

MINUTES OF MEETING Cabinet HELD ON Tuesday, 10th November, 2020,6.30pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Joseph Ejiofor (Chair), Seema Chandwani, Charles Adje, Mark Blake, Kirsten Hearn, Emine Ibrahim, Sarah James and Matt White

ALSO ATTENDING: Cllr Cawley – Harrison, and Cllr Morris

340. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

341. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Amin and Cllr Bull.

Cllr Hearn joined the meeting at 6.35pm

342. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

343. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Blake declared a personal, non – prejudicial interest in items 21 and 31, by virtue of being a parent of children at Fortismere school.

Following advice from the Deputy Monitoring officer, the Leader declared a personal interest in item 21 and 31.

Councillor Chandwani declared a prejudicial interest in item 9, by virtue of being a leaseholder in the borough. She would be leaving the meeting for this item as well as for the deputation at item 8.

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

There were no representations received.

345. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 13th of October 2020.

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

None

347. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

[Cllr Chandwani left the meeting at 6.42pm]

Deputation in relation to item 9

Mr Michael Hardy and Ms Gaby Vandanberg, Haringey Leaseholders Association, addressed the Committee in relation to item 9 – Alterations Policy for Leaseholders.

Mr Michael Hardy noted that leaseholders cared a lot about their properties and that they sought high standards for works carried out. In relation to consultation, he stated that he would like the policy to be reconsidered as he was not convinced that councillors had been provided with an accurate reflection of leaseholder views. He commented that there should have been more consultation and noted that, in considering the revision to this policy, there had not been a leaseholder panel or a comparison of the policies in other London Boroughs.

Mr Michael Hardy stated that the consultation letter to leaseholders, which implied that there was an inherent risk from windows in relation to fire safety, was misleading as windows did not have fire ratings and there were no fire safety regulations for windows, except for fixed panels. It was noted that there had been no indication to leaseholders that the ability to undertake their own works could result in cost savings and higher quality works. Mr Michael Hardy commented that leaseholders understood concerns about fire safety but considered that protection from fire could be retained based on the existing policy for alterations. He stated that the regulations on fire safety had not changed since 2018 and there was no evidence that doors or windows fitted by leaseholders had a role in causing or exacerbating fires.

Ms Gaby Van Den Bergh noted that the front door to her property was not secure and she did not feel safe in her home. She had applied to have her front door re-fitted in 2017 but had been directed to an incorrect form and then the policy had come under review. She outlined that locksmiths had looked at the door and it was not considered to be secure but she had been unable to obtain a replacement and had reached an impasse. Ms Gaby Vandanberg explained that her shed had been broken into and, as she did not feel that the property was secure, had lived with others. She urged the Cabinet to reconsider the policy and explained that, if leaseholders could afford to install doors and windows in accordance with the fire safety regulations, they should have the choice to do so.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal thanked leaseholders for attending the meeting and for their deputation. She noted that it was important that issues could be raised and urged residents to contact her where they felt that there had been inadequate performance or responsiveness and she would raise it directly with Homes for Haringey. In particular, she urged Ms Gaby Vandanberg to contact her so that this issue could be resolved as soon as possible.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal explained that the Council's primary concern was the safety of residents and that the decision to change the Alterations Policy for Leaseholders was not taken lightly. It was the Council's view that allowing leaseholders and their contractors to install their own windows and doors presented an increased fire risk and the Council had an overwhelming duty as a freeholder to keep all buildings and all residents safe. In relation to windows, the Cabinet Member stated that windows could make a significant contribution to the spread of fire and therefore did pose a concern in relation to fire safety.

The Cabinet Member noted that there had been a suggestion that the Council could allow leaseholders to fit their own windows and doors but could sue leaseholders where fitted items presented a risk to the building. She acknowledged that this was possible but highlighted that, following the Grenfell fire, the Council could not take risks that could lead to fire and physical harm to residents. It was added that the ability to sue would not provide any comfort and that ensuring safety was part of the Council's responsibility as the freeholder.

It was stated that, regardless of a change in policy, the Council was still responsible for the maintenance of buildings, including the windows and doors of each flat. It was noted that, if leaseholders believed that the Council was in breach of its maintenance obligations, they could make a claim of disrepair against the Council. The Cabinet Member encouraged use of this right if it was applicable. In addition, if leaseholders believed that the quality of works carried out was insufficient or that the costs were not reasonable, they could apply to the First Tier Tribunal to seek redress.

In relation to consultation, the Cabinet Member noted that all leaseholders were written to and asked to submit their views on the proposed change to the policy. It was explained that residents' views had been summarised and included in the Cabinet report. She commented that it was unclear how these views had been misrepresented but the Cabinet Member noted that residents were welcome to contact her about this. It was explained that there was not a clear majority of leaseholders in favour of the proposals and that this may not be a very popular decision but it was noted that views were fairly evenly divided between those in support, those against, and those who did not know. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that there was some opposition to this policy and stated that Homes for Haringey had not sought to avoid presenting these views.

The Cabinet Member noted that the previous policy, 'Service Improvements Initiatives for Leaseholders', had been introduced in 2008. She stated that she had not been a councillor at this point but highlighted that the current position was difficult as the risks attached to the previous policy were significant. The Cabinet Member noted that she had gauged views from other boroughs and found that they were taking a similar approach to that set out in the proposed policy; she considered that this was a more

appropriate course of action. It was added that it would still be possible to have conversations about how the policy could be implemented with some options for manoeuvre and choice.

The Leader noted that deputations were not normally permitted to ask additional questions but stated that, without setting a precedent, the deputation could ask an additional question. Ms Gaby Vandanberg noted that, during the past two years, she had been unable to have a secure door fitted. She accepted the fire safety issues in principle but explained that, if she purchased a door, she could be assured that it was secure and fire safe. She stated that her front door was not safe against burglary and she did not believe it was safe against fire. Ms Gaby Van Den Bergh noted that it was possible to get repairs but that, as the door had been replaced within the last 10 years, she was not permitted to have or to purchase a replacement. She enquired what would be done about people in her position who felt unsafe, particularly vulnerable people.

The Cabinet Member noted that these were legitimate questions about Homes for Haringey's responsiveness and ability to resolve situations and she asked Sean McLaughlin, Managing Director Homes for Haringey, to respond. The Managing Director for Homes for Haringey stated that he was not familiar with this individual case but would be happy to investigate the details. In relation to doors in general, he noted that this was one of the reasons for the change in the policy. It was explained that front doors needed to be fire resistant and that it was very difficult to obtain certifications, across the industry, that new doors met the required standards. It was added that the industry was not regulating to a sufficiently high standard and that Haringey Council and Homes for Haringey had commissioned their own tests to ensure that doors were acceptable.

The Leader thanked the deputation for attending and presenting their views.

348. ALTERATIONS POLICY FOR LEASEHOLDERS

[Cllr Chandwani remained absent for the duration of this item.]

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought to ensure that the Council fulfilled its obligations as a 'responsible landlord' in accordance with current legislation and, by removing the permission that allowed leaseholders to procure and install their own windows and doors, sought to take the necessary fire precautions to ensure safety was not compromised. It was noted that some of the information had been covered in the deputation under item 8.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the alterations policy for leaseholders would provide clear guidance on the different categories of work within and outside their homes for which the Council's consent would be required. The implementation of the policy would ensure that external installations adhered to the current regulatory standards and did not compromise fire safety. This would ensure that leaseholders and other residents would be safe in their homes. It was noted that the policy would also provide clear guidance on fees for leaseholders so that they could make fully informed decisions before deciding to undertake alterations to their homes.

The Leader enquired whether this change in policy would mean that Haringey was taking a different approach to other councils or whether this would bring Haringey in line with other councils. The Cabinet Member explained that, where a policy allowed leaseholders to replace windows and doors, it was difficult to understand and regulate works. The Cabinet Member clarified that there was no suggestion that leaseholders were more likely to undertake non-compliant work but highlighted that it would only take one piece of non-compliant work to cause harm. She added that she had spoken to some other London Boroughs and that their policies were broadly similar to the current proposal.

Sean McLaughlin, Managing Director (Homes for Haringey), noted that there was a range of policies across London Boroughs but that, on issues such as alterations and use of communal areas, many authorities were seeking increased restrictions and enforcement. It was explained that the new policy was not just based on comparing practice between boroughs but on advice from the London Fire Brigade and feedback from fires. In relation to front doors, practice could depend on the status of an individual Council's replacement and fitting programme and which doors they were permitted to fit. It was explained that, under Building Regulations, existing doors were held to the standard that applied when they were fitted but newly fitted doors were required to comply with new standards. So, although there were some differences between councils, most councils were seeking higher standards and a tougher enforcement approach.

The Cabinet Member noted that there were some variations between boroughs; she had spoken to one borough which had never permitted leaseholders to fit their own windows but did permit leaseholders to test a door and ask the council to fit it. However, she highlighted that some installations, including safety grilles on windows and security doors, could put residents at risk as they made it difficult or impossible for the London Fire Brigade to enter properties in emergencies. It was noted that there was a broad approach across London to prevent these types of installations. The Cabinet Member stated that it was the Council's responsibility to recognise if residents did not feel safe and to increase assurance and other work to ensure that the doors fitted were safe and that there were other, broader safety measures in place.

Cllr Cawley-Harrison highlighted two cases in his ward where works by Homes for Haringey had been poor quality or had never been undertaken. He enquired how residents could be assured that the standard of works was sufficient and that they were receiving a fair price when there was one provider for works. The Cabinet Member noted that it was important to receive feedback on works and for councillors to raise these issues; she stated that she raised constant challenges on these types of issues and she was sure that other councillors did the same, particularly councillors who sat on the Homes for Haringey Board. It was commented that, when issues arose, there were avenues to provide constant challenge on quality. The Cabinet Member acknowledged the merits of the open market but stated that this did not always ensure the highest quality of materials or works.

The Managing Director (Homes for Haringey) noted that he would not comment on the individual cases mentioned as he would need to look into the issues but he acknowledged some deficiencies in works and standards over time and that the levels of complaints were higher than he would like. It was explained that a number of

actions were underway to make improvements and from the Council side there had been support to do this. The Council was strengthening the team that oversaw the relationship between the Council and Homes for Haringey with increased expertise in buildings and in property services to provide appropriate challenge and support. It was stated that on the Homes for Haringey Board there was an independent board member who had responsibility for building safety for large housing associations and was chairing a group on compliance with safety standards in homes.

In addition, Homes for Haringey had their own health and safety board and on membership there was representation from the British Safety Council to ensure a level of independent assurance.

The Council were funding growth in the management of property services and this week there would be recruitment to a new Executive Director for Property Service's for Homes for Haringey. Also, later in the month, there would a new post of Director of Building Compliance . There had already been recruitment to a building safety manager position that will enable Homes for 'Haringey to meet the incoming regulations for high rise blocks.

With regards to costs, the Managing Director (Homes for Haringey) stated that he was not convinced that it was possible to get the very high safety and quality standards applied by Homes for Haringey elsewhere. He added that leaseholders could apply to the First Tier Tribunal for redress if costs were not felt reasonable. Homes for Haringey would always need to demonstrate that their costs were reasonable.

In relation to front doors, it was noted that weaknesses had been identified in the self-regulation of the industry and there had been some delays in replacement works as it had been difficult to find doors that were completely satisfactory and met the 30 minutes burns test that should be applied. It was explained that the Council were supporting Homes for Haringey to commission their own burn tests on doors and the Director was awaiting the results of this.

The Managing Director for Homes for Haringey outlined that, legally or ethically, they could not proceed with replacement works on the basis of assurance from the industry when there was reason to believe that this should be doubted.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the revised 'Alterations Policy for Leaseholders' regarding the improvement works that leaseholders are permitted to make to their property as set out in appendix 1 of the policy.
2. To approve the introduction of a requirement that, where a leaseholder's external windows and doors need to be changed, all such installations are to be carried out by the Council and its approved contractors.
3. To approve the fee structure detailed in paragraphs 6.13, 6.16 and appendix 1 of the policy which will be subject to an annual review.

4. To note the process for deciding whether landlord consent can be granted as detailed in paragraphs 6.6 to 6.12 and appendix 1 of the policy.

Reason for decision

The recommendations in section 3 are being proposed to ensure there is a clear and transparent process in place for allowing leaseholders to improve their properties. In providing consent, the Council will give consideration to the effect works may have on the structural integrity of Council owned buildings and the possible impact of these works on other tenants and leaseholders.

The recommendations also seek to ensure that all external installations have been manufactured and fitted correctly, in accordance with current regulatory standards and do not compromise fire safety. This is because the Council, as landlord, is ultimately responsible for the health and safety of all residents within Council owned buildings.

The recommendation also seeks to provide leaseholders with clarity on the fees payable for obtaining landlord's permission for alterations to their home.

Alternative options considered

The only alternative option was to continue with the existing 'Alterations Policy for Leaseholders' which was not feasible due to the Housing Health and Safety Rating System Regulations 2005 conferring powers on local authorities to ensure fire safety in occupied buildings. It is ultimately the Council's responsibility to have robust processes in place to ensure doors and windows are installed to current regulatory standards in the event of a fire.

349. SCHOOL STREETS PLAN

[The meeting paused for Cllr Chandwani to re-enter at 7.17pm]

The Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Equalities and Leisure introduced the report which sought approval for the School Streets Plan policy framework, and how School Streets would be implemented outside the schools across the borough. The report further set out the schools that the Council would focus on with its capital and match funding to deliver this over the next 4 years.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that London's air pollution was particularly harmful to children and young people in Haringey. Poor air quality was also an issue of inequality, with those in the east of Haringey suffering the worst effects of poor air quality. As well as this, children were more likely to be the pedestrian casualties in traffic accidents and were put at more risk by cars than other groups.

The Cabinet Member noted that some parents were weary of using public transport during the pandemic which was understood. However, it was hoped that this situation would change. People would be encouraging to walk, cycle or take the bus to school. This action would hugely benefit children's health and wellbeing, and peace of mind.

At the start of the COVID pandemic, it was quickly realised that air quality and health levels played a part in the ability to fight the virus. There was also a need to create space, where people could socially distance safely while dropping off and picking up children. As a result of COVID, many measures were put in place to assist students and their parents to socially distance.

The Council considered 20 streets to designate as school streets before the end of the financial year and another 10 in the next few years after that. That was half the total number of primary schools in the borough.

The Council were actively engaged in looking at sources of funding so that it could continue to do more School Streets. As there was a move towards low traffic neighbourhoods there would also be an opportunity for schools, in these streets, to become School Streets.

The administration would endeavour to explore every possible opportunity to fund School Streets as it believed this was extremely important for children in the borough.

The Cabinet Member set out the reasons for prioritising junior schools which was because young lungs were more damaged by terrible air and it was hoped that one day all the borough's schools would have School Streets.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley - Harrison and Cllr Morris, the following was noted:

- The first 20 School Streets would aim to be completed by the end of the financial year, March 2021.
- The report set out the criteria considered when prioritising the School Streets.
- In relation to the proposed number of School Streets in 5 years, it was acknowledged that this was not high enough but, as set in the report, the Council would be pursuing as many funding sources as available to increase this number. Some funding had been created out of the capital programme and the Cabinet Member was constantly pursuing additional funding. As set out above, School Streets could be delivered through low traffic neighbourhood schemes which the Council would hopefully be developing.
- It was noted that high car usage, outside schools, indicated that the school may not be engaged in the active travel programme. The Council would want the school to have completed all that was within its powers to support active travel and education for parents before a School Street was taken forward.
- With regards to the one-way traffic increasing road speeds outside specific schools and enforcement. The ambition is to close streets and this would be enforced through ANPR (automatic number plate recognition) cameras. These cameras would support taking forward enforcement action and help in reducing speeds in the area. In noting the wider traffic management systems around Schools Streets, which may propose one way roads. The individual designs for each of the schools in the Project Centre Report is a recommendation. Before

final design is confirmed there would be wider community engagement undertaken to ensure local objectives were achieved. With the aim of final measures being supported by the schools and the local community.

Cllr Morris highlighted some discrepancies in the data contained in the appendix concerning school numbers:

- The number of pupils at Highgate primary school which was listed as 1724 pupils, but this number was 420 pupils
- The number of Bounds Green Primary school students was noted in the report as 268 but this number just seemed to only indicate the infant school and not the junior school numbers
- The DFE website indicated that there were a third more pupils at Stroud Green school than the figures indicated in the report.

Agreed this information would be considered and rectified.

- With regards to vulnerable residents that live in a School Street and that need to be visited by carers, there was a query of whether they would receive an exemption to park in the street at the time the street was closed. It was noted that in the first School Street implemented, there was work completed to understand the residents living in the street that might need some support and how to put these actions in place. There were exemptions offered in relation to who can come in and out of the School Street. This did include blue badge registered holders and it could also be explored, adding in to the ANPR vehicle registration system, the number plates of carers that need to come in and out of the School Street. But the ambition is to stop all traffic around the school at opening and closing.
- There was a query on how the estimates on children being driven to schools were arrived at. In response it was noted that all schools, that were engaged in active travel, did hands up surveys on how they got to school so this was a reliable source of information and the survey was undertaken at least once a year and provided to the Council. This also fed into the Transport for London funding package applications. Schools were encouraged by the Council to undertake active travel behaviour and awareness raising.

In relation to the timing of bringing this report forward in November instead of March 2020, there were some issues that could not be resolved in time for the March meeting and this report was then planned for the June Cabinet meeting, after the Mayoral elections. However, at that time the pandemic response was prioritised.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the policy, management, and delivery approach to school streets as laid out in this report.

2. To adopt the recommendations as set out in the plan and agree to deliver the School Streets programme over the next 4 years, based around designs within the School Streets Report (appendix 1).
3. To agree to fund these measures on the schools listed in Section 7.12.2 and 7.12.3, from the Councils Capital Programme, and secure external funding sources to compliment this funding. If external funding cannot be secured, then the project will be scaled back to fit within the available funding envelope.
4. To give the Director for Environment and Neighbourhoods, authorisation to sign off the final designs of the school streets and the associated Traffic Management Orders, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member.

Reasons for decision

Delivering the School Streets Plan will contribute to outcome 9, objective c of the borough plan – specifically the commitment to improve air quality around schools. It will also contribute to outcome 10, objective an of the borough plan, which aims to make Haringey a more attractive place for active travel.

The School Streets Plan was created in response to a motion passed by Full Council in March 2019.

The plan has been created so that Haringey Council can target school streets at those schools most in need.

The plan sets out a standard framework to understand Haringey's school streets programme, allowing for consistent, successful and efficient delivery of these measures.

Alternative options considered

Do Nothing

Not approving the school streets plan.

This was rejected as it would mean the Council failed to deliver on the motion passed by Full Council in March 2019. And failure to deliver school streets would not achieve the objectives in the Borough Plan.

Implement school streets without a plan in place

This was rejected as school streets are targeted measures aimed at improving specific issues. To do this would mean that resources were not targeted in the most effective ways and that schools could receive school streets on an unfair basis.

This would mean that the Council was not doing everything it can to improve air quality at schools, improve road safety and increase levels of active travel.

350. ADMISSION TO SCHOOLS – PROPOSED ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2022/23

The Leader introduced the report which set out the proposed admission arrangements for entry to school in the academic year 2022/23 for Haringey's community (A community school in England and Wales is a type of state-funded school in which the local education authority (LEA) employs the school's staff, is responsible for the school's admissions and owns the school's estate.) and voluntary controlled (VC), nursery, infant, junior, primary, secondary and sixth form settings.

It was noted that every local authority must also publish a co-ordinated scheme which sets out the procedures all schools and academies must follow to co-ordinate the admission process for the reception and secondary transfer admissions round to ensure that all residents are offered a school place.

Approval was sought to commence a six-week period of statutory consultation. The details of the proposed consultation was set out in paragraph 3 of the attached report.

RESOLVED

1. To agree to commence consultation on the proposed admission arrangements, including the proposed in-year admissions scheme for the academic year 2022/23;
2. To agree to commence consultation on the proposed In-Year Fair Access Protocol which will be referred to as IYFAP in this report which, if agreed by Cabinet on 10 November 2020, will come into force on 1 March 2021;
3. To agree that the co-ordinated scheme for the admission of children to maintained primary and secondary schools as set out in Appendix 8 of this report can be published on the Haringey website on 1 January 2021;
4. To note that the proposed consultation on the proposed admission arrangements is proposed to take place between 24 November 2020 and 5 January 2021 as scheduled;
5. To note that following the consultation, a report will be prepared summarising the representations received from the consultation and a decision on the final admission arrangements and the In-Year Fair Access Protocol will be taken by Cabinet in February 2021.

Reasons for decision

The purpose of the proposed consultation is as follows To ensure that our proposed admission arrangements for 2022/23 are consulted upon and the co-ordinated scheme is set in accordance with the mandatory provisions of the School Admissions Code 2014.

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

We consult on our admission arrangements annually irrespective of whether or not there is a proposed change to the arrangements (The Schools Admission Code 2014 (para 1.42) sets out that when changes are proposed to admission arrangements, all admission authorities must consult on their admission arrangements (including any supplementary information form) that will apply for admission applications the following school year. Where the admission arrangements have not changed from the previous year there is no requirement to consult, subject to the requirement that admission authorities must consult on their admission arrangements at least once every 7 years, even if there have been no changes during that period.). This is to ensure transparency and openness on the contents of our arrangements and to allow parents, carers and other stakeholders who might not have previously been interested in admission arrangements (perhaps because they has no children of school age) to make a representation which can then be considered as part of the determination of the arrangements.

Alternative options considered

We are required by the School Admissions Code 2014 (para 1.42 – 1.45 of the Code) to carry out any consultation on our admission arrangements between 1 October and 31 January each year for a minimum period of six weeks. We are not proposing any changes to the proposed admission arrangements for the year 2022/23. As set out in para 4.3 above, we consult annually on our arrangements irrespective of whether we are proposing any changes, to allow transparency and openness in the process.

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

351. DETAILS OF THE UNIVERSITY SCHEME FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

The Leader introduced the report which set out the further details on the delivery of the Haringey Fairer Education Fund to young people in the borough for 2021. The scheme existed to open up more opportunities, for the borough's young people, and give them more choice on their future.

There were a number of interventions outlined to support children from some of the most deprived families in Haringey, including the creation of a bursary grant that Haringey's young people can apply for. It was noted that the deadline for applying to the bursary for the 2021 cohort was today [10th of November]

The policy was about fairness and the fund aimed to provide young people from financially disadvantaged backgrounds additional support to go on to university and more financial security once they get there.

The Leader believed that the Council can make a contribution to make university more affordable for low income families and this decision enabled this.

RESOLVED

To agree the detail of the scheme as set out in paragraph 6 of this report, including the funding associated with the scheme and the panel structure for the decision making on those students who will receive the bursary.

Alternative options considered

Several other options were considered:

A scheme covering the full cost of tuition fees – rejected as it did not support the young person's month to month living expenses and because the scheme proposed has a broader reach in terms of young people.

A Haringey student loan was rejected because it would not reduce debt for the students which is already a perceived barrier to accessing higher education.

Reasons for decision

Haringey is committed to creating greater equality, including in education and opportunities for access to higher education.

The interventions in this Haringey Fairer Education Funding scheme are designed in the context of wider inequalities. They aim not just to support young people who are considering the affordability of university, but also to support them as they carry out their studies and with their entry into the job market afterwards, through the use of mentoring and work experience. Fuller details of how young people would be supported as part of the scheme is set out in the July 2020 Cabinet report.

352. SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT - PARKING PERMITS AND CHARGES - ULEZ READINESS

The Cabinet Member for Transformation and the Public Realm introduced the report which clarified that an increase of £10 would apply to all annual parking permit charge bands following the review of parking charges and in line with the associated statutory consultation.

RESOLVED

1. To agree a flat rate £10 increase to all annual parking permit charges. That this increase and surcharges agreed by Cabinet in September will apply pro rata to the six monthly parking permits. Those charges were set out in appendix 1.
2. To authorise officers to make the necessary changes to the Traffic Management Orders.
3. To agree that those changes and the changes agreed by Cabinet in September become effective at the point of the new Parking IT system becoming live.

Reasons for decision

This decision is required in order to clarify the parking charges to be implemented following statutory consultation undertaken in June 2020.

Alternative options considered

The alternative option of doing nothing would leave an inconsistency in the Cabinet's decision and the parking charges that were intended to be implemented following statutory consultation.

353. BROADWATER FARM DESIGN CONTRACT VARIATION

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought approval to vary the existing contract with KCA who were the Design Team leading design proposals for the Broadwater Farm Estate. The variation would cover the costs of surveys required to support detailed design proposals and future additional costs, including those associated with the impact of COVID-19 on the programme.

It was noted that delivering high quality replacement and new homes alongside wider improvements to Broadwater Farm, was a priority for the Council. This is why it had commissioned KCA to work with the community to develop design proposals.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the initial design work had shown that the Moselle School site offered an exciting opportunity to deliver new council owned homes on this large, vacant site. As such, the Council were seeking to accelerate the design process for this site to secure new homes for residents at a quicker pace.

It was further noted that the acute need to deliver new social rented homes, was very much more apparent in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. COVID-19 had a devastating impact on communities, with the impact and burden falling heaviest on those who were already most in need. By seeking to bring forward design proposals for new housing, the Council were accelerating the: delivery of new homes for and training opportunities, which would be secured through the delivery of these new homes.

Following a question from Cllr Cawley- Harrison it was noted that the Council were aware of the public realm challenges faced as a result of the overall design of the estate and the historic issues concerning the connectivity between blocks and on the

ground. The Council were aware of the improvements needed to the environment and were working with residents on the urban design framework proposals. This included:

- considering how to make improvements that residents can actively see in the public realm,
- looking at the open spaces across the estate,
- considering movement across the estate,
- how to tackle crime and ASB,
- providing welcoming entrances at ground floors.

The service had started engagement in August and had positive feedback on the changes that they wanted to see.

In addition, it was noted that the wider work on decent homes would now include considering improvements to communal areas.

Further to considering exempt information at item 26,

RESOLVED

1. To agree to vary the existing contract with the KCA to include the following:
 - a) Extend the scope of their current commission to include developing detailed design proposals for the Moselle School site to RIBA stage 3;
 - b) Cover the costs of additional surveys
2. To approve the contingency amount set out in the exempt part of the report and to delegate to the Director of Housing, Regeneration & Planning, authority to approve the use of the contingency.
3. To approve the variation sum of £439,174 (excluding contingency), bringing the total contract value to £1,835,531.60.

Reasons for decision

The reasons for seeking to vary the existing KCA contract are set out below:
Moselle School Site.

The original commission required KCA to develop design proposals to RIBA stage 1 for three opportunity sites, which had been identified on the periphery of the Broadwater Farm Estate. One of these sites included the vacant Moselle School site. Since initiating work on the site, it is clear that designs for this site should be expedited as it offers substantial opportunity to deliver new homes (c.60-70 unit), including new council owned social rented homes for our residents at a quicker pace. By varying the existing KCA contract to include RIBA stage 2 and 3, the detailed design proposals can be developed at the same time as the detailed design proposals for the Tangmere and Northolt sites, allowing for design efficiencies and a holistic approach to development.

Varying the contract sum

The contract sum needs to be varied, to not only allow for the costs of the detailed design proposals for the Moselle School site, but to also ensure that the costs associated with surveys and delays due to COVID-19 19 can be accounted for.

A number of surveys are required to ensure that the detailed design proposals can be bought forward for new homes and improvements across the Broadwater Farm Estate. Three quotes have been obtained by KCA for each survey required to ensure value for money, however the quotes have come in higher than originally forecast and a number of additional surveys need to be undertaken, particularly in relation to the Moselle River and to facilitate conversations with the Environment Agency. As such the contract sum for the KCA contract needs to be amended accordingly.

The programme for the design work has been impacted by COVID-19 19. This is primarily due to the fact that engagement with the community was put on hold whilst the country entered into lockdown. Whilst Officers and the Design Team have worked hard to minimise the impact of pandemic on the programme, it is the case that the design programme has been extended. The current extension of the programme has been contained within the existing fee schedule, but any further delay to the programme, which is likely given recent government announcements, will result in increased expenditure to the Design Team and increased costs to the Council.

Alternative options considered

Undertaking a procurement exercise to secure detailed design proposals for the Moselle School Site

Officers considered undertaking a new procurement exercise to secure architects to take the Moselle School site through to detailed planning. However, following consideration this option is not being taken forward as KCA are best placed to progress the detailed design proposals. This is because KCA have already undertaken a substantial amount of work on the site, including undertaking detailed site analysis, developing emerging design proposals through the RIBA stage 1 process (RIBA stage 1 to complete in November) and ensuring these designs link and conform to the emerging wider Urban Design Framework being developed for the Broadwater Farm Estate. It is also the case that undertaking a procurement process would risk losing design efficiencies and would cause substantial delay, including up to 3 months for the procurement process and up to 2 months for project initiation and site analysis.

Not increasing the contract sum

The Council will not be able to progress the designs for new homes and the Urban Design Framework if the contract sum is not increased to reflect the cost of the surveys required.

354. FUTURE APPROACH TO COUNCIL RECRUITMENT

The Leader introduced the report which set out the future approach to Council recruitment following the end of the current contract with Hays in 2021. The new

approach would focus on providing more employment opportunities for Haringey residents, reducing reliance on recruitment agencies to source staff and achieving value for money.

The Leader outlined that the Hays contract for recruitment to permanent and temporary worker roles ends on 21 July 2021. Permanent recruitment was being brought in-house and would be delivered by the Council's enhanced Human Resources team in April 2021.

The Council has three key objectives that it aimed to achieve when considering future options for recruiting temporary staff going forward. These were:

- Increasing the number of Haringey residents able to benefit from employment opportunities at the Council – in line with our approach to Community Wealth Building.
- Reducing the amount public money spent via recruitment agencies by building our own capacity to recruit temporary staff directly including via Haringey Works.
- Ensure value for money for the Council in all Council recruitment activity.

It was considered that moving to a 'Neutral Vendor' supplier contract would support the delivery of these policy objectives.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley- Harrison, the following was noted:

With regards to the changes in place to take forward withdrawal from the Hays contract, the Council were now in a position to procure a better contract and put in place an alternative which was better, costly more effective, and delivered to more Haringey residents.

In relation to the cost of the contract, it was set out in the report that the majority of the cost was salaries as the company that completes the recruitment of temporary workers also pays the salaries of workers. Therefore, this was not profit for the contractor. The Council would be saving £800k from this new process and this will bring £3.2m savings over 4 years and enable more of this spend to remain local.

When exploring the type of staff recruited temporarily, there were a lot of social workers and this was a fluid market for recruitment. However, it was important to ensure access to vital staff to look after residents.

The ultimate objective was to recruit more Haringey residents and make working for the Council a viable and achievable objective. This also helped save money for the council and enabled spend to remain local.

The benchmarking of the success of this policy could be taken forward by scrutiny. However, the Leader outlined that the more local people that are recruited the more successful the policy would be. This decision would involve engaging more with local recruitment agents and the council were also seeking to create a route into permanent recruitment and permanent employment by building a talent pool. This would further enable more local working and more local spending.

After considering exempt information at item 27,

RESOLVED

1. To approve the strategy to build the capability of Haringey Works to become a major supplier of candidates for temporary and permanent roles at the Council, through the creation of a talent pool, as set out in paragraphs 6.4 to 6.6.
2. To approve that the Council works with the Haringey Employment Forum and local employment agencies to bring them into the supply chain of the new contract as set out in paragraph 6.7.
3. To approve, in accordance with Contract Standing Orders 7.01 (b) (selecting one or more contractors from a Framework) and 9.07.1(d), the award of a contract for the provision of Temporary Agency Workers for a period of 4 years up to a contract value of £108,000,000 to the organisation identified as Option 1 in the exempt part of this report. This sum is inclusive of all salaries paid to Council temporary staff and fees.

Reasons for decision

The Council's current contract expires in July 2021 and a procurement process has been undertaken to ensure a new contract can be placed that meets the Council's current requirements

The new contract will allow the Council to realise savings estimated at around £3,200,000 over the 4-year period of the contact based on current agency worker usage.

The new contract will enable the Council to build in-house temporary recruitment capability in a manageable way, focused on recruitment of local people and giving them priority access to opportunities.

Alternative Options Considered.

Do Nothing

This option was discounted as it would result in the Council having to go to the open market on each requirement to fill temporary positions with the risk of incurring higher fees and greater risk of the position not being filled.

355. VARIATION OF CONTRACT TO KIND DIAMOND BUILD CONSORTIUM ON THE LINDEN HOUSE PROJECT

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced the report which sought agreement to vary an award of contract to Kind Diamond Build Consortium to

complete the refurbishment of Linden House which now offered high quality, flexible and bespoke accommodation to four local residents.

The Cabinet Member was proud of the work being completed to enable people with a range of complex needs to live in the borough as a welcome part of their local community and in accommodation which had been developed to meet their requirements.

Further to considering exempt information at item 28,

RESOLVED

To approve a variation of contract to Kind Diamond Build Consortium to increase their contract value to £1,098,872.

Reasons for Decision

During the course of construction there have been instructions issued by the Contract Administrator to address issues discovered on site, consequently the construction value has increased from that of tender award. All instructions have been approved under strict change control procedures.

The key instructions involve structural works to the roof, removal of the chimney stack, rebuilding the bay at the front of the property, provision of structural uPVC windows in lieu of timber windows and the supply of alternative fire doors.

Alternative Options Considered

The option of doing nothing would mean that future invoices received for work already carried out would not be able to be paid.

Initiating a new procurement activity to undertake the varied works would not have been cost efficient for the Council having a well-established contractor on site and would have severely impacted on the completion of this project which was considered a particular priority project during the current Covid-19 pandemic.

Furthermore, to have seen two contractors on site would have created risks around co-ordination and safety and likely have invalidated certain warranties.

356. VARIATION OF CONTRACT AWARD AND ASSOCIATED PURCHASE ORDER ON HORNSEY LIBRARY REFURBISHMENT PROJECT

The Cabinet Member for Communities introduced the report which set out a way forward with regards to the completion of the main refurbishment works at Hornsey Library. Completion of the additional scope of works allowed the Library to be re-opened to the wider community with the new facilities and refurbished interior spaces available for use by November 2020.

The Cabinet Member was pleased to present this report, which signaled the Council's continued commitment not only to retaining, but to enhancing and maintaining Council

libraries. Through this refurbishment project, which had continued throughout the Covid-19 pandemic, the Council had been able to bring back a Grade 2 listed building to its former glory and to modernise its interior for 21st century users.

The report detailed the reasons for this request for a variation to the existing contract and for extra funding to complete the necessary works. A number of these works only became evident during the construction period and it was felt it was sensible to progress them now rather than coming back to them later, which could have necessitated a further period of library closure.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley – Harrison, the following information was noted:

- The Cabinet Member agreed to provide a response in writing concerning the potential availability of funding to improve the exterior areas of the library.
- There was a lessons learned review being embarked on to review the progress of this library and this information would be considered in the refurbishment of the other borough libraries. This was a grade two listed building, and it was a complex process to undertake the condition survey and to process the works. However, officers were keen to learn the lessons and this would include considering the level of contingency and spend as well on this project.

Further to considering exempt information 29,

RESOLVED

1. To approve a variation of contract to T&B Contractors Ltd for the external envelope repairs/enhancement, internal remodelling, refurbishment and fit out of Hornsey Library to the value of £310,284.43 (excluding contingency) thus increasing their original Contract value from £2,300,369.42 to £2,610,653.85 (excluding contingency).
2. To approve the contingency sum set out in Part B (Exempt Report) to this paper.
3. To delegate the authority to approve the use of the remaining contingency sum to the Assistant Director for Commissioning.

Reasons for decision

The significant number of unexpected building fabric and infrastructure issues, additional compliance works, and client requested changes have all resulted in an increase to the original tender award value.

The key variations comprise of:

- Internal floor screed replacement
- Replacement of incoming water mains supply pipework

- Services riser containment and internal fall protection
- Adaptation of the building structural frame to enable new glazing installation
- Removal of redundant services
- Installation of a new mains power distribution board and additional earthing capacity
- Reconfiguration of internal layouts,

The additional variations were implemented during this contract as it was deemed less disruptive to the Library Service and more cost effective as specialist contractors are currently on site, thus resulting in economies of scale and savings in contractor preliminary costs. Furthermore, it negated the need to postpone some elements of the works and for these works be procured separately.

Alternative options considered

A do-nothing option would mean that the Council would be unable to make payment for future invoices received and would run the risk of the Council being in breach of its contractual obligations.

The incorporation of the compliance variations into this project will enable the building to be handed back to the library service and will enable Building Regulation approval and the discharge of planning conditions.

Initiating a new procurement activity to undertake the varied works would not have been cost efficient for the Council whilst having a well-established contractor on site. This approach would have severely impacted on the completion of this project during the current Covid-19 pandemic and would have resulted in a greater disruption to the library service.

Furthermore, the presence of two contractors on site would have created risks around co-ordination and Health and Safety responsibilities and likely have invalidated certain warranties.

357. THE NOVATION OF THE REMAINING PART OF THE SAP CONTRACT FOR SCANNING SERVICES

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Planning introduced the report which sought to novate the contract for the SAP managed service to replace the company serving as the Council's main contractor by another company within the HCL group. This would allow for a continuation of the service for scanning services only until 31/5/21 when the contract expired.

In response to a question from Cllr Cawley – Harrison,

- Assurance was provided that the costs of the scanning services was less than £20k a year and it was due to this service being part of a larger contract of over £500k, that this required Cabinet approval. The Council were moving away from the contract with HCL and would be making a saving on scanning services going forward.

- It was clarified that the scanning services were needed to process invoices received by the Council and these can come in many formats and through email or by post. There can be thousands of records received which need to be electronically recorded and passed through the SAP finance system.

RESOLVED

1. To grant fresh approval for the novation of the SAP Managed Service Contract from Axon Solutions Ltd T/A HCL Axon to HCL Technologies UK Ltd under Contract Standing Orders 10.03 and 9.07.1(d).
2. To note that the contract value over the life of the contract, from the contract start on 16/9/13 until the contract's current scanning service expires on 31/5/21, is £4,321,781.00.

Reasons for decision

Cabinet was informed in Nov. 2019 that Axon Solutions T/A HCL Axon was being wound up as part of a restructure to reduce a complicated structure of the European companies within the HCL group and it would no longer exist. Axon Solutions T/A HCL Axon was proposing to novate the contract from them to another company within the HCL group, HCL Technologies UK Ltd, to allow for a continuation of the service provided. HCL's parent company in India, HCL Technologies Ltd was, and would remain after the proposed contract novation, a co-contractor with the relevant HCL subsidiary. Cabinet was asked to approve the novation and did. However, the restructure was delayed and in the meanwhile the contract was extended, varied and the value increased by £197,334.00. The HCL group now wish to proceed. However, because of the change in the scope and value of the contract it is thought that fresh approval should be submitted as they will remain a supplier until May 2021.

Alternative options considered

Axon Solutions Ltd said that we are required to novate the contract as they are winding down the company due to a restructure.

Contract termination was considered but were unable to terminate all services as we require their scanning services until the contract end.

358. EXTENSION AND VARIATION OF THE CONTRACT FOR THE INTEGRATED HEALTH IMPROVEMENT/WELLNESS SERVICE

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced the report which sought Cabinet approval for an extension and variation of the existing contract for the integrated health improvement/wellness service, named One You Haringey, in accordance with Contract Standing Order 10.02.1 b.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the 'One You' Haringey service assists residents to achieve this by supporting them to make healthier behaviour choices. The current

Covid-19 pandemic had highlighted the impact of behavioural choices on health. Reducing alcohol intake, being physically active, maintaining a healthy weight and quitting smoking are associated with reductions in complications from Covid-19. For example, a Public Health England (PHE) report in 2020, found that there is potentially a higher risk of COVID-19 related death with increasing BMI and even where studies have adjusted for confounding factors such as age, sex, measures of socio-economic status (SES), ethnicity and co-morbidities, the relationship between excess weight and COVID-19 risk has persisted. Smokers in addition, had an increased risk of contracting respiratory infections (such as Covid-19) and due to an increased likelihood of underlying smoking conditions, can experience more severe outcomes from Covid-19.

RESOLVED

To approve the implementation of Contract Standing Order 10.02.1 (b) and authorise the variation and extension of contract for the provision of an integrated health improvement/wellness service (One You Haringey) to Reed Wellbeing Ltd for a period of 18 months from 1 April 2021 to 30 September 2022.

The contract value over the 18-month extension of the contract is £750, 000 (The total value over the life of the contract is therefore £3,250,000)

Reasons for decision

The existing service, which was awarded by Cabinet in 2015, following an open tender process will expire in March 2021. The Contractor Reed Wellbeing Ltd is fully meeting the expectations of the contract. During the pandemic, the provider has worked with the council to find new ways to deliver services to ensure that residents continue to access health improvement services despite lockdown and with social distancing.

The procurement process for this contract was due to commence during the financial year of 2020-21 but due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the market is currently unstable and arguably if a new provider were appointed they would face barriers to establishing a new service, potentially jeopardising work being undertaken to improve the health of our most vulnerable residents.

Alternative options considered

Do Nothing - The Council could choose to no longer commission this service. This is seen to be damaging to residents especially those from economically disadvantaged groups, for the following reasons: this is an extensive, specialist programme which reaches inactive residents living in the most deprived areas of the borough. This includes people whose proclivity to develop a range of long-term conditions is exacerbated by their smoking, weight, and inactivity patterns. There is a particular risk to the Council's delivery of the Borough Plan, in regard to achieving its desired outcome of increasing the healthy life expectancy of residents, enabling them to live healthy and fulfilling lives, and staying active. To achieve the Borough Plan objectives, we need to ensure that those most in need of prevention services are able to access help to reduce alcohol consumption, quit smoking, manage their weight, and increase their physical activity levels. Reduction in the risk of development of long-term

conditions by increasing exercise and reducing smoking and obesity levels are key components of keeping residents healthy and connected to their community. There is a reputational risk as GPs are the major referrers to this service and are likely to raise its loss with our partners, North Central London Clinical Commissioning Group (NCL CCG).

The Council could recommission this service – going to market for the current service was explored and rejected. Being aware of the critical nature of the work that One You Haringey have been commissioned to deliver they have invested significant time in establishing strong working relationships with various departments in the local NHS Trusts, GP surgeries – where they use surgery facilities to deliver clinics and are working with other local delivery partners such as physical activity session providers, the Bridge Renewal Trust and the Tottenham Hotspur Foundation. One You Haringey have improved the diversity of clients who use the service with forty seven percent of clients identifying their ethnicity as Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) and non-white. Moreover, attempting to go out to tender during the pandemic would not be the Councils interest as many suppliers are already facing difficulties surviving in the market, and the ability to respond successfully to a tender would be impaired, as well as, trying to establish a new service in a socially distanced market means it would more highly unlikely they would be able to meet service targets in the contract time frame given the period it would take to mobilise and establish service provision. Further, disrupting progress at this point to start again with a provider with no knowledge, skills or history of working within the borough could have an extremely detrimental impact on both progress and the reach of the service to engage with diverse communities in Haringey.

359. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR HOMES FOR HARINGEY STOCK SURVEY

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the Cabinet report which requested approval to award a contract to undertake a 100% condition survey of the Council's housing stock. In line with good practice, a new survey was needed, and five years since the previous survey was undertaken. There were also a number of additional data requirements in respect of building safety and energy efficiency which the new survey would address. The survey would provide accurate and comprehensive data; enabling Homes for Haringey to effectively maintain and improve the housing stock; inform decisions about investment priorities, as well ensure that the Council meets all of its statutory landlord obligations.

Further to 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 successful tenderer identified in exempt Appendix A to carry out a comprehensive stock condition survey of the Councils housing assets. This will be for the sum of £539,860.

2. To approve the issue of a letter of intent for an amount of up to, but not exceeding £53,986, which represented a 10% of the contract sum.
3. To approve the delegation recommended in section 4 of the exempt information.

Reasons for decision

Homes for Haringey requires Cabinet approval to award a contract to undertake a stock condition survey of all the Council's housing stock. The objective of the stock condition survey is to provide comprehensive and accurate stock condition data that will enable Homes for Haringey to effectively manage the Council's housing stock. At the end of the survey programme, together with the full dataset and photographs, the surveying company will also provide a report setting out the key information from the surveys.

At the end of the survey programme an updated 30-year asset investment plan will enable Homes for Haringey to effectively plan long term investment in Haringey Council's housing stock.

The tender process was carried out in accordance with the London Borough of Haringey's London Construction Programme (LCP) Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) that incorporate price and quality. The successful compliant bidder scored the highest in relation to these criteria and this is outlined in Appendix A.

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 surveys. Homes for Haringey sought support and advice from Haringey Council's Strategic Procurement and determined the London Construction Programme Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) 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 effectively plan its future capital investment in the housing stock, in accordance with the Asset Management Strategy 2018-23.

360. FORTISMERE SCHOOL – WAIVER TO CONTRACT STANDING ORDERS TO VARIATION A CONTRACT FOR PHASE 3 FIRE PRECAUTION AND EXTERNAL FABRIC HEALTH AND SAFETY WORKS - CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARD

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which sought approval for a variation of award to Diamond Build Plc to undertake Phase 3 Fire Precaution and External Fabric Health and Safety Works pursuant to Contract Standing Order 10.02.1 (d) at Fortismere school.

The Cabinet Member outlined that Haringey's Major Projects were commissioned in July 2020 to deliver urgent compliance and condition work to Fortismere's sixth form accommodation (windows, fire compartmentation/fire doors, emergency lighting etc). The driver for the work had been Health and Safety inspection which determined the building unsuitable with the potential for not being available for the start of the Autumn Term.

To accommodate this need, officers procured a local contractor to mobilise under a waiver of contract standing orders as there was insufficient time to detail the scope, undertake a mini competition and complete. Diamond Build were duly appointed.

It was noted that Phase 1 was to erect and hire scaffolding – this enabled council to make safe and to provide a platform to inspections and fully scope the works.

It was further noted that Phase 2 consisted of the most urgent items which supported occupation for September. This was achieved with works continuing on site whilst in occupation until the end of November 2020.

Phase 1 and 2 were awarded as a waiver under delegated powers.

Phase 3 was a continuation of this work. Based on total project value of all 3 phases, a Cabinet report was needed as the total sum exceeds officer delegation.

For phase 3 (December 2020 to April 2021), officers' recommendation is to continue with the initial contractor, Diamond Build, as it created a smooth transition of the programme to minimise operational impact on the school and any potential clash of warranties/defect liabilities. Phases 1 and 2 have also proceeded positively to date.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley- Harrison,

The Council had the responsibility to inspect all schools for safety concerning building and maintenance. The AD for Schools and Learning advised that the service were not aware of other schools which had similar health and safety works to be completed. There was an ongoing health and safety inspection process for schools in the borough. If issues were identified they would be dealt with and the cost determined at the point when the works for school were scoped and assessed.

Further to considering exempt information, in which the withdrawal of recommendation 3.4 was agreed,

RESOLVED

1. To approve the variation of an existing award of contact to Diamond Build Plc to undertake Phase 3 fire precaution and external fabric health and safety works to the 6th Form Buildings at Fortismere secondary school as a main contractor for the fixed price sum of £372,336.78.

2. To note Phases 1 & 2 previously awarded to Diamond Build Plc as a waiver of contract standing orders under delegated powers.
3. To approve a total award for all 3 phases of £815,922.7

Reasons for decision

A recent Health and Safety inspection of the school's 6th form accommodation identified significant condition and compliance issues relating to fire precaution and external fabric health and safety works. This work was assessed by Haringey's Health and Safety officers as being required prior to the school returning to the buildings for the autumn term in September 2020.

There remains health and safety issues relating to fabric repairs that need to be addressed and the appointment of Diamond Build Plc to complete this work is considered the most economically advantaged approach which will limit the disruption to the school.

Alternative options considered

Use of the LCP Major Works Framework; Education Lot was discounted as this framework is not available for works below £1m. The Dynamic Purchasing System does not permit a direct award. A mini competition was discounted for Phase 1 & 2 as it was considered that negotiating with a contractor would be most efficient in terms of time due to the urgent health and safety nature of the work and economic benefits detailed above.

Competitively tendering the works was discounted as this would create a delay to the overall programme and prolong disruption to the school. This was not considered to offer the Council best value in terms of cost due to need to remove and re-erect scaffolding between phases. Benefits in contractor preliminary costs are also more likely due to a smooth continuation of works. As outlined in section 6 of this report, with Phase 1 & 2 previously awarded and continuing on site until November 2020, it is considered that the most expedient and cost effective procurement method for Phase 3 would be to award a waiver of contract standing orders (as set out in 3.1) to Diamond Build Plc.

361. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES

RESOLVED

To note the minutes of the urgent decision held on the 19th of October.

362. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS

RESOLVED

To note the significant and Delegated actions taken in October.

363. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

364. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as the following items contained exempt information under paragraph 3 and 5, Part 1 Schedule 12a of the Local Government Act 1972.

365. EXEMPT - BROADWATER FARM DESIGN CONTRACT VARIATION

As per item 353 and the exempt minutes.

366. EXEMPT - FUTURE APPROACH TO COUNCIL RECRUITMENT

As per item 354 and the exempt minutes.

367. EXEMPT - VARIATION OF CONTRACT TO KIND DIAMOND BUILD CONSORTIUM ON THE LINDEN HOUSE PROJECT

As per item 355 and the exempt minutes.

368. EXEMPT - VARIATION OF CONTRACT AWARD AND ASSOCIATED PURCHASE ORDER ON HORNSEY LIBRARY REFURBISHMENT PROJECT

As per item 356 and the exempt minutes.

369. EXEMPT - AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR HOMES FOR HARINGEY STOCK SURVEY

As per item 359 and the exempt minutes.

370. EXEMPT - FORTISMERE SCHOOL – WAIVER TO CONTRACT STANDING ORDERS TO VARIATION A CONTRACT FOR PHASE 3 FIRE PRECAUTION AND EXTERNAL FABRIC HEALTH AND SAFETY WORKS - CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARD

As per item 360 and the exempt minutes.

371. EXEMPT MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the exempt minutes of the meeting held on the 13th of October 2020.

372. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

None

CHAIR: Councillor Joseph Ejiofor

Signed by Chair

Date