

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY, 22ND JANUARY, 2019, 6.30pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Joseph Ejiofor (Chair), Emine Ibrahim (Vice-Chair), Charles Adje, Patrick Berryman, Mark Blake, Kirsten Hearn, Noah Tucker, Elin Weston and Kaushika Amin

In attendance – Councillors: Bull, Cawley- Harrison, Barnes, da Costa.

47. 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.

48. APOLOGIES

There were apologies for absence from Cllr James and apologies for lateness from Councillor Mark Blake.

49. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

50. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hearn declared a personal and prejudicial interest in items 8 and 9 by virtue of her voting membership of the North London Waste Authority.

Councillor Berryman declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect agenda items 8 and 9 by virtue of his voting membership of the North London Waste Authority.

51. 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.

52. MINUTES

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 11th of December 2018 were agreed as an accurate record.

53. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

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

54. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

The meeting paused while Cllr Berryman and Cllr Hearn left the Chamber.

A deputation was put forward by Mr Stephen Brice on behalf of the Pinkham Way Alliance in relation to item 9, Pre-Submission Consultation on the North London Waste Plan.

Mr Brice was accompanied by Evelyn Ryan and began his representation by drawing attention to the fact that the Pinkham Alliance had written a letter to the Monitoring Officer with regards to some misrepresentations and errors in the earlier draft of the report, shared with them. The Council's response, itself, raised issues and the Pinkham Way Alliance's reply to the Monitoring Officer would include a number of additional points about the report at item 9. Mr Brice continued to highlight the areas that required attention:

- Paragraph 6.33 – stated that Pinkham Way was also proposed to be designated as a site for waste planning purposes in the waste plan. Mr Brice contended that this demonstrated the Council's intention to re-designate this site, through the back door, as locally significant industrial land. This was something which the 2012 Planning Inspector had summarily rejected.
- The Deputation felt that paragraph 6.39, overall, did not make sense. They contended that the North London Waste Authority had made clear, in correspondence on the 14th of January, that their focus and strategy is on Edmonton and there were no plans for developing Pinkham Way but perceived this site as an asset for the future. Although, the NLWA were not asking for the site to come out of the plan, in the Deputation's view there was a marked difference from needing the site for delivery of its waste strategy or the potential for it to be used for waste use as asserted by the report at item 9. This section also left out the recent statement of the NLWA which set out that they do not consider the Pinkham Way site ideally suited for waste and maybe open to offers for the land.
- The statement that any proposal for waste use at Pinkham Way would be smaller than previous proposed developments, had no supporting evidence anywhere in the document.
- There was no reference in the report to the consultation response from Natural England, commenting on the rich diverse bio mix of habitats at Pinkham Way which would be a loss to Haringey and more widely to London, if the site was developed. The latter part of this comment was the form of words used to describe a site of metropolitan importance. The Deputation contended that this assessment put Pinkham Way on a par with other Haringey sites of

metropolitan importance such as Queenswood, Highgate and parts of the Lea Valley.

- The Deputation referred to Metropolitan sites which reported that the London Plan includes the best examples of London's habitats including sites in urban areas such as abandoned land colonised by nature and that these were the highest priority for protection. As a SINC, the site had fulfilled its planning purpose for 40 years. However, as designated employment land it had not provided employment in the last 19 years, since holding this designation.
- Deputation advised that in their view, the report did not address: the imbalance in the sustainability appraisals conclusions, the negative environmental consequences of development, the loss of the SINC designation, air quality problems and other matters not supporting the designation of this area as a site for waste disposal use.
- The Deputation then questioned the Council's ruling on treating two separate petitions as being one representation. The Deputation contended that the 2011 waste plan consultation guide specifically allowed groups to make a single response supported by signatures and the North London Waste Authority accepted the Alliance's submission on that basis. In Oct 2011, the planning inspectorate instructed the Council to follow the same process. The Council would be sent written evidence to support this issue of contention. The present consultation report revealed that the Pinkham Way Alliance made a submission supported by over a thousand signatures, consisting of 30 pages, 10,000 words, and 10 appendices. Also, late last year, the Alliance had launched its petition to Haringey, including a simple request to remove Pinkham Way from the waste plan. If there was confusion about distinguishing the status of the two petitions, then the Deputation suggested that the Council contact the lead officer at the North London Waste Authority.

The Leader sought the Deputation's view on the suitability of the other sites listed for waste composting, waste transfer and waste disposal. In response the Deputation contended that the remainder of the sites listed were industrial land sites which was suitable for inclusion in a waste plan. The London Plan identified SIL and LSIS as the places to go for waste land. All the other North London Boroughs had done this. However, Haringey Council was the only north London borough prepared to include a grade 1 site of importance for nature conservation on no solid grounds. There were 58 hectares of land allocated for potential consideration of use for waste when only 9 was needed. The Deputation's view was that the 5.5 acres of the Pinkham Way site was an extraordinary inclusion and there were no planning grounds for this.

The Deputation referred to the previous planning examination of the Pinkham Way site, through the site allocations plan process, and at this stage the site's designation of employment land was not found to be suitable and therefore it was questionable how it could be designated as industrial land.

The Deputation further contended that the Planning inspector had advised the Council, at the last hearing, that this land had not produced employment for the last 19 years and it was not right to keep this designation on a site that was not producing this

outcome. The Deputation asserted that the Planning hearing had questioned if the Pinkham Way site was needed by the Council for employment given that this had now become a valuable environmental site. This had further indicated that this land should not be allocated for employment purposes and the Deputation felt that this was likely to be the conclusion of the next Planning Inspector too. The Deputation contended that this view was supported by employment adviser and environmental adviser at the hearing, adding that a viability study considered at the hearing found the site not suitable for employment. The Deputation concluded that this was not objective planning action being undertaken by the Council and re-designating the site as a waste site was not acceptable and indicated that the decision could be legally challenged.

Mr Brice added that the Council was always maintaining that the site was objectively identified as required to meet employment needs. However, the employment needs identified, specifically related to B class business unit use at the site which was unsuitable for Pinkham way.

The Assistant Director for Planning was asked to respond to the technical points raised in the Deputation.

- The Deputation were selective in their quotes of the Planning Inspectors report. The site was an employment site and a SINC and the Council did not believe that these two uses for the site were incompatible. The site was not open space and was contaminated. In terms of the viability reports, these were responding to whether there were new employment uses put forward for the site and were not relevant for this particular instance as it would be the waste authority that would be bringing forward a new use for the site. Therefore, it was not correct to quote the viability report on this particular aspect without information on the context.
- The Assistant Director for Planning also advised that the matters raised in the Deputation tonight were not the matters raised in the written submission of the Deputation. Therefore, it was proposed that there be a response in writing to the issues, raised above, when there had been adequate time to consider the issues. The Assistant Director for Planning referred to the letter that was sent by the Pinkham Way Alliance to the Monitoring Officer and copied to the Chief Executive and Leader which had been responded to by the Legal department.

The Deputation clarified that there was a letter specifically sent to leader which had been sent in September without a direct response and they acknowledged receipt of the Monitoring Officer's letter. The timing of the required submission of a Deputation also meant that the submission could not include references to the report in question and therefore to avoid making representations in line with the report being considered at a meeting was also felt, by the Deputation, to not be appropriate.

The Leader responded to the Deputation, emphasising that the North London waste plan was in line with the London Plan and national planning guidance steer of requiring planning authorities to look at employment land for waste site use. The Deputation interrupted the response to dispute this. The Assistant Director for Planning further confirmed that the North London Waste Plan was in line with the

London Plan. The Leader underlined that waste had to be recycled somewhere, and making use of contaminated land which was a long way away from where people lived was an appropriate consideration. Neither national guidance nor the London Plan stipulated that only certain types of employment land should be identified for potential waste use. As required, the boroughs have assessed all sites and areas including Pinkham Way against a set of social, economic and environmental criteria as to whether the land is suitable for potential waste use.

The Leader was aware of the previous proposal, eight years ago, to put a larger incinerator on the Pinkham Way site and this was no longer planned. If the site were to be used, only part of the site would be used for the waste site, and this would be for recycling, waste composting or waste transfer.

The Leader thanked the Deputation for attending the meeting and for making their representations.

55. NORTH LONDON WASTE PLAN - PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 19) CONSULTATION

[Cllr Hearn and Councillor Berryman remained absent for this item]

The Leader introduced the report, advising that every local authority had a statutory duty to have a plan that makes them self-sufficient in waste disposal. Haringey Council has decided to achieve this through a partnership with its 6 neighbouring boroughs.

This was an important stage in the production of the North London Waste Plan (NLWP) – Pre-submission publication. Since consultation on the Preferred Option draft was undertaken, borough officers and members from all seven authorities have been working collaboratively to resolve the complexities of planning for the management of north London's waste alongside meeting councils pressing need for additional housing and the regeneration of redundant or surplus industrial land.

The revised NLWP had properly engaged the county authorities that currently receive some of north London's waste, fulfilling the Duty to Cooperate. It identified sufficient designated employment areas suitable for the future provision of the waste facilities North London councils need to manage the waste generated in north London. The areas selected were the result of robust assessment and an acknowledgement that new facilities should not be concentrated in only one or two boroughs. It also safeguarded all existing waste facilities, ensuring that these continue to contribute towards managing north London's waste arisings.

The Leader recognised that waste and recycling are issues that can raise passions. People were rarely keen to have their own waste processed or incinerated on their own doorsteps. This Council, along with its neighbouring boroughs, have had to take a big picture view of how best to manage and dispose of the waste of just over 2 million Londoners.

The administration was comfortable that it was proposing a balanced plan, that takes on board conflicting agendas and priorities. As a result, the North London Waste Plan

is a justified and robust waste policy document that Haringey Council should welcome and endorse.

The Leader drew attention to paragraphs 6.33-6.42 which outlined the response to the Regulatory Committee comments.

Following the meeting of Regulatory Committee on the 18th October, it was noted that there were some factual errors in the Site Assessment of the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works. This was located at pages appendix 3 – Site Assessment Sheets for Haringey Sites, Sheet A22-Hr Friern Barnet Sewage Works, pages 346 - 350

The Leader clarified that the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works was not a site allocation in the Local Plan, but is designated as Employment Land and as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.

The Leader further clarified that the most recent flood mapping undertaken for the Borough confirmed that the site in Flood Zone 2, and not Flood Zone 2 and 3, and that no part of the site falls within Metropolitan Open Land, highlighting that the Pinkham Way site is not a publicly used and accessible site.

The Leader asked Cabinet to delegate completion of these clarifications to appendix 3 to the Assistant Director for Planning. He also requested that Cabinet agree to delegate authority to the Assistant Director for Planning to include any further required information in the report pack to full Council. This was subsequently agreed by Cabinet.

In response to Councillor da Costa's questions:

- The fact that there were no immediate plans for the Pinkham Way site did not mean that it was not needed in the future. The waste plan further points out that there is a potential need for consideration of this site in the future.
- The Assistant Director for Planning referred to table 11 and 13 in the waste plan which sets out the restrictions on the uses that would be possible for the Pinkham Way site. Therefore, this site could not be used for an incinerator. The Assistant Director for Planning explained that, in terms of how the potential areas for waste disposal were set out for Haringey, this current waste plan document was different to how the previous waste plan was completed. This waste plan was identifying areas of search rather than actual sites. Therefore, areas where it may be proposed, in the future, to locate a site. The reasons why Haringey had included more hectares areas of land areas compared to other London boroughs was that some of them are inner London borough so had smaller sites . In addition the Council had identified industrial sites and the Pinkham Way site which are large sites. However, this did not mean that the Council were over allocating and simply meant sites were larger in Haringey but that not that the entire area of the sites would be used or that all of the sites would be used.
- The Council together with the North London waste team had sought legal advice concerning the assertion that the Pinkham Way was a vegetated site

that had blended into the local area and was deemed green open space and could not be built on. This advice led the Council to conclude that the inclusion of the Pinkham way site in the waste plan did not conflict with the national planning policy framework.

RESOLVED

To note the recommendation from Regulatory Committee that Pinkham Way be removed from the list of identified sites in the NLWP. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 6.33-6.42 of this report, Cabinet agreed to not to accept the Committee's recommendation;

To delegate completion of the above outlined clarifications, at paragraphs 7 to 9, to appendix 3 to the Assistant Director for Planning.

To delegate authority to the Assistant Director for Planning to include any further required information in the report pack to full Council

To recommend to Full Council:

i)The approval of the NLWP (set out in Annex 1) for publication, consultation and subsequent submission to the government as being ready for examination; and

ii)To agree that the Director of Housing Regeneration and Planning in consultation when appropriate with the Cabinet Member responsible for Planning, and in conjunction with the other north London boroughs, are authorised to submit appropriate changes to the NLWP in the run up to, and during, the public examination into the document, in response to objectors' submissions, requests from the Planning Inspector and any emerging evidence, guidance or legal advice.

Reasons for decision

To enable the NLWP to progress to adoption, and to ensure the North London Boroughs have an adopted plan to manage waste arising in the area and to deal with planning applications for waste facilities.

Alternative Options considered.

The Council could decide not to progress with the North London Plan. However as a Waste Authority the Council would still be obliged to produce a Waste Local Plan. This is a requirement stemming from Article 28 of the European Union (EU) Waste Framework Directive which states that all member states must prepare a Waste Management Plan. The National Waste Management Plan for England, supported by the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW), identify that the National Waste Management Plan will be supported by each WPA's Waste Local Plan and as such it is a statutory requirement to prepare this document.

Any Waste Plan must be prepared in line with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Given the advanced stage of preparation of the NLWP, which has been a robust and sound process, and the delay in putting in place up to date waste management policies, a decision not to proceed with the NLWP would result in the Council needing to commence a Haringey only Waste Local Plan. This option has been rejected by officers as not being a reasonable alternative.

56. COUNCIL TAX PREMIUM FOR PROPERTIES EMPTY FOR MORE THAN TWO YEARS

[Councillor Blake arrived at the meeting 7.10pm]

The Cabinet Member for Finance introduced this report which requested Cabinet to recommend to Full Council to increase the Council Tax premium charged on long-term empty dwellings from 50% to 100% from 1 April 2019.

The Cabinet Member highlighted the administration's manifesto commitment to redistributing the burden of Council Tax. The proposal to increase Council Tax premium would create additional income for the Council. The Labour administration believed it was correct time to increase the premium payable on long-term empty dwellings.

Following questions from Cllr Tucker and Cllr Barnes, the following was noted:

- The Cabinet Member concurred that the imposition of an increased Council Tax premium was an appropriate measure and would deter against individuals leaving properties empty long-term and could result in such properties being brought back into usage, which would help address the borough's housing shortage.
- The Cabinet Member also concurred with the position that the Council was in a difficult financial position because of the central government's austerity policies. The extra income provided from the Council Tax premium increase would have the potential to bring much needed funding into the Council to use on essential services.
- In 2018, there were approximately 500 long-term empty dwellings.
- The London Boroughs of Barnet, Enfield and Islington had introduced a 50% Council Tax premium on long-term empty dwellings but it was understood they were also considering increasing this to the maximum 100%.
- There were side effects to long-term empty swellings, such as squatting, anti-social behaviour, structural issues from lack of maintenance. In addition, neighbouring properties suffered an adverse impact on the price of their properties.
- There were two exemptions from the premium. This included dwellings which formed part of a single property where other parts of the property are used as a sole or main residence, and properties owned by service personnel posted away from home.
- In 2017/18, the Council received £92,900 from the long-term empty dwelling premium and the proposed increase in premium would therefore result in extra

income likely being generated. However, the Cabinet Member noted it was not possible to predict how much extra income might be generated but it was projected it would be net positive for at least two years.

- The potential increased revenue would be an inadvertent gain but the main reason for the increase was to deter the properties from being long-term empty dwellings, as opposed to a financial gainer for the Council.

Agreed that the appropriate officer would write to Cllr Barnes to confirm the number of Empty Dwelling Managing Orders the Council had issued.

RESOLVED

To recommend to Full Council to increase the premium charged on long-term empty dwellings from 50% to 100% from 1 April 2019.

Reasons for Decision

Since 2013, councils have been given the discretionary power to charge a premium on dwellings deemed to be 'long-term empty', i.e. properties which have been unoccupied and substantially unfurnished for at least two years. At present, the amount of Council Tax payable for such properties can be increased by 50%, so that the payer is liable to pay a total of 150% Council Tax.

The legislation has recently been changed to give councils the power to increase the premium from 50% to 100% from 01 April 2019. This means that the total amount of Council Tax payable for such properties could be increased from 150% to 200%.

Increasing the premium to 100% has the potential to bring in additional income which would support the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy and help mitigate its funding pressures.

Some of the Council's neighbouring boroughs, such as LB Enfield, LB Islington and LB Barnet currently charge the maximum existing premium of 50% and are also considering increasing this to a 100% premium following the change in legislation. Therefore, the proposal is likely to mean Haringey is acting in line with its neighbouring boroughs.

It is recognised that Council Tax payers who are liable to pay the premium are unlikely to be making full use of Council services whilst the property is long-term empty. However, Council Tax is not charged on the basis that every payer will use every service and Council services do not stop or reduce in cost when a property becomes long-term empty.

In addition, an increased premium may encourage residents to bring long-term empty properties back into use. There is shortage of housing in the area and so there is potential for long-term empty dwellings to be put to better use if used to increase the available housing. This would in turn reduce the pressure on housing stock.

Some properties are exempt from the premium by statute and this will not change:

- A property which would be the sole/main residence of a person but which is empty while that person resides in accommodation provided by the Ministry of Defence by reason of their employment (e.g. service personnel posted away from home).
- A dwelling forming part of a single property, where other parts of the property are used as a sole or main residence.

The Council will continue to have the means to reduce or eliminate Council Tax liability, for example to cater for cases of exceptional hardship.

Alternative Options Considered

No change or increasing the premium to less than 100%

The Council could choose not to extend the premium and leave it at 50%, or to increase the premium to more than 50% but less than 100%.

This is not proposed because the Council is under significant financial pressure to deliver a sustainable Medium Term Financial Strategy. Increasing the Council Tax premium to 100% would generate additional income for the Council.

In addition, increasing the premium to the maximum 100% may encourage residents to bring long-term empty properties back into use which could in turn lead to an increase in available housing.

Removing or reducing the existing premium

The Council could choose to remove or reduce the existing premium.

This is not proposed because the Council is under significant financial pressure to deliver a sustainable Medium Term Financial Strategy. Removing or reducing the Council Tax premium would reduce the Council's income.

In addition, removing or reducing the premium may reduce the incentive for residents to bring long-term empty properties back into use.

57. A STRATEGY FOR TOTTENHAM HIGH ROAD / AWARD OF GLA GRANT FUNDING FOR THE "ENTERPRISING TOTTENHAM HIGH ROAD" PROJECT

The Cabinet Member for Strategic Regeneration introduced this report which sought Cabinet approval to :a 10-year Strategy for Tottenham High Road 2019-2029, accepting a sum of £1.8m capital funding and £200,000 revenue from the GLA, and to give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to approve the Good Growth Fund grant agreement with the GLA.

The Cabinet Member noted the vital role of Tottenham's town centres in providing jobs, services, shops, leisure facilities and social places and spaces. Therefore, it was important for the people of Tottenham that their town centres were protected and improved upon. The Mayor's recent announcement to award the council £2m for the Good Growth Fund project, "Enterprising Tottenham High Road" demonstrated the commitment to improving Tottenham's town centres.

The Cabinet Member praised officers for their work in the creation of the strategy and also local businesses for their contribution to its research.

The Cabinet Member paid a special tribute to Dave Hall, who played an important role in Tottenham, especially the creation of the Holcombe Road Market.

Following questions from Cllr Barnes, the following was noted:

- Ward Corner was not included in the Strategy as it was not considered appropriate to be included in a Tottenham specific strategy. However, there were plans to develop Ward Corner, separate from the strategy in question.
- Officers confirmed additional funding for the project would be sought from various schemes, such as Transport for London's Liveable Neighbourhoods Programme. In addition, central government had created a substantial fund allocation for high streets in town centres across England. The Council would put forward a competitive bid.
- Having a clear and integrated strategy in place put the Council in good stead to target new funding that might become available. The Council had a successful record of accomplishment in securing funding because of its clear policies and strategies in place.

RESOLVED

1. To adopt 'A Strategy for Tottenham High Road (2019-29)', included as appendix 3, as the council's framework for the promotion and direction of projects for town centres along the High Road between Bruce Grove and Seven Sisters, endorse projects arising from the Strategy and support the identification of internal and external funding opportunities to support their delivery.
2. To accept a sum of £1.8m capital funding and £200,000 revenue from the GLA as set in paragraph 6.21 / 6.22 of the report and for the council to enter into agreement with the GLA in order to deliver the council's successful Good Growth Fund scheme, "Enterprising Tottenham High Road" in accordance with paragraph 6.21 et seq.
3. To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Strategic Regeneration and the Director of Finance, to approve the Good Growth Fund grant agreement with the GLA and other agreements related to third party organisations required for delivery of the Enterprising Tottenham High Road project.

Reasons for decision

A recent report has indicated that Haringey has some of the best and worst performing high streets in the capital in Muswell Hill and West Green Road / Seven Sisters respectively. A downturn in the health of UK high streets has cost tens of

thousands of jobs. Major chains including House of Fraser, Evans Cycles, Maplin and Poundworld have collapsed into administration during 2018 while many others, including New Look, Carpetright, Mothercare and Homebase have all been forced to seek legal agreements with their landlords to shut stores and slash their rent bills.

Tottenham's town centres are the heart of the community and provide many of the services, jobs, leisure spaces and shops that people need and use every day. It is important for the people of Tottenham that their local town centres are protected and enhanced. They provide a pivotal role in helping to build the wealth of local communities as described in the emerging Haringey Borough Plan, and are a vital means to helping to tackle inequalities.

Tottenham's town centres need to evolve to reflect best practice approaches and learn from the very best examples of town centre success. It is essential that the council puts in place a strong multi-agency framework to support ongoing investment in our High Road town centres. A failure to do so is highly likely to result in decline. The Strategy aims to support both the High Road's economic health, while simultaneously responding directly to the role high streets play in meeting local needs. Investment also helps attract significant external funds to maximise emerging Borough Plan outcomes, including for instance a bid to the recently announced £675m Future High Streets fund.

Successful delivery of best practice through the Tottenham High Road Strategy will be valuable in promoting enhancements in town centres in other parts of the borough. This might extend to a number of initiatives arising from the Strategy, including means of engagement with residents and businesses, methods of enhancing local employment and business capacity, enhancement of spaces around town centres to improve management and maintenance issues and better use of public spaces, facilities and buildings to promote healthier communities.

ETHR is the first of the five major projects identified by the Strategy. The elements of the ETHR have been proposed because they promote the positive objectives of the Strategy to promote town centres for the benefit of local people. Following the announcement, GLA requires Haringey to enter into a grant agreement by the 31 March 2019.

Alternative options considered

Option 1: "Do not approve the Strategy, nor enter into agreement with the GLA for GGF funding"

The background work undertaken in developing this Strategy indicates a need for further interventions along the High Road. With no strategy, the council would not have a strategic plan to guide interventions and investment decisions along the High Road.

The council has an interest in taking an active role in future of its town centres through the development of a sustainable approach to the High Road. Co-ordinated change provides a greater chance of successfully addressing needs and delivering long-lasting change. An unco-ordinated approach would be reactive, and increase the risk of actions conflicting with each other, and an undue focus on short term rewards. This would not represent the best use of council funds and resources.

The High Road Strategy has been an important factor in driving forward the ideas and bidding process for achieving this award of funding. If the Strategy is not adopted, it would undermine the commitment shown by the council to deliver projects such as the GGF project “Enterprising Tottenham High Road”. Similarly, if Cabinet does not agree to enter into a grant agreement with the GLA then delivery of the Strategy is likely to be undermined, with project objectives either compromised or incapable of being progressed, and as such, opportunities to support local community benefits, as described in paragraph 6.21 et seq, will be missed.

Option 2: “Approve the Strategy as described in this report and enter into GGF grant agreement with the GLA”

A Strategy for Tottenham High Road addresses the significant challenges that face UK town centres generally and the specific issues and demands related to Tottenham’s town centres, in accordance with the priorities of the emerging Borough Plan and best practice approaches.

Consultation and research has indicated that there are significant issues which need to be addressed, such as anti-social behaviour, accessibility and promoting health, which are most effectively addressed through the co-ordinated approach provided by the Strategy, and are potentially not fully resolvable in the long term without these co-ordinated interventions.

This report describes a clear vision for Tottenham’s town centres, proposed major projects which will help to realise these visions, and the costs, benefits and delivery approach to realise the council’s objectives.

The confidence provided through a Strategy that is co-ordinated and commands broad support across a range of stakeholders, residents, businesses and council services is more likely to attract greater investment and confidence by local people, visitors and external investors.

Following the recent announcement regarding the council’s successful bid for Good Growth funding, GLA requires Haringey to enter into a grant agreement by the 31 March 2019. This will allow timely delivery of the ETHR and delivery of its objectives. Accordingly, the preferred option is Option 2, to approve the Strategy and enter into grant agreement with the GLA.

58. STATION ROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT WORKS

The Cabinet Member for Environment introduced this report which sought the Cabinet’s approval to award a contract to enable the bidder to replace the existing bridge structure in Station Road over the New River, N22.

The Cabinet member noted the existing bridge was in need of replacing and had become a potential hazard. The bridge had an important strategic location and was on the route of the W3 bus. Cabinet were assured the scheme would be fully funded by Transport for London via the London Bridges Engineering Group.

Following questions from Cllr Bull, the following was noted:

- The Cabinet Member accepted there would be some disruption whilst the bridge was out of action but, having consulted with Arriva, there would be no diversion to the W3 route.

- The bridge could be dismantled in parts and for one half of the bridge to be worked on whilst the other remained in use. This would minimise the level of disruption caused

Further to considering the exempt information at item 21,

RESOLVED

- 1 To approve the award of a contract for the "Station Road Bridge Replacement Works" to Bidder 1 in the sum of £1,022,403.34 + VAT as permitted under Contracting Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.01(d).
- 2 To authorise Haringey's Legal Department to issue a letter of intent (LOI) for the amount of up to and not exceeding £100,000 or 10% of the total contract price, whichever is the higher value as stated under CSO 9.07.3

Reasons for decision

Officers have undertaken a competitive tendering exercise to secure a contractor to deliver the "Station Road Bridge Replacement Works". Through this process Bidder 1 have scored the highest and have demonstrated that they should be awarded the contract.

By awarding the contract to Bidder 1, the Council is securing the delivery of the "Station Road Bridge Replacement Works". It is the council's intention for the works to be conducted between March 2019 and November 2019.

The scheme is fully funded by TfL via the London Bridges Engineering Group (LoBEG). This includes all the staff costs, design and statutory undertakers diversions which has been carried out ahead of the main works to minimise the risks.

The works delivered by the scheme are essential to replace the existing bridge that has passed its design life. The works will also result in the removal of weight restrictions over the bridge as well as minimise maintenance costs in the long term. As part of the scheme delivery, the existing zebra crossing will be upgraded to incorporate cycle crossing facilities as well as the southern footpath to be widened and change it to shared use (pedestrians and cyclists). These measures will form part of the "Quiet Ways" cycle improvements across the borough to improve cycling and is fully supported by TfL.

The new bridge will also create a better environment for walking by removing the existing "Crash kerbs or Trief Kerbs" and rails located on both sides of the existing bridge. This is important for this busy route for pedestrians and which is frequently used by school children for the nearby schools.

A number of statutory undertakers (stats) diversions have taken place to date to prepare for the bridge works and to minimise the risks to the scheme. Stats works done to date: UKPower Network for High Voltage Electricity; British Telecom and Thames Water.

Station Road connects Alexandra Palace to Wood Green, and two high-frequency bus routes are operating on this section. The new bridge will ensure long term reliability of the network.

Alternative options considered

Officers have considered not awarding the contract. However, this option was rejected as Officers have followed a due process and the preferred contractor has demonstrated that they can deliver the works and have been awarded the highest score.

It is also the case that there is insufficient time to retender the works. This is because the current commitment by LoBEG to fund the scheme could be withdrawn if insufficient progress is demonstrated.

59. THE YOUNG PEOPLE'S SUPPORTED HOUSING PATHWAY

The Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families introduced this report which sought approval from Cabinet to award contracts for the provision of the Young People's Supported Housing Pathway.

The Cabinet Member noted the contracts sought to award provision of 35 units of visiting support accommodation, which included a specialist service for unaccompanied asylum seeking children who had become old enough to qualify for those services. There would also be a 10 unit Housing First for care leavers, which would be the first of its kind in the United Kingdom. Those services would be in addition to services that had already been commissioned to support LGBTQ+ young people with stonewall housing and also services that the Council would be looking to commission separately to provide support for young women and young parents towards the end of 2019.

The contracts would be for provision of a range of support across issues, such as health and wellbeing, crime and safety, employment and skills, and building financial resilience. It was highlighted to Cabinet that those proposals and the specifications for the contracts were developed in consultation with young people who were also involved in interviewing the providers as part of the procurement process.

The Cabinet Member closed by claiming the contracts were an important element in delivering on the Administration's manifesto commitment to tackle homelessness in the borough.

Following questions from Cllr Barnes, the following was noted:

- There were no bids for Lot 1 (Assessment Centre) and Officers believed the reason for that was around identifying a suitable property. The incumbent provider was North London YMCA. They had not bid because they were in the process of exploring their options for the provision of future services. They would continue to operate the Assessment Centre despite not having made a bid for Lot 1. The Council was negotiating how the services might look beyond 1st March 2019 and the North London YMCA had been exploring extension to the existing contract and what other services could be offered there to meet

- young people's needs. Officers assured more services were to be offered to young people than what was currently being offered at this 24/7 site.
- Lot's 2 and 3 would mostly be provided from street properties which Officers claimed would be more attractive to a number of the organisations the Council was working with because they were easier to acquire.
 - No decision had been made with regards to retendering Lot 1. However, Officers would monitor how the Pathway worked with the new services and, if the Council identified the need for the assessment function to continue, it might explore having the assessments take place at a different building to its current one.

Further to considering the exempt information at item 22,

RESOLVED

To approve the award of three contracts for the Young People's Supported Housing Pathway, to the organisations outlined in the exempt report, for a duration of three (3) years with option to extend for a further three (3) years, with a commencement date of 1st March 2019. The total value of the contracts for the initial three (3) years is £553,041 and the total value of the contracts over the six (6) years is £1,106,082.

Reasons for decision

The Homelessness Reduction Act sets out a responsibility for local authorities to prevent and relieve homelessness at the earliest stage. In Haringey, our Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategies clearly outline our commitment to tackling the causes and triggers of homelessness and addressing housing vulnerability. In addition, the Council has a statutory duty to provide accommodation and support for care leavers and homeless 16-17 year olds. Young people are especially vulnerable to homelessness triggers due to their age, economic status and lack of experience living independently. Supported accommodation helps young people address the issues that led to their homelessness, prepare for independent living and secure long-term housing security. Therefore, a Supported Housing Pathway which specifically addresses the needs of young people is required.

The current contracts for Young People's Supported Housing Services expire on the 28th February 2019.

A full tender process was conducted by a joint team of Council officers and service users following a period of service re-design. The Pathway structure reflects in-depth consultation and design work with young people, frontline practitioners and neighbouring boroughs:

- a) Lot 1 was for the provision of a high-support Assessment Centre,
- b) Lot 2 for the provision of Visiting Support Services. This Lot includes discrete services for former Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children, in recognition of the specialist services that this cohort requires.
- c) Lot 3 for Housing First for Care Leavers.

Alternative options considered

Extend the current Housing Related Support Contracts for young people beyond the 28th February 2019

In March 2017, Cabinet approved the recommendations of the Supported Housing Review, which committed to commissioning a new and integrated pathway of supported housing for homeless young people and care leavers. This pathway would offer a range of new provision types, settings and support levels, with services tailored to meet different needs and a focus on enabling young people to build on their assets. The existing supported housing contracts did not deliver this vision; therefore, a re-design exercise was required.

Do nothing

The Council's statutory duties under the Homelessness Reduction Act (2017) and the Children and Social Work Act (2017) require appropriate housing to be available to relieve homelessness for particularly vulnerable groups. The Young People's Supported Housing Pathway is a key element of this provision in Haringey, so it is not considered a viable option to let the contracts expire without identifying alternative provision.

60. WHITE HART LANE STATION LAND DISPOSAL

The Cabinet Member for Strategic Regeneration introduced this report which sought Cabinet approval to appropriate two parcels of land that sat within the new White Hart Lane ("WHL") Station redevelopment area in order to dispose of them to Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd

Cabinet were informed the station redevelopment works would include a new: double-height ticket hall; well-lit station entrance; step-free London Overground ticket gate lines and station facilities; the erection of 20 cycle spaces and 3 disabled car parking spaces; and works to forecourt areas and public realm enhancements. Crucially, the station would have step-free access between the ticket hall concourse and both the northbound and southbound platforms.

The Cabinet Member noted that, for this project to go ahead, the sites would need to be appropriated to TfL, as TfL were not able to release the funds for the acquisition of those lands. It was anticipated the Council would have its money returned if those funds were released.

Officers confirmed they would write to Cllr Cawley-Harrison regarding the extent of the proposed step-free access at the station and its surrounding area.

Further to considering the exempt information at item 23,

RESOLVED

1. To agree the appropriation of two freehold land parcels, one of which is known as “land on Love Lane” (shown edged red on the plan attached at Appendix 1) and the other of which is known as the “UKPN site” (shown edged red on the plan attached at Appendix 2) from being held in the General Fund for planning purposes to the General fund for general purposes; and
2. To agree the transfer of these land parcels to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited for a sum of £1.00 for the purposes set out in paragraph 6.1 this report and based on the draft Heads of Terms attached at Appendix 3 of this report; and
3. To give delegated authority to the Assistant Director of Regeneration to agree the final Heads of Terms for the transfer.

Reasons for decision

These recommendations are being made to enable the redeveloped WHL Station to open in summer 2019. The redeveloped station will deliver a range of economic, social and environmental benefits to the local community. The station redevelopment has been delivered using over £25 million of public funds and will continue to attract further investment into North Tottenham.

Alternative options considered

The following alternative option has been considered:-

Option 1 – Don’t undertake the land transfer

The Council could refuse to undertake the land transfer and require that the station be operated under a new legal structure that does not stipulate that Network Rail own the land.

This option has been discounted as Network Rail have been clear from the outset that they must own the land to enable RfL to operate it legally. This arrangement has been in place since the 2012 Mayor’s Regeneration Fund funding agreement between the various parties. The Council would risk damaging its relationship with Network Rail if it does not honour this arrangement and it would lead to the Station being unable to open in summer 2019 and impact on delivery of the benefits to the local community.

61. WOODSIDE HOUSE REFURBISHMENT

The Cabinet Member for Strategic Regeneration introduced this report which sought Cabinet approval to vary the original contract with T&B (Contractors) Limited by allowing the increase of the original value by up to £750,000.

The Cabinet Member had raised concern regarding overspend on the project, which had been approved by the previous administration. However, the Cabinet Member was satisfied the refurbishment of Woodside House would provide the Council with better facilities in the future. The Mayor’s parlour had relocated to Woodside House and there was an registry office for weddings to take place.

The Cabinet Member recognised it was unfortunate that previously unknown issues had arose during construction which meant the project would have to overspend to fix those issues, such as drainage problems that delayed had construction efforts. Cabinet were advised that the Council could face additional charges if it did not resolve the extra costs.

Following a question from Cllr Barnes, the following was noted:

- The Cabinet Member noted a report was being prepared on the lessons learned from the refurbishment and this could be shared with her once completed.
- Officers confirmed the £750,000 was the maximum increase and it was possible this sum could decrease following negotiations.
- Officers confirmed a full appraisal of all sites would take place before such similar projects were undertook in the future.

Officers advised it was difficult to crossover lessons learned from the Woodside House Refurbishment project to new build projects, as the latter would likely not have pre-existing conditions

RESOLVED

1. That pursuant to Contract Standing Order 10.02.1b, to approve a variation and increase the value of the contract with T&B (Contractors) Ltd to deliver refurbishment works to Woodside House by up to a further £288,034.31, which is in addition to an increase of £461,965.69 approved under delegated authority in October 2018. This would increase the original contract award by £750,000. The overall impact on project budget (as per Paragraph 8.1.2) is in the region of £472,000, representing a 13.5% increase.
2. For the reasons set out in Paragraph 6.7 and 6.8 of the report, to grant delegated authority to the Director of Customers, Transformation and Resources to agree further variations if required to settle the final account. The authority is limited to that available under Contract Standing Order 10.02.1(a).

Reasons for decision

To ensure Haringey Council can adhere to its contractual obligations and make payment of contract valuations.

Alternative options considered

In order to make invoiced interim valuation payments that are required in December and January, approval is required now, while final negotiations are completed (construction contracts allow six months for the presentation of the Final Account by the main contractor after Practical Completion of the works). If not approved, the council would be unable to make payment of the bi-monthly interim valuations, as well as Final Account payment and would mean it would be in breach of its contractual

payment obligations and be at risk of incurring additional interest costs on unpaid amounts.

62. LOVE LANE PSPO - NON KEY

The Cabinet Member for Communities, Safety and Engagement introduced this report which provided Cabinet with the findings of the statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) for Love Lane Estate, Northumberland Ward, and sought approval for the introduction of the PSPO.

The Cabinet Member highlighted the long running issues faced on the Love Lane Estate, including anti-social behaviour, drug dealing, prostitution and homelessness. The proposed PSPO was an enforcement initiative. The implementation of the PSPO would involve collaboration between various services within the Council, the police, Homes for Haringey, Regeneration, Local businesses, Local Resident Association and support services such as Drug & Alcohol Service Haringey (DASH) and other agencies as appropriate. The Cabinet Member claimed the PSPO would provide an effective measure in helping to prevent anti-social behaviour.

The Head of Community, Safety and Enforcement provided further background. The PSPO would be seeking to restrict the high level of alcohol consumption, drug taking, and prostitution taking place around the Love Lane Estate. All residents in Love Lane had been written to by the Council, explaining the ongoing issues and how the Council was seeking to address them, such as through a PSPO. The Council found a large number of residents who had responded were in support of the PSPO. There would be a three week period of pre-enforcement in which outreach officers would engage with individuals the PSPO would affect. Following that, the PSPO would come into force. Fines would not be issued to homeless or rough sleepers but officers would engage with those individuals to provide assistance, wherever possible.

Following a question from Cllr Amin, Officers confirmed the Council was actively engaging with Homes for Haringey as this was an estate under their charge and visits would be carried out in partnership with them.

RESOLVED

To approve the introduction and implementation of a PSPO in the terms of the draft attached at Appendix 1, for a period of three years effective from 23rd January 2019 having taken into account the EQIA at Appendix 2, and the consultation report at Appendix 3.

Reasons for decision

In accordance with the statutory guidelines the Council consulted with the Chief Officer of the police as well as the local policing body for the affected areas, and they have confirmed their agreement to the introduction of the PSPO.

In addition a public consultation was carried out to ascertain the views of local residents, business and people working or visiting the affected area. The outcome presented an overwhelming support for the PSPO. The outcome of the Public consultation can be found at Appendix 3.

The Council and partner agencies have undertaken a number of enforcement actions to tackle the anti-social behaviour on the estate. The main concern is and has been for a number of years, the significant presence of drug dealing and drug misuse. Regrettably this is not a solitary problem on the estate. It gives rise to and serves as a magnet for a number of other serious anti-social behaviour and crime which plague the lives of local residents such as; people loitering in the common parts of building (including the stairways) using illegal and/or illicit substances; soliciting and engaging in illicit sex work; and the sight and stench of urine and faeces in the stairways.

A number of partly successful actions have been taken against individuals to prohibit them from entering the estate (as detailed in appendix 1 of the Cabinet report of 8 November 2017), unfortunately, this has not resolved the issues. The PSPO will provide the police and council enforcement service with an additional tool for tackling this serious problem.

Alternative options considered

Not to pursue a PSPO

Given the length of time that the behaviour has been ongoing and the detrimental effect the behaviour is having on the residents of Love Lane this is not an option. In the absence of a PSPO, the Council would have to continue to undertake individual enforcement action; reliance on this method would not be as effective or efficient as a PSPO.

Enforcement action against individuals requires the identification of individuals, which is not always possible and can entail lengthy and costly legal proceedings. A PSPO would serve as a significant deterrent; hence, identity and legal actions may not be an issue. In addition, the number and turnover of perpetrators in this locality has been significant; action against an individual may end that person's activity in the defined area but would not necessarily deter others. Reliance on individual enforcement action could become extremely costly and interminable for the council, as new perpetrators are appearing all the time.

63. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES

RESOLVED

To note the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee minutes for the meeting held on the 29th of October 2018.

64. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS

RESOLVED

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

65. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

66. 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.

67. STATION ROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT WORKS

As per item 58.

68. THE YOUNG PEOPLE'S SUPPORTED HOUSING PATHWAY

As per item 59 and the exempt minutes.

69. WHITE HART LANE STATION LAND DISPOSAL

As per item 60.

70. EXEMPT MINUTES

RESOLVED

To agree the exempt minutes for Cabinet held on the 11th of December 2018.

71. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

None

CHAIR: Councillor Joseph Ejiofor

Signed by Chair

Date