January 2017 to dispose of 20 HRA infill sites to Sanctuary Housing Association and instead utilise these sites to deliver the Council's housing development programme, either within the Company or in the HRA. This includes three sites identified as phase 1 sites in paragraph 6.8, ten further sites being brought into later phases



of the GLA grant funded programme and seven sites being put onto the GLA's small sites portal as detailed in paragraph 6.10. These sites will be brought back to a future Cabinet to agree disposals.

12. To agree to reimburse Sanctuary for their development costs of £338,758 on these sites in return for all surveys, searches, fees and designs and warranties undertaken to date on these sites, which will all novate to the Council and that the cost be met from the Housing development programme budget.

### **Reasons for decision**

On 17 July 2018 Cabinet agreed to the setting up of the Company, subject to the documents needed for its incorporation being agreed by Cabinet. The Articles of Association and Memorandum of Understanding (shareholders' agreement) and other documentation of the Company are being drafted by Pinsent Mason's solicitors, the Council's external legal advisors. The formal setting up of the Company will not now be agreed until early 2019, when the full implications of the lifting of the HRA borrowing cap are understood.

The Council's housing development programme will initially develop on Council owned sites. Cabinet is asked to note the six Council owned sites identified as priority 1 sites in the GLA grant funded programme detailed in paragraph 6.8, as well as the sites detailed in paragraph 6.10, which are proposed for the GLA small sites programme. Business cases for these six will be developed and brought back to a future Cabinet for decision, including whether to proceed via the Company or within the HRA.

The Council's housing development programme requires initial capital funding of £4.4m to work up the sites to planning stage. Other funding will be secured as the sites are developed from GLA grants and s106 offsite contributions, alongside possible sales revenue from the market homes developed that can cross-subsidise the affordable housing.

The agreement with the GLA to ring-fence Right to buy receipts will ensure that the receipts will always be spent on affordable housing within the Borough and will not have to be returned to Government after three years if unspent.

The decision not to proceed with the disposal of the Phase 2 infilled sites to Sanctuary will mean these sites can now be used to deliver the Council's housing development programme, which would not have been possible under the previous Cabinet decision.

### **Alternative options considered**

The formation of the Company was agreed by Cabinet on 17 July 2018, with the detail being left for agreement at a future meeting. Articles of Association and Memorandum of Understanding (the Shareholder Agreement) have been drafted, along with recommendations on all other key decisions. However, agreeing these and setting up the Company too soon may hinder the Council's ability to deliver the housing development programme in the most effective way.

A decision to set up the Company and dispose of sites to it immediately could mean missing the opportunity of fully using the potential of the HRA borrowing capacity. Delaying the setting up of the Company until the New Year will allow time for the HRA business plan to be reviewed and for exploring all the options for the housing development programme.

The other key decisions, on identifying the sites (including the former Sanctuary sites), agreeing the initial capital funding and accepting the GLA grant offer and the Right to Buy Ring-fence deal) could all have been delayed until the decisions on the Company were agreed. However, this would have prevented any progress being made on these sites until after the decision on the Company. This would be an unnecessary delay, as this initial work is required whether the homes are delivered via the Company or in the HRA. It could also be a costly delay, as the GLA grant requires the initial starts on site in 2019/20.

## **12. AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT (AMR) 2017/18**

The Leader introduced the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) which covered the monitoring period 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2018 and was used to assess the effectiveness of Haringey's planning policies and to inform any future revisions to policies or their implementation. The report set out the Council's current performance to date and was for noting and publication on the Council's website.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To note that there were no comments that the Regulatory Committee asked to be put forward to Cabinet.
2. To note the findings of the Authority's Monitoring Report (AMR) for the monitoring period 2017/18.
3. To note the Authority's Monitoring Report (AMR) 2017/18 will be made available for public inspection, on the Council's website, in line with the statutory requirements.

### **Reasons for decision**

The publication of the Authority Monitoring Report is a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the Act"). Approval of the AMR 2017/18 for publication will ensure that the Council meets its statutory obligations for planning performance monitoring.

### **Alternative options considered**

The Act 2011 requires local planning authorities to produce monitoring reports. The Council considers that Haringey's existing procedure of annual monitoring is an effective way for presenting the effectiveness of planning policies, within existing resources. As such, no other options were considered.

## **13. ULTRA LOW EMISSION VEHICLE STRATEGY**

The Cabinet Member for Environment introduced this report, highlighting that poor air quality and pollution affected us all, and approximately 50% of all pollution came from transport. This draft action plan explored how the Council would enable and encourage residents to move towards Ultra Low Emission Vehicles which would reduce the main source of pollution in the borough. In 2017, it was estimated that there were 225 electronic vehicles in Haringey, by 2020, Transport for London estimated this would rise to 1,000.

This action plan aimed to ensure that the Council raised public awareness of ultra low emission zones and charging technology through campaigns and education. The plan sought to create accessible vehicle charging points throughout the borough so that it could operate a fully lower emissions zone vehicle fleet by 2030. Work was being done with partners to ensure all commercial fleets that operated within the borough also had low emissions and were electric by 2040. The Cabinet Member informed the aspiration was for Haringey to be the leader in carbon friendly and cost efficient charging systems, which would benefit the environment and generations to come.

Cllr Barnes sought a commitment from the Cabinet Member that, of the proposed 150-500 electronic charging points across the borough by 2020, none would be installed on pavements. The Cabinet Member responded there were two types of electronic charging points. The larger was not practical for pavements but would be included in car parks. The smaller charging point was practical for pavements, would be no larger than street lamps, and positioned on the edge of pavements.

The Cabinet Member would provide a written response to Cllr Barnes on how much the Council was planning on spending between now and the introduction of the Ultra Low Emission Vehicle Strategy. With regard to increasing public awareness through campaigns and education, a written response would also be provided on how many vehicles within the Council fleet were currently ultra low emission, compared to how many that were not.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the Draft Action Plan;
2. To agree that the Draft Action Plan be published for public consultation; and
3. Following public consultation, to give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to sign off the Final Action Plan, which will be amended based on public consultation.

## **Reasons for decision**

By developing an Action Plan, the borough can have a co-ordinated approach to future proofing the borough ahead of a growth in electric vehicles. In light of the Ultra-Low Emission Zone expanding to inner London in 2021, residents and businesses with the most polluting vehicles will incur a daily charge. The Council needs to steer the transition to ultra-low emission vehicles to be ahead of technology developments and regional/national policy developments on air pollution and climate change.

The Draft Action Plan sets out the following objectives:

a) Increase public awareness of ultra-low emission vehicles and charging technology through campaigns and education

As ultra-low emission vehicles are not yet widespread, there are many questions and doubt surrounding the switch to electric vehicles. Campaigns and events, amongst other communicative mediums, are an important way to directly engage with potential users and to help alleviate any concerns they may have. Utilising the extensive research into attitudes and behaviours surrounding electric vehicle adoption can aid how we target potential users to alleviate barriers.

b) For the Council fleets to lead by example and have an all ultra-low emission fleet by 2030

It is imperative that the Council takes action with their own fleets and seeks to phase out the use of traditional combustion vehicles where possible. This aligns with the emerging Air Quality Action Plan 2019-2023. This shows the residents and businesses in the borough that the Council also take responsibility for emissions and will tackle them head on. Electric cars have a significantly lower running cost than traditional combustion vehicles and therefore, electrifying the Council fleet would induce cost savings to the Council in the long term.

c) To collaborate with partners to ensure all commercial fleets operating in the borough are ultra-low emission vehicles by 2040

Tackling private-car use and the Council fleet alone is insufficient to achieve a significant decrease in transport-related emissions and the shift in private car use should filter into other aspects of the borough's transport. Therefore, working with a wide range of partners (e.g. bus operators, local businesses and small- and medium-sized enterprises, service stations, taxis and private-hire vehicles, car clubs and canal boats) allows us to realise emissions benefits in all sectors of road transport, as well as including our waterways.

d) To develop an electric vehicle charging network in line with expected demand over the next 10 years

Transport for London have predicted the number of electric vehicle registrations for all London boroughs. These scenarios cover expected levels of demand in 2020 and 2025, with both a baseline scenario and high uptake scenario. In the '2020 high uptake' scenario, all wards will have at least 25 electric vehicles, with some wards having at least 50, and others with at least 75. We expect there to be 3 number of users per on-street charging point, and therefore most wards require at least 8 number of charging points, with some wards needing 16 and others requiring 25.

e) To be a leader in innovation for carbon-friendly and cost-efficient charging technology

We want the borough to be a test-bed for new and upcoming charging technologies which lead to carbon-friendly modes of transport, as well as to keep charging cost-efficient to users.

In order to test and refine the Action Plan, and promote its 'ownership' in the wider Haringey Community, it is proposed that the Draft Action Plan be published for a period of public consultation. Following that consultation, it is proposed that the

Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning be given delegated authority to approve the Final Action Plan which will be amended on the basis of public consultation.

### **Alternative options considered**

#### Do nothing

The Action Plan would not be developed and published. This is not an option as the overarching Haringey's Transport Strategy (2018-2028) has committed the Council to deliver a sustainable transport action plan with the Ultra-Low Emission Vehicle Action Plan directly supporting Outcome 3 of the Transport Strategy. This would compromise the reputation of the Council. Furthermore, under 'do nothing', the Council would:

- A. have no coherent strategy to navigate the shift to electric vehicles, causing Haringey to fall behind regional and UK progress
- B. not have a plan to support the national government and regional government programmes to deliver ultra-low emission vehicles
- C. not a planned approach to mitigate the negative impacts of the Ultra-Low Emission Zone on residents and businesses
- D. miss an opportunity to generate income from charging infrastructure

#### Propose an Action Plan of narrower scope and ambition

An Action Plan of this nature is not common to local Councils. To pursue this narrower, less ambitious approach would risk reducing Haringey's ability to drive ultra-low emission vehicle uptake and mitigate transport-related emissions. Some Councils have an 'Electric Vehicle Charging Point Delivery Plan' however, Haringey's Draft Action Plan goes into greater detail and encompasses a wider scope (e.g. electrifying the private sector, incorporating vehicles on our waterways, public education and awareness of electric vehicles, and set timeframes within which we want to achieve our objectives).

#### Not consult on the Draft Action Plan

A lack of public consultation would mean local views are neglected in development of this plan, especially when it is an issue that will affect all residents and business (e.g. the introduction of an Ultra-Low Emission Zone).

## **14. ADMISSION TO SCHOOLS – PROPOSED ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2020/21**

The Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families introduced this report which sought approval to commence a six week period of statutory consultation on proposed admission arrangements for 2020/21. The Cabinet Member clarified that paragraph 4.5 required a correction of '60' to '30' when describing the number of places available at Tiverton. Also at paragraph 7.14, points 3 and 4, the Cabinet noted that this should read 2019 instead of 2018.

In response to a question from Cllr Brabazon, about the reduction on planned admission numbers in Tiverton and Welbourne schools, and if this was connected with a reduction in family housing in the area, it was noted that , generally, primary school numbers have been falling in Haringey and London. This PAN reduction was at the proposal stage but if there was a future increase in housing then consideration could

be given to increasing the PAN for these two schools. The impact of housing development on local areas was a longer term consideration but it was important to take the steps now and consider this issue. The Cabinet Member was happy to convene an internal meeting to explore this.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To agree to consult on the proposed admission arrangements, including the proposed in-year admissions scheme for the academic year 2020/21;
2. To agree to consult on the proposed IYFAP which, if agreed at Cabinet in February 2019, would be come into force from 1 March 2019;
3. To agree that the co-ordinated scheme for the admission of children to maintained primary and secondary schools as set out in Appendices 2 and 3 of this report can be published on the Haringey website on 1 January 2019.
4. To note the proposal to reduce the PAN for Welbourne and Tiverton Primary Schools by one form of entry (1FE) – 30 Reception pupils each from September 2020 as part of the community and voluntary controlled (VC) schools" published admission arrangements.
5. To note that consultation on the proposed admission arrangements is scheduled to take place between 26 November 2018 and 7 January 2019;
6. To note that following the consultation, a report will be prepared summarising the representations received from the consultation and a decision on the final admission arrangements and the In-Year Fair Access Protocol will be taken by Cabinet in February 2019.

## **Reasons for decision**

### Why do we consult? –

This report and the consultation that will flow from it *if* the report's recommendations are agreed will ensure that our proposed admission arrangements for 2020/21 are consulted upon and the co-ordinated scheme is set in accordance with the mandatory provisions of the School Admissions Code 2014.

The School Admissions Code (2014) requires all admission authorities to publicly consult on their admission arrangements where changes are being proposed. The Code stipulates that if no changes are made to admission arrangements, they must be consulted on at least once every 7 years.

We consult on our admission arrangements annually irrespective of whether or not there is a proposed change to the arrangements. This is to ensure transparency and openness on the contents of our arrangements and to allow parents, carers and other stakeholders who might not previously been interested in admission arrangements (perhaps because they didn't have a child of school age) to make a representation which can then be considered as part of the determination of the arrangements.

What is the change and potential risk to the arrangements being consulted on for 2020 entry? –

Para 3.1 above sets out that we are proposing to reduce the PAN for Welbourne and Tiverton Primary Schools by one form of entry (1FE) – 30 Reception pupils each from September 2020. The School Admissions Code (2014) sets out the requirement for all admission authorities to undertake statutory consultation where they propose a decrease to the PAN of a school.

Tiverton Primary is a community school located at Pulford Road, London N15 6SP and sits within planning area 3 (see map of planning areas on page 7 below). The school normally admits 2 classes (60 Reception pupils) per year. However, due to a decrease in the demand for school places, we are proposing to reduce the school's PAN to 60 for the 2020/21 academic year.

Welbourne Primary is a community school located at Stainby Road, London N15 4EA and sits within planning area 4 (see map of planning areas on page 7 below). The school normally admits 3 classes (90 Reception pupils) per year. However, due to a decrease in the demand for school places, we are proposing to reduce the school's PAN to 60 for the 2020/21 academic year.

Planning areas 3 and 4 in which these schools are located show the most significant surplus of places. Both Tiverton and Welbourne Primary schools have vacancies across all year groups and our projections show that demand is likely to continue to decrease. Current school roll projections for planning area 3 (where Tiverton is located) suggest a surplus of school places of between 1-2 forms of entry between now and 2026/27. Current school roll projections for planning area 4 (where Welbourne is located) suggest a surplus of school places of between 3-4 forms of entry between now and 2021/22.

Approval was sought from the Schools Adjudicator for a temporary reduction in PAN for Tiverton Primary School for entry in September 2018. A reduction by 1 form of entry was agreed and it is likely that a similar request will be made for entry in September 2019 due to the lack of demand. Our projections show that demand is likely to continue to decline and the school will struggle to fill beyond 1 form of entry.

Welbourne Primary School has the highest number of vacancies across all year groups compared to other schools in Planning Area 4. It is likely that this will have had a ripple effect locally as falling demand is rarely evidenced at just one school but is often felt across several. A benefit of planning places judiciously is that it keeps rolls relatively buoyant across and beyond any planning area as surplus places are reduced.

We are proposing to reduce the number of available places at these schools to enable them to operate more efficiently and cost effectively. The proposed reduction of PANs for these schools will allow better alignment of PANs with actual number of pupils on roll, leading to cost savings.

Consulting on our admission arrangements for entry in September 2020 gives these schools sufficient time to review their internal structure so that any potential impact on

staff reorganisation can be minimized. It will allow the school leadership teams in offering a more accurate number of places and also help with long term planning.

Equality consideration was given to the selection of these specific schools for a reduction in PANs to help frame any potential impact on protected groups. Our proposal will not adversely impact on families trying to access their local school with high quality provision. A projected surplus of school places in the planning areas where these schools are located means that we expect sufficient places to still be available for local children if the PANs are reduced at Welbourne and Tiverton Primary School for entry in September 2020.

All local schools are rated 'Good' or 'Outstanding' by Ofsted and are able to support children with a wide range of abilities, special needs, disabilities and learning difficulties, from able, gifted and talented pupils to those with multiple and significant disabilities, medical conditions and learning difficulties. Welbourne and Tiverton do not offer any specific provision that is not provided elsewhere and we believe that the needs of the community can be met at other local schools and this will be tested during the consultation process. We will closely monitor the number of primary applications received at the time and in the event there is an increase in demand for primary school places and additional places are required, these schools can revert to their original PAN.

### **Alternative options considered**

We are required by the School Admissions Code 2014 (para 1.42 – 1.45 of the Code) to consult on our admission arrangements between 1 October and 31 January each year for a minimum period of six weeks. Last year, the consultation on the proposed admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled (VC) schools included a proposal to introduce an additional oversubscription criteria for children of staff to follow after the sibling criterion. Cabinet agreed to the proposal in February last year which means the children of staff criterion will come into effect from September 2019.

This year we are not proposing a change to the oversubscription criterion for community and VC schools. While there are other ways admission arrangements can influence the allocation of school places set out in the Schools Admissions Code 2014 (e.g. designated catchment areas, identified feeder schools or giving priority in our oversubscription criteria to children eligible for the early years premium/ pupil premium) no alternative option is being considered at the time of writing this report.

## **15. CONSULTATION ON DRAFT CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR BRUCE CASTLE, TOTTENHAM CEMETERY, TOWER GARDENS AND PEABODY COTTAGES, AND DRAFT LOCAL HERITAGE LIST**

The Leader introduced this report which sought approval for four draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan documents, and the draft Local Heritage List for a six week public consultation. The conservation area appraisals related to four



adjoining Conservation Areas in the Bruce Grove/Lordship Lane area; Bruce Castle, Tottenham Cemetery, Tower Gardens and Peabody Cottages. Each document included a comprehensive appraisal of the Conservation Area, and set out the Council's strategy for managing the area going forward in order to protect its special character, including design guidelines.

The Local Heritage List identified locally significant buildings and structures across the borough that were not included on the statutory list, or covered by other statutory designations. The consultation document included new selection criteria for identifying locally significant assets, guidance on the management of local heritage assets through the planning process, and a list of buildings and structures recommended for inclusion on the list with short descriptions of each. Following the consultation, the draft documents may be amended having regard to representations received. They would be referred back to Cabinet for adoption by the Council in early 2019.

The Leader further drew the Cabinet's attention to the informal recommendations proposed by the Regulatory Committee on the 18<sup>th</sup> October 2018 at paragraph 7.1.1.

Cllr Brabazon questioned officers on the Bruce Castle conservation plan, specifically how the conservation area related to the park as well as the Grade 1 listed building within it. Officers noted the Bruce Castle conservation area included the park and the historic Grade 1 listed building. A statutory listing designation applied to the historic Bruce Castle building which was a separate designation from the conservation area and there would be no change to this.

The Leader requested officers to provide a written response as to whether or not the Bruce Castle conservation plan had any direct impact on the Park itself.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the comments of the Regulatory Committee and notes the officer response set out at paragraph 7.1.1.
2. To approve the draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan documents and draft Local Heritage List, attached at Appendices 1-5, for a six-week public consultation and authority is delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning to make any applicable amendments to these documents arising out of Cabinet meetings prior to consultation.
3. That the documents will be amended having regard to representations received at consultation, and will be referred back to Cabinet for adoption in early 2019.

## **Reasons for decision**

The Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement sets out our commitment to involving residents, local communities and other interested parties in the plan-making process through consultation. There is a statutory requirement that the Council's proposals for the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas be submitted for consideration at a public meeting (Planning (Listed Buildings and

Conservation Areas) Act 1990 section 71). It is considered good practice to engage with local communities on heritage issues.

### Conservation Area Appraisals

The Council has a statutory duty to ensure that conservation areas are preserved or enhanced, and publish policies for the implementation of the same (Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, 71 and 72). The Council's adopted Local Plan policies support the conservation of the significance of the Borough's heritage assets (SP12, DM9), and require decision makers to have regard to appraisals and management plans when considering the impact of proposals on the historic environment (DM9 C).

Tottenham Cemetery, Tower Gardens and Peabody Cottages Conservation Areas do not have adopted appraisals. The current appraisal Bruce Castle Conservation Area has not been updated since 2009, and is considered out of date. The new document provides an updated survey of the area, and includes a management plan, design guidelines and a comprehensive boundary review, which are not included in the current Bruce Grove Appraisal. It is therefore important that the Council publishes these appraisals along with the management plans in order to support the Council's local plan policies and ensure that the significance of the area is preserved and enhanced. A summary of the special interest of each conservation area is provided at paragraph 6.9 below. A summary of the content and structure of the new appraisal documents is provided at 6.10 below.

Up-to-date Appraisals will provide a sound basis for development management decisions that is defensible on appeal, and will serve as a useful guide for property owners and those bringing forward heritage projects and development proposals as to how best to preserve and enhance each area's character. In some cases, the character of these Conservation areas has been harmed or is vulnerable to harm through inappropriate (often small-scale) development. These documents will be a valuable tool in addressing this.

The appraisals also include a comprehensive review of each conservation area's boundary, with recommendations for small revisions in some cases. It is important that the Council publish these recommendations with a view to revising the boundaries after consultation to ensure that conservation area designations are warranted, meaningful, and in line with statutory requirements and national policy. There is a statutory duty to review conservation area designations from time to time (Planning, (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, 69) and the Council must ensure that designated conservation areas are of sufficient special architectural or historic interest, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 186) and Historic England guidelines. The proposed boundary changes are described in 6.11 below.

### Local Heritage List

The NPPF (paragraph 184) requires that local planning authorities to set out 'a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment' in their Local Plan. Emphasis is placed on recognising that heritage assets are an 'irreplaceable resource' and should be conserved 'in a manner appropriate to their significance'. These requirements apply to buildings identified on the Local Heritage

List, which are included within the definition of heritage assets in the NPPF. Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states that such ‘non-designated’ heritage assets can merit consideration in planning matters, with the authority taking a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

The Government’s Planning Practice Guidance (paragraph 39) suggests that local authorities create locally administered lists of undesigned sites that have been identified as having heritage interest meriting consideration in planning decisions. This is considered a sound, consistent and accountable way of identifying non-designated heritage assets, clarifying what it is about them that is significant, and ensuring this is given due consideration when changes affecting the historic environment are proposed. Recent guidance from Historic England supports this approach.

The process of preparing a local heritage list is also an opportunity for local authorities and communities to work in partnership, celebrate heritage that is valued by the community at the local level, and promote engagement in heritage issues. It is considered good practice for sustainable management of the historic environment.

### **Alternative options considered**

The existing conservation area appraisal for Bruce Castle was updated in 2009, and is considered out of date. The area has undergone some changes since then, and best practice guidance for conservation area appraisals has evolved. Tottenham Cemetery, Peabody Cottages and Tower Gardens do not have adopted appraisals. Continuing to manage these areas without up-to-date documents in place is not considered advisable.

The document includes recommendations for alterations to the boundaries of the conservation area. The option of leaving the boundaries as they currently are has been considered but this course is not recommended. The National Planning Policy framework (Paragraph 186) states that “When considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that the area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest”. In cases where there is no discernible special character, the designation is unhelpful.

Haringey’s existing local list is considered out of date, and not fit for purpose. It has not been revised since 1997, and many entries have not been reviewed since the list was first adopted as part of the 1976 Borough Plan. There is no published selection criteria, rationale or descriptions relating to the listings. The legislative and policy context, and the role that local listing has within the planning process have changed considerably since the listings were first compiled. Continuing to refer to this list is not considered advisable. Inclusion of clear selection criteria and listing descriptions that relate to current national and local heritage policy is considered essential if the Local Heritage List is to be an effective tool in managing change.

## **16. ADOPTION OF STATEMENT OF GAMBLING POLICY**

The Cabinet Member for Civic Services introduced this report which sought authorisation to take the draft Council's Statement of Gambling Policy to public consultation. It was a requirement by law to review this policy every three years. The current policy was adopted in January 2016 and was therefore due for review, to be published in March 2019. Following consultation, a further report would be presented to the Cabinet on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2019 with the results of that consultation and would be seeking approval to the draft Statement of Gambling Policy at Full Council in March 2019. The Cabinet Member noted that officers were not able to deviate from the national position on gambling, where laws were imposed at a national level. The Cabinet Member welcomed the consultation which requested gambling operators to consider carefully where they were located, and to ensure they were consistent with the licensing objectives.

Questions were asked by Cllr Barnes and Cllr Ibrahim and the following was noted:

- The Cabinet Member confirmed that she had not personally had discussions with the gambling operators. Officers confirmed they would individually contact betting shops if there were particular issues with fixed odd betting terminals.
- Officers advised that, within the report, there was a local area profile which stated the crime figures for 2017, broken down by ward and betting shops. It also showed the high risk areas, which were situated in the east of the borough.
- Officers informed there was an active Bet Watch group which was chaired by the Licensing Officer and Metropolitan Police. It was well attended by the main gambling operators and one of its purposes was to promote compliance with the licensing objectives.
- The government had previously indicated there would be a 2 year delay in its implementation of the legislation on fixed odd betting terminals but once implemented this would further require the policy to be updated.

## **RESOLVED**

To approve the draft Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Gambling Policy 2019-2022 for public consultation and instructs officers to carry out the consultation over a 10 week period.

### **Reasons for decision**

To comply with the requirements of the Gambling Act 2005 the Council must prepare and consult on a statement of gambling policy for the period 2019-2022.

To obtain the views of interested parties on the proposed statement of gambling policy and use these views to formulate any changes to the policy.

### **Alternative options considered**

No alternatives were considered. It is a statutory requirement that the policy be reviewed at least every three years, and that a public consultation is carried out. If the Council did not have a policy it would be acting ultra vires with regards to any decisions it makes when determining gambling premises licences.

The Gambling Commission has laid down requirements which the Council must follow with regards to the Gambling Policy. If they are not followed the Council could face risk of judicial challenge. The Gambling Commission guidance has been followed in drafting this revised policy.

## **17. TO AGREE THE CESSATION OF THE SHARED IT AGREEMENT WITH CAMDEN & ISLINGTON WITH EFFECT FROM 1 JANUARY 2019**

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Insourcing introduced this report which provided an update to Cabinet on the development of its Shared Digital Service (“Shared Digital”) with the London Boroughs of Camden and Islington. Since Cabinet’s approval of the project, it had become apparent the three Councils had different local priorities and approaches concerning ICT and digital services. This report set out the process to discontinue the arrangement with effect from 31 December 2018, ensuring a rapid process to ensure stability for the ICT and Digital services in Haringey.

The Cabinet Member explained, although Shared Digital Services was based on a worthwhile principle, that of gaining improvements by joint working with other local authorities, it was not possible to continue with the project. Nevertheless, there had been some benefits to Haringey from participation in Shared Digital thus far, with an estimated savings of approximately £800k from joint purchases. Furthermore, it was not anticipated that the Council would incur financial losses as a result of the cessation of the project. Although the cessation of the project was not something which was sought by the Council, it provided Haringey with more direct operational control of its ICT and digital services moving forward. The Cabinet Member had discussed the situation with the trade unions, who were happy with staff remaining in the direct employment of the London Borough of Haringey.

The Leader then invited questions from Councillors and the following was noted.

- Learning from this initiative when considering future shared service initiatives.
- Officers confirmed that there were differences but that these were not of a political nature. For example, Haringey had a priority to explore the technology processes that it used, such as the use of robotics, but the other two boroughs did not share this. The Cabinet Member reiterated that it was the intention of Haringey and its officers to continue with the project but the difference in priorities prevented this.

- Officers advised that the priorities of Camden were more closely linked to that of Haringey' and, therefore, there was the possibility to explore future collaboration on projects between the two boroughs, such as in customer and digital platforms.
- Officers responded that, as all of Haringey's ICT staff were still in place, the only significant changes to be made to the service were in line management. The Council was therefore confident that the local ICT service would be operational by that date.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To agree that the Cabinet resolutions made on the 17th July 2018 are not progressed and that a local Haringey Council ICT service will become operational ahead of the ending of the shared service arrangement, anticipated by the 1st January 2019.
2. To delegate authority to the Director of Customers, Transformation and Resources to put the above into effect, including: finalising dates for incremental transition of the service; the final date on which the shared service arrangements will end, and the agreeing of the financial implications of the cessation of the SDS delivery arrangements and their return to Haringey sovereign management.

### **Reasons for decision**

This report is submitted for consideration by Cabinet urgently because it is clear that the three Councils have different local priorities and approaches with regards to ICT and digital services. This means that the proposed Digital Shared Service can no longer be implemented and it is necessary to revert to local operations at pace to maintain integrity of service.

Given the diverging priorities of the three Councils, it is no longer possible or practical to implement a shared service, or "light" model, as envisaged.

### **Alternative options considered**

In light of the decisions made by the other partner boroughs (Camden and Islington), to the effect that the Shared Digital Service should be closed and that the pure shared risk and reward principle is no longer viable, it is not practical to pursue another option at this stage although, where possible the Council may seek to work closely again with Camden in the future as and when it is mutually beneficial to do so.

## **18. LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Environment introduced this report and highlighted how important transport was to Haringey. The Council was bidding for £7.5m from the Mayor's Transport fund for development of a Local Implementation Plan (LIP) which would deliver a range of small and larger projects to support Haringey's transport infrastructure, such as traffic schemes and accessible crossing. The objectives of the transport strategy was to discourage the use of cars and encouraging the uptake of cycling and walking. There was concern about the role transport played in contributing to high emissions and pollution within the borough. A draft plan had been created which was due to go out for consultation, meaning there was an opportunity to make changes. Following the consultation, the plan would be submitted in February.

The following information was noted in response to Cllr Barnes' questions:

- Officers advised that a report had been completed on Shepherds Hill which proposed recommendations. These were due to be discussed with the neighbourhood forum to identify any observations, following which, future projects could be created. Officers noted the LIP was a flexible 3 year plan and, whilst the first year was more definitive in terms of set projects proposed, there was scope to include new projects in years 2 and 3, if a project were to arise as a result of a safety audit or justified concerns from residents. The Highgate neighbourhood forum were also advised that they could apply for the Neighbourhood Portion of the Community Infrastructure Levy to fund projects such as traffic calming measures in Shepherds Hill.
- Officers informed that ward Councillors would be consulted on individual schemes following approval of the draft LIP by Cabinet.
- Officers responded that this had been explored, such as dockless bike providers. Additionally, following the approval of the Ultra Low Emission Vehicle Action Plan previously, an income stream could be generated through charging points in the borough. There were also an opportunity to raise funds through the parking permit system for car clubs in the borough.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the draft LIP3 submission as set out in appendix 1 and agree to:
2. submit the draft LIP3 to Transport for London;
3. carry out statutory consultation (in accordance with the requirements of section 145 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999) and public consultation on the draft LIP3; and to
4. delegate authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration, Planning and Development to sign off, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods, the final LIP3 to be submitted to the Mayor of London following consideration of the consultation responses

## **Reasons for decision**

The LIP submission provides a major source of funding over a three-year period to deliver the draft Haringey transport strategy projects and programmes.

### **Alternative options considered**

The draft LIP3 submission supports the priorities in the Corporate Plan and 2018 Haringey Transport Strategy. There are no alternative sources of funding to deliver these important projects and programmes. It is, therefore, not considered necessary to consider other options.

## **19. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

### **RESOLVED**

To note the minutes of the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of July 2018.

## **20. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

### **RESOLVED**

To note the significant and delegated actions taken by Directors in October 2018.

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

None.

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

### **RESOLVED**

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as the items below contain exempt information, as defined under paragraph, 3 and 5, Part 1, schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

## **23. EXEMPT MINUTES**

### **RESOLVED**

1. To agree the exempt minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> October of 2018 meeting.
2. To note the addendum to the 11<sup>th</sup> of September exempt minutes.

## **24. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

CHAIR: Councillor Joseph Ejiofor



Signed by Chair .....

Date .....