

# **MINUTES OF MEETING CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 2020, 6.30PM**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Joseph Ejiofor (Chair), Seema Chandwani (Deputy Chair), Charles Adje, Kaushika Amin, Mark Blake, Gideon Bull, Kirsten Hearn, Emine Ibrahim, Sarah James and Matt White**

**ALSO ATTENDING: Councillors- Ogiehor and Mitchell**

## **278. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Leader referred to the notice of filming at meetings and the meeting noted this information.

## **279. APOLOGIES**

There were apologies for lateness from Cllr Ibrahim.

Cllr Ibrahim arrived soon after at item 280.

## **280. URGENT BUSINESS**

None

## **281. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

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

None

## **283. MINUTES**

### **RESOLVED**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 14<sup>th</sup> of July 2020.

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

None

## **285. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

### Deputation in relation to item 14

Mr Bruno Carr addressed the Cabinet in relation to agenda item 14. He informed Members that he was supporting the 2200 residents, 85% of the consultation respondents, that were against the proposal to increase the charges for parking permits in the borough and whom he felt were being ignored. Mr Carr felt that, given the current economic climate, it was untimely to increase any charges.

He felt that the response to the objections in the report was weak and questioned the presentation of these objections and how the evidence had been added to support these. He continued to contend that there was greater emphasis in the document on the positive responses to the consultation rather than those objecting.

Mr Carr continued to question the principles behind the increased parking permit charges, highlighting the higher proportionate percentage increase to parking permits for more environmentally efficient cars against more polluting cars. The proposed changes were also not fully aligning to the Ultra Low Emissions Zone vehicle categories. There had already been careful analysis and assessment of the vehicles by TFL experts and scientists of low emission vehicles that were to be encouraged for purchase and use. The proposals seemed to penalise residents that had bought these vehicles.

He requested that the Cabinet Members either defer the decision for six months, and reassess the economic situation, or reassess the charges to match the ULEZ.

The Leader thanked Mr Carr for his deputation.

In response to questions from Cabinet Members, Mr Carr responded as follows:

- He agreed that Friends of the Earth would support the aims of the decision to reduce emissions and improve air quality and he also supported this aim. However, Mr Carr felt that the percentage increases proposed had not been looked at clearly and if they had been would have been challenged as there was a unequal increase when comparing permit charge increases between electric or hybrid cars and higher polluting cars. It was felt that if further work had been completed, at the early stage, with environmental groups, this would have provided a fairer strategy, leading to increases in more polluting cars and better connection with TFL analysis which allowed diesel cars in the euro six category to be exempt.
- In relation to the optimal increases sought, Mr Carr spoke about expecting to see the highest percentages of the most significant increases levied against the

most polluting cars and less against electric cars and hybrid models. Mr Carr felt that residents would need to understand the impact of higher polluting cars on air quality to encourage use of lower emitting vehicles. Also, he felt that there was a need to consider the whole question of emissions across parking, and road traffic, instead of solely targeting additional income from residents.

- Mr Carr questioned the strategy of tackling parked vehicles under the guise of emissions. He expressed that improved public transport access, more cycling routes and improved highways needed to be in place before taking forward behavioural change activities.

Councillor Chandwani, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, responded to Mr Carr's deputation as follows:

- Disputed the focus on percentage increase by the deputation and instead underlined that increases were at real value cost.
- The increase was £10 per year for a low emission vehicle, and £20 per year for a high emission vehicle, therefore it was wrong to imply that a higher percentage increase for low emission vehicles meant a higher charge. [Clerks note - The report at paragraph 6.5 advised that the changes consulted on include a £10 increase across all existing charge bands to help cover the cost of running the service - later in the meeting at item 14, the Cabinet members were asked to confirm that they had read the report and recommendations which included this information]
- There was a tariff for where electric vehicles of £21 per vehicle
- 54,000 residents had been directly targeted during the consultation, with only 5% responding. There had been significant efforts to encourage people to respond to the survey and the Council knew that 16000 people checked the website and 2000 had responded to object. This was a survey of 50,000 people, with 36000 opening the email and 2000 people objecting.
- The Cabinet Member objected to the view that there was good diesel and bad diesel cars and referred to Oxford university research and other research that indicated that euro six vehicles were damaging and polluting. There was concern that the ULEZ scheme had not been strong enough on diesel cars and the wrong impression created that you could drive these cars.
- There were 4 neighbouring boroughs with euro six in their diesel surcharging and this helped demonstrate that the Council were not out of kilter with other London boroughs.
- Emphasised 80p to £1.20 a week increase for parking which was not significant enough to impact on people's finances when compared to cost of increased bus fees.

The Cabinet Member stated that to change behaviours and improve the response to the climate crisis, strong decisions must be made by Councils. Vehicle owners also needed to take responsibility and purchase lower polluting vehicles. To conclude, the Cabinet Member added that when residents with parking permits purchased lower emission vehicles, the Council would lose revenue due to the lower cost of the permit.

## **286. FEEDBACK TO THE STATUTORY CONSULTATION ON PARKING PERMITS AND CHARGES**

[ Clerk's note – Cllr Ibrahim left the meeting at 7.04pm]

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods introduced the report which set out the results of the statutory consultation undertaken on proposed changes to parking permits and parking charges, and sought approval for the implementation of the proposals as set out in the recommendations.

The Cabinet Member advised that during the consultation process 54,000 residents had been directly targeted, and 2776 residents had objected to elements of the proposal. 374 residents had responded in support of the proposal.

The Cabinet Member referred to sections 1.2 and 6.5 of the report which set out the proposals for parking permit charges being agreed at the meeting.

The appendix at pages 220-231 set out the financial changes in real terms, which was a £10 increase per year for low emission vehicles and £20 increase per year for high emission vehicles. [Clerks note - The report at paragraph 6.5 advised that the changes consulted on include a £10 increase across all existing charge bands to help cover the cost of running the service - later in the meeting at item 14, the Cabinet Members were asked to confirm that they had read the report and recommendations which included this information.]

In response to a question from Councillor Ogiehor, the Cabinet Member agreed to investigate with the Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability and Head of Carbon Reduction how residents with off-street parking could be encouraged to switch to low emission vehicles as part of the Air Quality Action Plan.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To consider the representations received in response to the statutory consultation on parking permits and charges as set out in paragraph 9 (consultation results) and in Appendix 1 to this report.
2. While the majority of respondents did not support the proposals consulted on, their contribution to the delivery of strategic objectives, with associated health benefits needs to be considered.

3. To agree that Cabinet authorise officers to proceed to draft the relevant Traffic Management Orders to implement the following measures as also set out in Appendix 2 by November 2020:
- A £10 increase across all existing parking permit charge bands.
  - An £80 surcharge on all parking permits issued to diesel fuelled vehicles.
  - A £50 surcharge on second and subsequent residential parking permits per household.
  - To limit permit account holders to the use of two daily visitor permits per day.
  - To increase the charge for daily Visitor Permits in all Controlled Parking Zones to £4.
  - To introduce a free virtual residential parking permit for Disabled Blue Badge Holders for their home CPZ, replacing the existing Companion Badge.
  - To introduce a £20 administration fee on parking permit refunds except for visitor parking permits which shall be non-refundable.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Council is required to consider objections and representations received in response to Statutory Consultation undertaken on any changes to parking permits and charges. Following that consideration, to decide whether to proceed to implementation of measures as set out at paragraph 3 (III) above.

### **Alternative options considered**

Consideration was given to relying on National and Regional levers to influence car ownership and use. Those measures include the expansion of the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) to Haringey in 2021. However, Haringey's ambitions in terms of improving air quality require decisive local measures to be implemented. This is also considered a timely opportunity to implement measures that improve the health and well-being opportunities for all borough residents.

Consideration was given to introducing concessions for Euro 6 diesel fuelled vehicles. However, the findings from recent research confirm that these vehicle types still have high levels of harmful emissions. This is supported by the International Council on Clean Transportation who suggest that even the newest, cleanest Euro 6 diesel vehicles emit high levels of harmful nitrogen oxide. It was subsequently felt that all diesel fuelled vehicles should be subject to the surcharge.

Consideration was given to introducing the 25% diesel surcharge on on-street and car park charges from November 2020, as part of a package of measures to reduce diesel related pollutants. However, following due consideration of the feedback to the consultation, this will not be implemented at this point in time. This will also help support our town centres in their recovery from the impacts of the Covid 19 pandemic.

## 287. 2020/21 FINANCE UPDATE QUARTER 1

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which covered the Council's financial position at Quarter 1 (Period 3) of the 2020/21 financial year, include General Fund Revenue, Capital, Housing Revenue Account and Dedicated Schools Grant budgets. The Cabinet Member drew the Cabinet's attention particularly to paragraphs 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 4.1, 5.1, 6.11, 7, 9 and 10. He added that it was critical to maintain strong financial management in the current economic climate and pandemic.

The Cabinet Member highlighted the continued and increasing pressure that the Council were facing from underfunding of the High Needs Block of the DSG since the Government's expansion of the age for Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) eligibility. The Council, like many other authorities across the country, had been left in a position where, despite best efforts, were unable to meet the needs of these young people within the budget that had been allocated. The Cabinet Member underlined that the additional funds provided for 2020/21 to date in no way went far enough and do not provide the sustainable solution that these young people and their families needed as was evidenced by the forecast £4.5m overspend included in the report.

The outcome of the Government's SEND review was still waiting publication and in the interim the Cabinet Member emphasised the need for the Council to continue to vocally lobby for additional resources.

- In response to a question from Cllr Ogiehor, there were ongoing risks in relation to the money spent at the start of the Covid-19 pandemic. This spending was in accordance with central government directions and further spending was expected. So far, the Council had only received in the region of £18m but were forecasting to have a greater net spend impact resulting from the pandemic than the grant allocated. There was growing concern about the risk of not receiving full reimbursement and the effect this would have on the Council's finances if it had to ameliorate this, and it was continued to hope to receive the reimbursement.
- Councillor Ogiehor spoke about the conclusion of a 4 year legal challenge in which carers working for a provider in Haringey had recently been awarded backdated earnings for not receiving the minimum wage. In response to queries about: the financial risk to the Council as a result of care workers of a council contractor paying them below the minimum wage, having assurance on care contract management arrangements and auditing care contracts to ensure no similar issues occurred in the future, the Cabinet Member advised that he would discuss this with the relevant Cabinet Member and respond to Cllr Ogiehor in due course.
- The Cabinet Member also advised that more recently, there were provisions made by the Council, during Covid 19, for home care workers, working for providers in Haringey, to receive an uplift equivalent to the London Living wage and the requirement to pay London Living Wage was also added to the new DPS home care contracts agreed at Cabinet in June.

## RESOLVED

1. To note the forecast revenue outturn for the General Fund (GF), including the impact of Covid, and known and estimated levels of announced Covid funding, is a net overspend of £23.1m. This is before any further emergency grant support (Section 6, Tables 1a and 1b, and Appendix 1). This excludes the DSG forecast.
2. To note that Directors have been asked to focus on actions to bring the forecast overspend down before the end of the year.
3. To note the net Housing Revenue Account (HRA) forecast of £9.6m overspend (Section 6, Table 2, and Appendix 2).
4. To note the net DSG forecast of £4.6m overspend, the actions being taken to seek to address this and the potential implications for the GF (Section 7 and Table 3).
5. To note the forecast budget savings position in 2020/21 which indicates that 50% (£8.3m) may not be achieved. (Section 8, Table 4, and Appendix 3). This is incorporated in the GF budget pressures addressed in recommendation 3.1 above.
6. To approve the proposed budget adjustments and virements to the capital programme as set out in Table 5 and Appendix 4 and note the forecast expenditure of £251.5m in 2020/21 which equates to 43% of the revised capital budget (Section 9, Table 5 and Appendix 4).
7. To approve the budget virements as set out in Appendix 5.
8. To note the debt write-offs approved in Quarter 4 2019/20 (Appendix 6).
9. To approve the Council's income recovery practices, operative from 1 October 2020, following the temporary changes made since April of this year (Section 10).
10. To approve the approach to providing assistance to the Bernie Grant Arts Centre, as set out in section 6.17.6.

## **Reason for Decision**

A strong financial management framework, including oversight by Members and senior management, is an essential part of delivering the Council's priorities and statutory duties. This is made more critically important than ever as a result of the severe financial duress placed on the Council by the Covid-19 crisis.

COVID-19 affects everything local authorities do – as community leaders, public health authorities, education authorities, employers, partners, and service deliverers. The Leader, Cabinet and its officers continue to need to focus on responding to the crisis while ensuring normal critical services are provided.

## **Alternative Options Considered**

The report of the management of the Council's financial resources is a key part of the role of the Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer) in helping members to exercise their role and no other options have therefore been considered.

### **288. APPROVAL OF SINGLE USE PLASTICS POLICY AND ACTION PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability was pleased to introduce the report which sought adoption of the Single Use Plastics Policies and approval of the Single Use Plastics Action Plans. She outlined that 8 million tonnes of plastic ended up in the ocean each year, with plastic remaining a pollutant for hundreds of years. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic the use of Single Use Plastics had spiralled over the last six months (in order to maintain infection control).

The Cabinet Member outlined that there were two sections to the Action Plan – the first was to set out how the Council would show leadership and use its procurement powers and purchaser requirements, and its own operational practices to reduce the use of single use plastics in its operations. The second Action Plan set out how the Council would continue to work with partners and empower the wider Haringey community to reduce the use of single use plastics.

In response to a question from the Leader, Joe Baker – Head of Carbon Management, advised that there had already been some changes made by the Council in the reduction of single use plastics, such as the material used for parking tickets, the provision of Council branded keep ups for purchase in the canteen and a surcharge for the use of single use cups.

The following information was provided in response to questions from Councillor Ogiehor:

- The Council had looked into installing water fountains in the borough; however, the challenge was that the costs to maintain the fountains was excessive. The GLA could install fountains and maintain these accordingly.



- It was important to ensure the policy was watertight before putting to Cabinet for approval, which was why it may feel that there had been a delay in implementation.

## **RESOLVED**

To approve the Single Use Plastics Policies and accompanying Action Plans, attached at Appendices 1 and 2 of this report, which outlines how the Council will reduce Single Use Plastics in the Council and across the borough.

### **Reasons for decision**

Haringey Council is committed to doing everything possible to respond to the climate emergency and improve sustainability across its own operations and in the borough of Haringey.

The policies and action plans contribute to the Place Priority of the Borough Plan, specifically objective 10 to make the borough a cleaner, accessible, and attractive place – targeting waste minimisation.

Reducing consumption across the Council's offices and the borough will save money, reduce waste, improve our environment, and decrease the amount of harmful plastics ending up in the world's oceans or in landfill.

The Single Use Plastics (SUPs) Policies and accompanying Action Plans represent a step towards this by outlining exactly what the Council will be doing to reduce reliance on SUPs within its own offices, on Haringey Council owned land, in Haringey schools, and across the borough.

Haringey Council has already taken bold steps to reduce SUPs, such as working with the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) on a low-plastic zone in Crouch End, reducing SUPs in Council offices and getting businesses signed up to refill schemes.

### **Alternative options considered**

#### **Do Nothing**

This was rejected as it would not comply with the Borough Plan, specifically objective 10 to make the borough a cleaner, accessible, and attractive place – targeting waste minimisation.

#### **Do a Council plan only**

This was rejected, as the Council is well placed to help reduce SUPs beyond its own organisation. To only focus on plastics the Council directly uses would miss opportunities, such as SUPs at events, SUPs in schools and SUPs used by the Council's partners.

#### **Do a Borough plan only**

This was rejected as the Council can learn from its own experience of reducing SUPs to inform the most effective ways to work in the borough. The Council would not want to offer advice on reducing SUPs if it could not demonstrate its own efforts to reduce SUPs.

## **289. NEIGHBOURHOOD MOVES SCHEME**

*[Clerk's note Cllr Ibrahim returned to the meeting at 7.25pm]*

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought approval for a consultation to amend the Housing Allocations Policy to allow for a Neighbourhood Moves Scheme. The Neighbourhood Moves Scheme would apply automatically on any new housing development with 5 or more new Council rented homes unless Cabinet made the decision to exclude a new housing development. The proposed Scheme would give existing Council tenants priority for new homes that are built in their neighbourhood, particularly those who are living in homes which are too big or too small.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To note the Equalities Impact Assessment at Appendix 1.
2. To note the proposed alterations to the Housing Allocations Policy attached at Appendix 2.
3. To note the Draft Neighbourhood Moves Scheme attached at Appendix 3 which will be attached to the Housing Allocations Policy.
4. To approve a consultation on these proposed amendments to the Housing Allocations Policy.
5. To delegate approval of the Consultation Documents to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal.
6. To note that following consideration of the consultation responses, a second Cabinet report will be submitted to give final approval of the amendments to the Allocations Policy.

### **Reasons for decision**

The proposed changes will honour the Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy, as well as seek to address over-crowding by releasing larger family homes which are under-occupied and allowing over-crowded households to move locally. It will also support community cohesion.

Recommendation 3.2 is required to allow changes to be made to the Housing Allocations Policy.

### **Alternative options considered**

An alternative option is to consult on a Local Lettings Plan for each scheme individually. This is not recommended because there are a large number of schemes in the development pipeline, and consulting on a Local Lettings Plan for each scheme individually is not practical.

Another alternative option is not to apply the Neighbourhood Moves Scheme on new Council housing. This was rejected because, firstly, this Scheme will help address both under-occupancy and over-crowding, and secondly because it will allow residents to benefit from new Council housing being built in their local area.

## **290. HOUSING OPTIONS AT 500 WHITE HART LANE TO SUPPORT HIGH ROAD WEST SCHEME**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration introduced the report which offered Love Lane resident leaseholders the opportunity to acquire a property on 500 White Hart Lane site with a reduced equity requirement. This allowed the Council to maximise rehousing options for leaseholders and directly deal with affordability concerns.

The Cabinet Member reiterated that the Council was committed to working with leaseholders to identify rehousing solutions that met their needs. The Council understood that Love Lane Estate leaseholders had concerns about their current and future homes and faced some difficult decisions about whether to stay in the area or purchase a new home now outside of the Estate. The Council also understood that no two households were the same and each household would have different needs and varying financial positions.

It was noted that the Cabinet had made a decision in March 2020 to agree a new High Road West leaseholder offer for consultation with leaseholders, which proposed an enhanced equity loan for new properties within the High Road West Scheme. It was noted that it was also for these reasons, that the attached report sought authority to offer Love Lane resident leaseholders shared equity loans with a lower threshold requirement at 500 White Hart Lane.

Further to considering a response to the leaseholder's concerns at item 24 and exempt information at item 25,

### **RESOLVED**

1. To agree that the intermediate properties at 500 White Hart Lane be offered for sale to the resident leaseholders on the Love Lane Estate who wish to sell their property to the Council: and
2. To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning and the Director of Finance to agree any individual equity loans to those resident leaseholders subject to:

- a) the resident leaseholder contributing the full market value of their current home plus home loss payment where this is possible; and
  - b) the equity requirement to qualify for a Portable Equity Loan be within the agreed cost envelope set out in the EXEMPT report which permits equity amounts below the 60% level.
3. To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to agree, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal, the marketing strategy for any intermediate properties at 500 White Hart Lane, that are not acquired by Love Lane resident leaseholders and to dispose of these properties in accordance with that strategy.

### **Reasons for decision**

The reason for this decision is to ensure that the Council can keep its commitments to resident leaseholders on the Love Lane Estate, to maximise their rehousing choice and provide affordable rehousing options.

As described in paragraph 6.9 below, the Council's Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy (the ERRPP) sets out the Council's minimum commitments to residents affected by regeneration schemes. For resident leaseholders it details the arrangements of equity loans, which aim to help them acquire new homes by providing additional finance, which is only repayable upon the subsequent sale of the property or the death of the leaseholder.

The ERRPP normally requires resident leaseholders to contribute 60% of the equity of the new home they wish to acquire to qualify either for an equity loan in the renewal area or (the "portable equity loan") elsewhere in the borough. The resident leaseholder must contribute the full market value of their current home plus the Home Loss payment.

The ERRPP also requires that any additional contribution by the leaseholder beyond 60% must go to increase the leaseholder's equity share in the replacement property, thereby setting a maximum value of the replacement home of 1.83 times the value of the leaseholder's current home. If this is greater than the borough-wide upper quartile house price, that latter becomes the maximum value of the replacement home.

Recent valuations of both the new homes at 500 White Hart Lane and of properties on the Love Lane Estate have suggested that the some resident leaseholders may not be able to raise the 60% equity requirement for an equivalent size home at 500 White Hart Lane and that therefore some properties at 500 White Hart Lane may exceed these maximum replacement home values. This would mean that some of the homes could be unaffordable, hence the proposal outlined below.

The ERRPP does however allow for individual schemes to offer a lower minimum equity share, and therefore a higher maximum replacement home value. Officers recommend setting a lower minimum equity requirement where a resident leaseholder on Love Lane cannot afford to contribute 60% of the value of the new home at 500 White Hart Lane. This will ensure that the Council meets its commitment to provide

affordable rehousing options for Love Lane resident leaseholders as well as maximising rehousing choice.

Should Love Lane resident leaseholders not wish to take up the offer of a property at 500 White Hart Lane, the Council needs to make sure it makes best use of these intermediate properties. As such, a marketing strategy will be required to ensure that any surplus properties are marketed to those who the Council believes has the greatest need for the homes. This could include other resident leaseholders affected by estate renewal schemes. For this reason, this report also seeks a delegated authority for the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to agree, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal, the marketing strategy for any intermediate properties at 500 White Hart Lane, which are not acquired by Love Lane resident leaseholders.

### **Alternative options considered**

#### Not to offer an equity loan

If the Council choose not to offer an equity loan on the purchase of these units, it is unlikely that they would be affordable to Love Lane resident leaseholders. This is because the cost of the new homes will be higher than the value of the leaseholders' current property on the Love Lane Estate. This would mean that 500 White Hart Lane would not help the Council to meet its commitments to resident leaseholders on the Love Lane Estate.

#### To offer an equity loan under ERRPP terms but not with the option of a lower equity share from the leaseholder

The Council could choose to offer an equity loan on the purchase of these units only where the value of the current property plus 10% Home Loss equals 60% of the new property and not with a lower minimum equity share where necessary. This may mean that some resident leaseholders from the Love Lane Estate that wish to purchase a property at 500 White Hart Lane are not able to.

## **291. UPDATE ON COUNCIL OWNED SITES IN WOOD GREEN**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which set out the work underway to develop a long-term strategy to make the best use of Council owned sites in Wood Green and described the impact of the current Covid 19 pandemic on the programme.

It was noted that , prior to Covid 19, work was underway to prepare a business case for redeveloping the Library site to include a new library and customer services, office accommodation, and potentially additional services including democratic space and a Leisure Centre. The Council had also been considering longer term options for the Civic Centre, keeping in mind its listing, as part of the accommodation strategy.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the Covid 19 crisis has meant that the Council has had to take a step back and pause while the longer-term effect and requirements were

reviewed. This was possible now with the recent acquisition of Alex House which met the Council's short- and medium-term accommodation needs.

It was noted that from consultation with residents, businesses and stakeholders, there was interest in changing Wood Green. The Council was a major landowner and needed to play a key role. The report set out pending decisions about Council accommodation property in the town centre which could lead to better use of Council land to support existing and new communities. The report further set out a timetable for decisions to be made about Council owned sites in the medium term.

In response to questions from Cllr Ogiehor and Cllr Mitchell, the following information was provided:

- In relation to the timelines for hoardings remaining on the Civic Centre site, these could in place until 2024 to allow the required internal and external works to be undertaken on the building.
- With regards to considering the future use of the Civic Centre site and allowing community groups to hire use of the rooms, this would be considered as part of the accommodation strategy and the specific work on locality with partners. This included considering opportunities for partner organisations and businesses to co-locate. It was hoped that the Civic Centre could be used to facilitate community groups, council use, civic duties, and meetings.
- The Cabinet Member was not aware of any specific issue concerning the wider surrounds of George Meehan House as indicated in appendix 2 of the report. There had been longstanding concern about the physical state of an adjoining building and a further building at back of the site which backed onto the car park of the premises. Additional information about the assessment of this issue could be provided by the Director for Customers, Transformation and Resources.
- With regards to Blue House Yard, there were a number of works that needed to be completed and the Council were engaging with users of the site. The Council were taking forward several 'meanwhile' use projects to ensure that businesses thrived. It was hoped that the work on Blue House Yard provided the businesses with as much support as required.
- With regards to expenditure on River Park House accommodation and overall consideration of the Councils buildings in Wood Green, the purpose of the report emphasised that it was good business sense to review the accommodation plans that the Council had prior to Covid and the Council were already in the process of commissioning feasibility work to be completed on sites.

- Due to Covid 19, Councillors were not able to visit other boroughs which had completed a review of their accommodation. However, there were plans for an all member briefing which would provide further information to be shared.
- There were further floors on River Park House that needed to have works completed and although this required resources to be applied when the overall future of the building was not yet agreed, it was still important to take forward this work as the Council had a fiduciary duty to ensure that all assets and resources were used in an appropriate manner.
- Essentially the attached report was, at this stage, providing officers with the opportunity to carry out a review and consider the various buildings within the Wood Green area and how the council can use them as well as put them to better use.
- The Cabinet Member for Local Investment and Economic Growth commented and gave assurance that he fully understood the support that would be required to businesses in Blue House Yard and he had taken forward engagement activities with the business holders, including highlighting access to the discretionary business grant support . He was happy to work with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration and Officer team to ensure that the long-term future of Blue House yard, either on this site or on a similar site.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the timetable for consideration of the accommodation strategy by Cabinet.
2. To note the action being taken now to temporarily protect the Civic Centre pending a decision about future investment.

## **Reasons for decision**

In July 2019, Cabinet agreed to the principle of consolidating Council accommodation in Wood Green and work has been progressing to develop this in detail including a possible new building on the Library site and options for the Civic Centre and whether to retain it for Council use.

However, since July 2019, a number of events have taken place which mean that the business case for new accommodation needs to be reviewed, including the recent acquisition of Alex House and Covid 19 experience which has changed some of the assumptions which fed into the business case about accommodation requirements.

The condition of the current corporate buildings in Wood Green varies from fair to extremely poor. It is anticipated that should the Council decide to consolidate to one or two buildings, this will take 5-7 years to deliver in full. Therefore, a review is taking place of occupation of existing building and of short to medium term investment needs to make sure buildings are fit for purpose for that period, and a study of opportunities to vacate some buildings and potentially realise commercial income.

This report sets out a summary of the high-level medium-term strategy for Council owned sites in Wood Green and a timetable for decisions relating to each site.

In March 2020, the Civic Centre was closed for safety reasons. It is necessary to prevent further damage to the Civic Centre by protecting it pending works to repair it, this report sets out the immediate protection measures which are being carried out.

### **Alternative options considered**

Reports which are for information or noting and do not involve any actions being agreed do not require this section to be completed.

## **292. REPORT ON THE FINDINGS OF AN OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION WHERE A REPORT HAS BEEN ISSUED - NON KEY**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which appended a report from the Housing Ombudsman in June 2020 which had found the Council at fault with regard to a resident's homelessness application.

The Cabinet Member placed on record her apology to Ms B for the distress caused by the Council's failings. She was glad to note that Ms B has been financially compensated and was now being housed in a suitably sized home let by the Haringey Community Benefit Society. The Cabinet Member was glad that the Council has taken the opportunity to learn from this incident and has taken steps to ensure that this mistake did not reoccur.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To accept the findings and recommendations of the Ombudsman in the report shown at Appendix 1.
2. To note and approve officers' compensatory payments to Ms B totalling £5,304.37, as set out in paragraph 6.14 below.
3. To adopt this report as the Council's formal response under s.31 Local Government Act 1974, to be communicated to the Ombudsman.
4. To adopt this report as the Cabinet's formal response as required by s.5A Local Government and Housing Act 1989, for distribution to all members and the Monitoring Officer.



## **Reasons for decision**

As set out in the Ombudsman's report, Ms B has been found to have suffered injustice as a result of faults on behalf of the Council.

Where a report such as this is made by the Ombudsman, it must be laid before the authority (s.31 Local Government Act 1974). In cases such as this where the Council is operating executive arrangements, "the authority" means the executive, i.e. Cabinet (s.25(4ZA) Local Government Act 1974).

## **Alternative options considered**

The Ombudsman cannot force the Council to follow its recommendations, but local authorities generally do follow them.

If the Ombudsman is not satisfied with the Council's response, he will make a further report explaining this and making recommendations. He can also require the Council to make a public statement about the matter.

Therefore, Cabinet could choose to reject any of the recommendations made by the Ombudsman.

However, this alternative is not recommended because the Ombudsman's recommendations represent an appropriate remedy for the reasons set out above.

## **293. RISK BASED VERIFICATION POLICY (RBV)**

The Cabinet Member for Corporate and Civic services introduced the report which set out the requirement for an annual review of the RBV policy. Given the impact of Covid-19, the Government had issued advice and a decision from Cabinet was being sought on whether or not to adopt that advice.

It was noted that the Risk Verification System used a software that determined the level of checks that needed to be carried out when a resident makes a claim for Council tax benefit reduction or housing benefit. It was noted that since November 2019, the use of the software had reduced the number of letters asking applicants for more information for claims. This had been the source of complaint for residents over the years as it caused delays and now having the software increased the speed of the process for considering benefit claims.

The Cabinet Member emphasised that the automated system did not have a role in deciding whether a claim was awarded or not and this decision was made by an officer. It was also noted that since the introduction of the system, no claimant had been asked for further information and many were being asked for less.

In light of the Covid 19, the DWP had suspended the need to review the policy by local authorities and the decision being considered was whether or not to adopt that advice.

Following questions from Cllr Mitchell, the following information was provided:

- With regards to a review of the policy, this was introduced in November 2019, and the advice from the government was that the Council should not be carrying out a review at this time. This review would likely take place in the middle of next year.
- It was reiterated that the software had provided significant improvements over the course of the year in the processing of claims. There was no impact on the assessment of claims, even the high-risk claims, from this software and the Council were externally and internally audited on an annual basis.
- The audit results were considered at Corporate Committee on an annual basis. These were assessed in year, in terms of error rates, in relation to the distribution of housing benefit, overpayments and the software had made a significant improvement to these rates.
- Assurance was provided that the software does not discriminate claimants from protected characteristic groups. It considered the types of claims and where there is a change of circumstances and allowed for a simple claim form to be completed without the need to provide the same level of information as making a new claim.
- With regards to low, medium, and high types of claims, it was noted that low risk applicants will often be those in receipt of tax welfare benefits and where the Council can access the DWP system. The applicant does not need to provide verification and their claims can be processed quite quickly.
- Medium and high-risk categories related to the complexity of the information provided and were often concerned with household income composition and individual income to be assessed.
- There was monthly performance analysis of the changes to circumstances claims to allow any changes to be considered such as overpayments that could occur or to understand if there are anomalies and allow further background information to be checked. There were also quality checks completed on cases to provide additional assurance.
- Part of the equalities comments were assessed to be confidential information by Legal services and added to the exempt part of the report and further details would be provided in the exempt part of the meeting. It was agreed that the Head of Legal would provide a broader response to the query from Cllr Mitchell after the meeting.

Further to considering the exempt information at item 26,

**RESOLVED**

As set out in the Part B exempt report

As set out in the Part B exempt report

**Reasons for decision**

To continue to help reduce fraud and error in the processing of Benefit claims.

As set out in the Part B exempt report

**Alternative options considered**

For the reasons contained in the report, no other option was considered.

**294. APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FOR ST MARY'S CLOSE AND NIGHTINGALE LANE**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought approval to appoint the recommended contractor to complete a new build development of five Council rented homes; two at St Mary's Close N17 and three at Nightingale Lane N8, and to appropriate the land for planning purposes to facilitate the development process.

It was noted that on approval, these developments would be the seventh and eighth scheme to move to a start on site, of the 58 schemes in the Council housing delivery programme that the Council intends to directly deliver itself. It will be the twelfth and thirteenth schemes to move to a start on site in the overall programme.

Five new Council homes in two wards – two three-bedroom homes and three two-bedroom homes – meant that five households who are not currently adequately housed would be living in homes that met their needs.

Further to considering exempt information at item 27,

**RESOLVED**

1. To approve the appointment of Cosmur Construction Limited to undertake the new build works to provide a total of five Council rented homes at St Mary's Close and Nightingale Lane for a total contract sum of £1,348,437.49 and to approve the client contingency sum set out in the exempt part of the report.
2. To approve the appropriation of the land at St Mary's Close and Nightingale Lane (edged red in the plans attached at Appendix 1) from housing purposes to planning purposes under Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 as they are no longer required for the purpose which they are currently held, and for the purpose of carrying out development as set out in paragraphs 6.1 to 6.27 of this report.
3. To approve the use of the Council's powers under Section 203 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 to override easements and other rights of neighbouring

properties infringed upon by the St Mary's development, under planning permission Ref: HGY/2020/0136 and by Nightingale Lane development, under planning permission Ref: HGY/2020/0159.

4. To delegate to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, after consultation with the Director of Finance and the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal, authority to make payments of compensation as a result of any infringement arising from the development and the recommendation 3.1.3, within the existing scheme of delegation.
5. To approve the appropriation of the land at St Mary's Close and Nightingale Lane (edged red in the plans attached at Appendix 1) from planning purposes back to housing purposes under Section 19 of the Housing Act 1985, after practical completion of the development on 31 December 2021.

### **Reasons for decisions**

St Mary's Close and Nightingale Lane was approved by Cabinet on 9 July 2019 to be included in the Council housing delivery programme. This scheme has subsequently been granted planning consent and is ready to progress to construction. This report therefore marks the third, and final, Member led decision to develop these two sites.

Following a formal tender process, a contractor has been identified to undertake these works.

The appropriation of the site for planning purposes is required as it will allow the Council to use the powers contained in Section 203 to override easements and other rights of neighbouring properties and will prevent injunctions that could delay or prevent the Council's proposed development. Section 203 converts the right to seek an injunction into a right to compensation. The site will need to be appropriated back from planning purposes to housing purposes on completion of the development to enable the Council to use the land for housing and let five new Council homes at Council rent.

The new development at St Mary's Close and Nightingale Lane will also allow the Council to regenerate the land, helping to reduce the anti-social behaviour currently attracted to the sites, improving the security and aesthetics for the surrounding existing residents. In addition, the development will help support delivery of the Borough Plan, Priority 1: "Our vision is for a safe, stable and affordable home for everyone, whatever their circumstances".

### **Alternative options considered**

It would be possible not to develop these sites for housing purposes. However, this option was rejected as it does not support the Council's commitment to deliver a new generation of Council homes.

This opportunity was procured via a direct appointment from the London Construction Programme (LCP) Major Works 2019 Framework Agreement, the recommended route for a contract of this value. An alternative option would have

been to run a competitive tender from the LCP, but this option was rejected due to limited interest from the framework contractors.

The Council could continue with these schemes without appropriating the site for planning purposes, but this would risk the proposed development being delayed or stopped by potential third party claims. By utilising the powers under Section 203 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 (HPA 2016), those who benefit from third party rights will not be able to seek an injunction. Making use of this power allows the Council to override these third rights and allows the third party to make a claim for compensation only. The Council recognises the potential rights of third parties and will pay compensation where a legal basis for such payments is established. The housing delivery team actively engaged with residents about the development of these sites as they proceeded through the feasibility and design stages and any comments or objections raised were taken into consideration by Planning Committee in reaching its decision. For these reasons, this option was rejected.

The Council could decide not to appropriate the land for housing purposes upon practical completion of the building works. This option was rejected because it could prevent the Council from being able to offer up these homes for occupation as social housing thereby not supporting the delivery of much needed affordable homes.

## **295. APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FOR POYNTON ROAD**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought approval to appoint the recommended winning contractor to complete a new build development of two Council rented three-bedroom family terraced homes at Poynton Road N17 and to appropriate the land for planning purposes to facilitate the development process.

It was noted that on approval, this development will be the sixth scheme to move to a start on site, of the 58 schemes in the Council housing delivery programme that the Council intends to directly deliver itself. It will be the eleventh scheme to move to a start on site in the overall programme.

The Cabinet Member outlined that Poynton Road was currently housing derelict buildings, since 2014 when they ceased to be used as retail units. The Council's intervention would turn an eyesore plagued by anti-social behaviour into two new family terraced homes for Council rent.

Further to considering exempt information at item 28,

### **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the appointment of the recommended winning contractor set out in the exempt Appendix 2 to undertake the new build works to provide a total of two Council rented homes at Poynton Road for a total contract sum of £673,377.00 and to approve the client contingency sum set out in the exempt part of the report.

2. To approve the appropriation of the land at Poynton Road (edged red in the plans attached at Appendix 1) from housing purposes to planning purposes under Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 as they are no longer required for the purpose which they are currently held, and for the purpose of carrying out development as set out in paragraphs 6.1 to 6.27 of this report.
3. To approve the use of the Council's powers under Section 203 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 to override easements and other rights of neighbouring properties infringed upon by the Poynton Road development, under planning permission Ref: HGY/2020/0182.
4. To delegate to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, after consultation with the Director of Finance and the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal, authority to make payments of compensation as a result of any infringement arising from the development and the resolution 3.1.3, within the existing scheme of delegation.
5. To approve the appropriation of the land at Poynton Road (edged red in the plans attached at Appendix 1) from planning purposes back to housing purposes under Section 19 of the Housing Act 1985, after practical completion of the development on 31 December 2021.

### **Reasons for decisions**

Poynton Road was approved by Cabinet on 9 July 2019 to be included in the Council housing delivery programme. This scheme has subsequently been granted planning consent and is ready to progress to construction. This report therefore marks the third, and final, Member led decision to develop these two sites.

Following a formal tender process, a contractor has been identified to undertake these works.

The appropriation of the site for planning purposes is required as it will allow the Council to use the powers contained in Section 203 to override easements and other rights of neighbouring properties and will prevent injunctions that could delay or prevent the Council's proposed development. Section 203 converts the right to seek an injunction into a right to compensation. The site will need to be appropriated back from planning purposes to housing purposes on completion of the development to enable the Council to use the land for housing and let two new Council homes at Council rent.

The new development at Poynton Road will also allow the Council to redevelop and secure the premise alleviating the anti-social behaviour currently attracted to the site and helping to improve security for the surrounding existing residents. In addition, the development will help support delivery of the Borough Plan, Priority 1: "Our vision is for a safe, stable and affordable home for everyone, whatever their circumstances".

### **Alternative options considered**

It would be possible not to develop this site for housing purposes. However, this option was rejected as it does not support the Council's commitment to deliver a new generation of Council homes.

This opportunity was procured via a competitive tender from the Councils London Construction Programme (LCP) Dynamic Procurement System (DPS) for minor works, the recommended route for a contract of this value. An alternative option would have been to run a competitive tender via the Council's LCP Major Works Framework, but this option was rejected as this framework can only be utilised for works from £1m+.

The Council could continue with the scheme without appropriating the site for planning purposes, but this would risk the proposed development being delayed or stopped by potential third party claims. By utilising the powers under Section 203 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 (HPA 2016), those who benefit from third party rights will not be able to seek an injunction. Making use of this power allows the Council to override these third rights and allows the third party to make a claim for compensation only. The Council recognises the potential rights of third parties and will pay compensation where a legal basis for such payments is established. The housing delivery team actively engaged with residents about the development of these sites as they proceeded through the feasibility and design stages and any comments or objections raised were taken into consideration by Planning Committee in reaching its decision. For these reasons, this option was rejected.

The Council could decide not to appropriate the land for housing purposes upon practical completion of the building works. This option was rejected because it could prevent the Council from being able to offer up these homes for occupation as social housing thereby not supporting the delivery of much needed affordable homes.

## **296. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR EXTERNAL MAJOR WORKS TO IMPERIAL WHARF ESTATE**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought approval for an award of a contract to contractor A to carry out external major works on the Imperial Wharf Estate.

The proposed works to Imperial Wharf will bring all homes on the estate up to the full Decent Homes Standard as well as ensure compliance with current fire and building regulations. The overall project will contribute to helping to achieve the Borough Plan objectives for housing which include delivering Decent Homes, ensuring all homes are safe and improving resident satisfaction, as set out in more detail in section 10 of the report.

In addition, following extensive consultation with residents, residents will benefit from an improved estate environment that includes designing out crime measures to tackle anti-social behaviour. The aim for this project is to achieve the Silver Award which is a Police initiative that recognises physical security standards have been incorporated into works to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour. The Designing Out Crime Team will attend site to inspect and sign off each block and on successful completion of the works, the Imperial Estate will achieve the Silver Award. The Award would be presented by the Metropolitan Police Designing Out Crime Officer.

Further to considering exempt information at item 29,

## **RESOLVED**

1. Pursuant to the Council's Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1(d), for to approve the award of a contract of £4,200,594.50 to the preferred contractor identified in exempt Appendix A for the installation of flat roof covering, windows, resident and main entrance communal doors, external brickwork repairs, fire protection works, redevelopment of children play area and associated estate improvements. This will incorporate the communal internal and external areas of the Imperial Wharf Estate as follows: 228 -270, 304-346 & 378-442 Craven Park Road, 1,2,3,5,6,7,8, 32-51 Maple Close.
2. To approve the issue of a letter of intent for an amount of up to, but not exceeding £420,059.45, which represents 10% of the contract sum.
3. To approve the total professional fees of £323,277.75, which represents 7.7% of the contract sum.
4. To note the total project costs of £4,523,872.25.

### **Reasons for decision**

Homes for Haringey requires Cabinet approval to award the contract for the installation of flat roof covering, windows and rear door replacement, resident front entrance doors and main entrance communal doors, external brickwork and concrete repairs, fire protection works, drainage repairs, internal and external decorations, emergency lighting, bins store and recycling storage, resurface walkway and upstands, replacement of paving to identified areas redevelopment of the children's play area, landscaping and associated estate improvements. This will incorporate the communal and external areas of the Imperial Wharf Estate. This will enable essential safety works to commence and the estate to be brought up to the Decent Homes Standard.

The tender process was carried out in accordance with the framework requirements that incorporate price and quality. The successful compliant bidder scored the highest in relation to these criteria in the associated lot 1.1B.

### **Alternative options considered**

An alternative option would be for Homes for Haringey to use third party industry frameworks or an OJEU compliant tender process to deliver the construction works to the Imperial Wharf Estate. Homes for Haringey sought support and advice from Haringey Strategic Procurement and determined the London Construction Programme framework as being the optimum route to the market. This was due to the speed of access to quality-checked contractors and focus on companies that focus their resources in the local area.



A do-nothing option would mean the Council is not able to deliver external capital investment works to bring the estate up to the Decent Homes Standard, in accordance with the Asset Management Strategy 2018-23.

## **297. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR EXTERNAL MAJOR WORKS TO THE TURNER AVENUE ESTATE**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought approval for the award of a contract to contractor A to carry out external major works on the Turner Avenue Estate.

The proposed works to Turner Avenue will bring all homes on the estate up to the full Decent Homes Standard as well as ensure compliance with current fire and building regulations. The overall project will contribute to helping to achieve the Borough Plan objectives for housing which include delivering Decent Homes, ensuring all homes are safe and improving resident satisfaction, as set out in more detail in section 10 of the report.

In addition, following extensive consultation with residents, residents will benefit from an improved estate environment that includes designing out crime measures to tackle anti-social behaviour. The aim for this project is to achieve the Silver Award which is a Police initiative that recognises physical security standards have been incorporated into works to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour. The Designing Out Crime Team will attend site to inspect and sign off each block and on successful completion of the works, the Turner Avenue Estate will achieve the Silver Award. The Award will be presented by the Metropolitan Police Designing Out Crime Officer.

After considering exempt information at item 30,

### **RESOLVED**

1. Pursuant to the Council's Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1(d), to approve the award of a contract to the preferred contractor identified in exempt Appendix A for the installation of flat roof covering, windows, resident and main entrance communal doors, external brickwork and concrete repairs, fire protection works, drainage repairs, communal internal and external decoration, emergency lighting and boundary walls to the Turner Avenue Estate. This will be for the sum of £2,608,320.63.
2. To approve the issue of a letter of intent for an amount of up to, but not exceeding £260,832.63, which represents 10% of the contract sum.
3. To approve the total professional fees of £216,229.78 which represents 8.29% of the contract sum.
4. To note the total project costs of £2,824,550.41.

### **Reasons for decision**

Homes for Haringey requires Cabinet approval to award the contract for the installation of flat roof covering, windows, resident and main entrance communal doors, external brickwork and concrete repairs, fire protection works, drainage repairs, communal internal and external decorations, emergency lighting and boundary walls to the Turner Avenue Estate. This will enable essential safety works to commence and for properties to be brought up to the Decent Homes Standard. This is following a tender process undertaken in conjunction with Haringey Council's Procurement team via the London Construction Programme (London Construction Programme) framework and processes.

The tender process was carried out in accordance with the framework requirements that incorporate price and quality. The successful compliant bidder scored the highest in relation to these criteria in the associated lot 1.1B.

### **Alternative options considered**

An alternative option would be for Homes for Haringey to use third party industry frameworks or an OJEU compliant tender process to deliver the construction works to the Turner Avenue Estate. Homes for Haringey sought support and advice from Haringey Strategic Procurement and determined the London Construction Programme framework as being the optimum route to the market. This was due to the speed of access to quality-checked contractors and focus on companies that concentrate their resources in the local area.

A do-nothing option would mean the Council is not able to deliver external capital investment works to bring the estate up to the Decent Homes Standard, in accordance with the Asset Management Strategy 2018-23.

## **298. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

### **RESOLVED**

To note the minutes of the following:

Urgent decision 27/07/2020  
Urgent decision 10/08/2020  
Cabinet Signing 24/08/2020  
Urgent decision 28/08/2020  
Urgent decision 4/09/2020

## **299. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

### **RESOLVED**

To note the significant and delegated actions taken in July to August.

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

Before entering the exempt part of the meeting, the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal provided the following information in response to concerns that had been raised by a Love Lane Leaseholder for Cabinet to note and consider, prior to considering the exempt report on Housing Options at 500 White Hart Lane to support the High Road West Scheme.

- This report was about maximising housing choice for Love Lane leaseholders- something the Council had committed to do in the HRW Leaseholder Guide.
- The Council could not offer old homes for new, but we can try and make these homes affordable through the equity loan arrangements. No interest was paid on the unowned equity.
- The leaseholders' properties were valued independently to ascertain the market value and an arbitration process is available if needed. The 500 WHL properties cannot be sold for under market value, but the equity loan offer could make them affordable to leaseholders.

The following responses were provided to the specific concerns raised:

- The Council is building replacement homes at High Road West for leaseholders that wish to move into them and will consult residents in the autumn on the HRW Leaseholder Offer which provides a number of rehousing options, including equity loans and leasehold swap.
- The leaseholders' properties were valued independently to ascertain the market value and an arbitration process is available if needed. This was committed to by the Council in the 2014 Leaseholder Guide and is set out in the draft Leaseholder offer.
- The leaseholders are eligible for an equity loan on a property elsewhere in Haringey to help make these homes affordable if they do not wish to move to the High Road West scheme.
- The equity loan offered at 500 White Hart Lane and on the High Road West scheme would be interest free and does not need to be repaid unless the property is sold or transferred.
- The terms of the equity loan as set out in the ERRPP are that the Equity Loan will need to be repaid when the property is transferred to another owner unless the property is inherited by the leaseholder's spouse, civil partner or a person living with them as their husband or wife.
- There are affordable housing conditions that require the Council (or any registered provider) to sell the units according to a valuation which is less than 3 months old, so the council would not be legally able to sell these flats below this value.

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

**RESOLVED**

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

**302. EXEMPT - HOUSING OPTIONS AT 500 WHITE HART LANE TO SUPPORT HIGH ROAD WEST SCHEME**

As per item 289 and the exempt minutes.

**303. EXEMPT - RISK BASED VERIFICATION POLICY (RBV)**

As per the exempt minutes and item 293.

**304. EXEMPT - APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FOR ST MARY'S CLOSE AND NIGHTINGALE LANE**

As per item 294 and the exempt minutes.

**305. EXEMPT - APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FOR POYNTON ROAD**

As per item 295 and the exempt minutes.

**306. EXEMPT - AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR EXTERNAL MAJOR WORKS TO IMPERIAL WHARF ESTATE**

As per item 296 and the exempt minutes.

**307. EXEMPT - AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR EXTERNAL MAJOR WORKS TO THE TURNER AVENUE ESTATE**

As per item 297 and the exempt minutes.

**308. EXEMPT CABINET MINUTES**

**RESOLVED**

To approve the exempt minutes of the meeting held on the 14<sup>th</sup> of July 2020.

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

None

CHAIR: Councillor Joseph Ejiofor

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....