

# **MINUTES OF MEETING Cabinet HELD ON Tuesday, 9th March, 2021, 6.30 - 9.20 pm**

## **PRESENT:**

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

**Also attending: Councillors Pat Berryman, Scott Emery and Alessandra Rossetti**

### **455. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Leader informed all present that the meeting was to be streamed live on the Council's website.

### **456. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Amin.

### **457. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **458. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

### **459. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 9 February 2021 be approved as a correct record.

Councillor Bull gave apologies for his early departure from the meeting due to ill-health.

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

None received.

### **461. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

None received.

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

None.

#### **463. 2020/21 FINANCE UPDATE QUARTER 3**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which outlined the budget position at Quarter 3 (Period 9) of the 2020/21 financial year, including General Fund Revenue, Capital, Housing Revenue Account and Dedicated Schools Grant budgets. The Cabinet Member referred to the impact of Covid-19 on the borough and the financial impact on the current year's agreed budget was set out very clearly in the report. He added that it remained critical that the Council maintained its strong financial management at this time in order to continue to do the best for all who live and work in the borough.

The Cabinet Member responded to questions from Councillor Emery:

- In terms of overspend in the high needs block, Haringey was not unique in this situation and Local Authorities were working together to lobby the Government to ensure that funding was provided to meet the funding gaps experienced by many Councils.
- Whilst it was not good to use reserves to fund budget gaps, the Cabinet Member stated that he and the Finance team would do what they could to ensure that the budget gap was reduced by looking at where savings could be made.
- The debt write-offs were historic and could not remain in the accounts, therefore the necessary steps needed to be taken to remove these. Systems had been put in place to ensure any services provided by the Council in terms of payroll services, the money would be provided first to the Council and then payments made, which was a change to the previous system.

#### **RESOLVED to**

1. 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 £8.1m (Q2 £9.8m). This is before any further emergency grant support (Section 6, Tables 1a and 1b, and Appendix 1 of the report). This excludes the DSG forecast.
2. Note that Directors have been asked to focus on actions to bring the forecast overspend down before the end of the year.
3. Note the net Housing Revenue Account (HRA) forecast of £4.2m (Q2 £4.2m) overspend (Section 6, Table 2, and Appendix 2 of the report).
4. Note the net DSG forecast of £6.5m (Q2 £5.3m) overspend, the actions being taken to seek to address this and the potential implications for the GF (Section 7 and Table 3 of the report).

5. Note the forecast budget savings position in 2020/21 which indicates that £7.7m (47%) (Q2 £7.3m (45%)) may not be achieved. (Section 8, Table 4 and Appendix 3 of the report). This is incorporated in the GF budget pressures addressed in recommendation 3.1 above.
6. Approve the proposed budget adjustments and virements to the capital programme as set out in Table 5 and Appendix 5 of the report and note the forecast expenditure of £198m (£218m Qtr2) in 2020/21 which equates to 37% (40% Qtr2) of the revised capital budget (Section 9, Table 5 and Appendix 4 of the report).
7. To approve the budget virements and receipt of grants as set out in Appendix 5 of the report.
8. To note the debt write-offs approved by officers in Quarter 3 2020/21 (Appendix 6 of the report) and approve the >£50,000 debt write-offs (Appendix 6a of the report).

### **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.

## **464. INSOURCING OF SECURITY SERVICES**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which sought approval for the creation of an inhouse security team in line with the Council's Insourcing Policy. An inhouse security service would allow the Council to respond to the changing profile of its buildings and how they are used, and also provide greater control over the service to improve management and performance in line with related teams within Operational Facilities Management. The existing workforce would benefit from significantly improved terms and conditions including better pay, annual leave, sickness and pension entitlement through the Local Government Pension Scheme. The security workforce employed by the current provider currently comprised of local staff, with over 95% living in Haringey and the remainder living in neighbouring boroughs.

The Leader gave thanks to the team of officers who had worked to deliver insourcing, which was right for the Borough and would provide a better service for local people.

The Cabinet Member responded to questions from Councillor Emery:

- The insourcing of the security service would provide better terms and conditions for local people employed by the current provider.
- All current staff would be covered under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) (TUPE) Regulations. There would be no redundancies made. The current contract paid staff at London Living Wage, which would continue.

## **RESOLVED**

1. That Cabinet approves the insourcing of corporate security services from the current provider United Guarding Services (UGS) in accordance with the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) (TUPE) Regulations.

### **Reasons for decision:**

In October 2019 Haringey's Cabinet approved and adopted an Insourcing Policy. The Insourcing Policy includes a commitment to a structured approach to support sustained progress on this agenda by:

- making it easier for us to work collaboratively with our communities in the design and delivery of public services which reflect what they need, recognising that service delivery is a core element of our relationship with residents.
- strengthening our organisational sustainability and resilience, by further developing the skills and knowledge of our workforce; and our organisational capacity and infrastructure.
- increasing the numbers of locally employed people who will benefit from the excellent terms and conditions we offer as an employer.
- opening services to increased scrutiny and accountability to drive improved outcomes; and,
- squeezing the maximum financial and social value from each pound spent.

The Council's Facilities Management (FM) service was the first major insource initiative brought inhouse following the publication of the Insourcing Policy. The initial Cabinet decision to undertake an insource of FM in 2019 noted that 'a review of security services will be conducted in a later phase to identify the most appropriate delivery model'.

Following completion of the core FM project, a further service review was undertaken by officers to identify the Council's needs in relation to security. This service review was tasked with reviewing a range of options to consider what future security

arrangements would be most appropriate for the Council in future. The scope and findings of the review are set out in Appendix 1 of this report.

In order to meet the needs of staff, visitors, and residents, it is essential to have safe, welcoming, and well-maintained buildings. Security has a crucial role in supporting that objective and by bringing the team and staff inhouse, the Council will have a greater degree of control over the management of this service.

The Council's Asset Management Plan sets out how the Council will approach future decisions about its estate. As we move forward beyond the Covid pandemic, it will be important to continue to ensure we have right buildings to support the delivery of services for our residents.

As part of the service review and following consultation with a number of other local authorities who employ inhouse security or concierge teams, it was clear that a directly employed security service is better placed to respond in a more agile and innovative way to the Council's future property portfolio changes.

A dedicated security team would help to meet the evolving needs of the Council to improve the customer experience and overall management of buildings. As a highly visible team that constitutes the first point of contact for many service users as they enter our buildings, the creation of an inhouse security team will enable the Council to have direct control, performance management and consistency of service in line with our other front-facing services.

Through regular Security Industry Authority (SIA) led training and the promotion of Haringey's corporate values, incoming security staff will be subject to the same standards as current Council staff within the Operational Facilities Management (OFM) service, under the same management team, to create a more coherent and effective service.

Combining functions within a new operating model such as static security guarding with an increased focus on customer-facing or 'way-finding' roles, as well as a greater emphasis on building maintenance checks, will allow incoming security staff to develop a broader range of skills to adapt more flexibly to the way we run our buildings in future.

It is recognised that this more holistic approach to security and facilities management will lead to a new operating model within the OFM service. While a future inhouse team with enhanced roles and responsibilities, and improved terms and conditions, is more financially expensive when compared to maintaining external provision it still represents the best value solution with the added social value, greater flexibility, and improved front line customer service offer.

These social value calculations are set out explicitly within the Enabling Framework contained within the Council's Insourcing Policy. Haringey's approach to Community Wealth Building also puts an emphasis on the Council using all its available levers to build the prosperity of local people and communities economically, through employment, and socially, with an emphasis on those who are working in lower-paid employment.

### **Alternative options considered**

**Maintain existing service externally** – this option does not deliver in terms of the Council's wider insourcing policy objectives. Bringing security inhouse will allow the Council to realise additional service benefits by implementing a new operating model that will embed the team within OFM and enhance security officers' roles and responsibilities in line with improved terms and conditions. Third party provision of security does not provide sufficient levels of control to drive service improvements and ensure that the service is managed in line with other teams within the OFM service. Whilst this option had the potential to deliver greater financial savings, it did not deliver on the social value calculator contained within the Enabling Framework set out in Appendix 1.

**Hybrid Insource** – Various options have been explored in which part of the service was brought in-house, whilst other elements continued to be provided through third party provision. These options are set out in more detail in Appendix 1 and were not progressed because they did not provide sufficient assurances over the cohesive management and control of the service and increased the operational risk by splitting the fixed security element of the service through two providers. A hybrid option would not fully meet the core objectives identified within the Insourcing Policy and would dilute the social value benefits derived from a full insource.

**Concierge Model** – The service review also considered a model staffed by concierge officers without SIA accreditation. This was not considered operationally robust enough to ensure the highest standards of safety for staff and visitors based on existing data regarding security incidents in Haringey over the previous five years. It was noted that this model may be operationally viable under different circumstances where the corporate estate was rationalised to one central building.

## **465. HARINGEY FAIRNESS COMMISSION**

*Note: Councillor Amin joined the meeting during this item.*

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Corporate Services introduced the report which set out the progress made in implementing the Fairness Commission recommendations to date; the plan to set out how Fairness Commission recommendations would be implemented as part of the Borough Plan refresh; and the

proposal to consult Fairness Commissioners as part of the production of a forthcoming report in June 2012.

The Cabinet Member responded to questions from Councillor Emery:

- Fairness Commissioners were not asked of any party allegiance when invited to join the Commission.
- Haringey was one of eight London Boroughs to have failed the Housing Delivery Test. It was important to note that this was a patently unfair measure of housing delivery, as it relied on developers building out on Planning Permissions which had been granted. The test took into account a three year period which wasn't reflective of the true picture of house building which was lumpy. The Haringey Planning Department were one of the best performing planning services in London.
- Part of the Commission involved reviewing significant evidence on different perspectives on economic models.

### **RESOLVED to**

1. Note the progress made implementing Fairness Commission recommendations to date (including as part of the Covid-19 response), including on the areas which have received particular attention as part of our response to the Covid-19 pandemic.
2. Note the plan to set out how Fairness Commission recommendations will be implemented as part of the Borough Plan refresh, due to come to Cabinet for decision in June 2021.
3. Note the proposal to consult Fairness Commissioners as part of the production of June 2021 Cabinet report.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Fairness Commission was established in July 2018, with the aim of better understanding the causes of unfairness in the borough through conversations with residents and other local stakeholders and developing practical recommendations for how the council and partners can tackle inequality and work to better support residents, communities and businesses in Haringey.

In its final report (February 2020), the Fairness Commission made a set of recommendations to redress social, economic and political inequalities in the borough. A Cabinet report receiving the Commission's report and recommendations noted the positive contribution evidence from the Commission had already made to informing on a number of important organisational agendas.

Within weeks of the publication of this final report, the UK went into the first national lockdown, and in the year since, the disproportionate impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on some of our residents has reinforced the need to address the injustices highlighted by the Commission, particularly: tackling poverty; prioritising equity and inclusion; and addressing structural inequality.

Learning from the Commission has helped shape our emergency response to the pandemic, including some of the ways we have worked differently with our communities and partners and in some of the new ways of delivering services. This impact is captured in a 'Recovery and Renewal' Cabinet report (December 2020), which is intended to inform the refresh of Haringey's Borough Plan, 2019-23, in light of the impact of Covid-19 on both the borough's residents and on the council, including the impact on council finances.

The refreshed borough plan will be published in June 2021 and will include detail on how Fairness Commission recommendations will inform how we deliver our priorities going forward. It will be accompanied by a detailed report setting out how recommendations will be implemented.

The purpose of this report is therefore to take stock of progress in implementation to date, as part of our response to Covid-19 (and more widely), with a focus on those themes from the Fairness Commission which have been particularly significant during the last year.

An overview of progress in each of these themes is included in Appendix A. Detailed actions and deliverables for these will be defined in the June Borough Plan refresh Cabinet report.

#### **Alternative options considered**

None.

#### **466. CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Equalities and Leisure introduced the report which set out the results of public engagement on the Borough's Climate Change Action Plan and sought approval to the Council's responses to the engagement process, agree the alteration made to the Action Plan and to formally adopt the Haringey Climate Action Plan.

Joe Baker, Head of Carbon Management responded to questions from Councillor Emery:

- The local volunteer network was a request from the community. It enabled co-delivery of the Climate Change Action Plan. The network would be facilitated by Council staff.
- Targets would be monitored and reported as part of the Annual Carbon Report.

#### **RESOLVED to**

1. Accept the results of the community engagement on the draft Haringey Climate Change Action Plan and the alterations made as a result of the feedback;
2. Agree the alterations within the Haringey Climate Change Action Plan that have been made based on the community's feedback;



### 3. Agree to adopt the updated Haringey Climate Change Action Plan

#### **Reasons for decision**

Delivering a net zero carbon borough by 2050 is an objective in the Borough Plan 2019-23. However, in light of the new scientific evidence published in the report *Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 degrees Celsius* by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2018), Full Council in March 2019 agreed to declare a climate emergency, and to review this date for delivery with a view to bringing it forward in recognition of that emergency.

In March 2020 the Council agreed to publish and consult on the draft Haringey Climate Change Action Plan. The Action Plan sets out the actions required with a challenging but realistic timeframe to reduce the borough's carbon footprint. It sets out the actions which are already funded, the additional funding that is needed and the legislative changes needed. It also outlines the delivery routes with national, and regional government, as well as the work required from borough's stakeholders. Between October 2020 and January 2021, the Council undertook engagement across the Haringey Community. This information has been used to inform the draft Action Plan and set clearer priorities for the Council and community to focus on.

National and regional governments have increased their focus and funding on the delivery of "Green Growth" and funding related to COVID recovery plans for England all have a focus on a green recovery. The Action Plan now reflects these changes at a national and regional level and new funding opportunities. This Action Plan will enable the Council to secure these funding streams.

#### **Alternative options considered**

**Reflect a limited number of points from the community in the CCAP.** This was rejected as the Climate Change ambition and its delivery is far wider than just the Council. The Council only directly manages approx. 8% of the borough's total carbon footprint. This covers all council buildings, the majority of the schools, the Council's fleet and the Council's housing stock managed through Homes for Haringey. Therefore, if the borough is to deliver a Net Zero Carbon Borough this will need to be based around trust and shared knowledge. By taking on board the community views this will start this process.

While reflecting only a limited number of points from the community may allow us to remain focussed on a smaller number of priority areas. This option was rejected because of the considerable community and partnership contributions needed to implement the CCAP.

### **467. HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC REALM INVESTMENT PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Transformation and Public Realm Investment introduced the report which sought approval for the Highways Investment Plan for 2021/22 financial year. Transport played a pivotal role in daily lives with the global pandemic highlighting the need to provide welcoming and accessible streets and public realm to

facilitate daily walks and socialising outdoors. It was important to keep up the investment in Haringey's streets and continue the aim to ensure that Haringey has a high quality and safe highway with a reliable public transport system, accessible to all. The Cabinet Member thanked staff in the Highways team for their work on the plan.

The Cabinet Member and Peter Boddy, Highways and Traffic Manager, responded to questions from the Cabinet and Councillor Emery:

- Although Lordship Lane covered a number of wards, only the worst sections of the road would be repaired due to funding limitations.
- A formula was used to assess the maintenance proposals and only those with a score above 65 were included in the programme. As more investment was provided, the criteria would be lowered and more roads would be included in the programme going forward.

**RESOLVED to:**

1. Approve the Highways Investment Plan for 2021/22 financial year as set out in section 7 of the report; and
2. Give delegated authority to the Head of Highways and Parking, consequential on the Highways Investment Plan:
  - To make decisions relating to scheme design and implementation;
  - To carry out consultation;
  - To consider representations received in response to consultation and to report significant or substantial concerns back to the relevant Cabinet Member; and
  - To make traffic management orders, where there are no valid objections.

**Reasons for Decision**

This HIP sets out the Council's highways and traffic projects for the coming financial year and how they align with the Council's strategic objectives.

The report provides detail of the funding arrangements and seeks authority to proceed with the development and delivery of these projects subject to appropriate consultation.

**Alternative options considered**

No other options were considered. The Council has a statutory obligation to maintain the public highway network.

Allocated funding is not sufficient to cover all maintenance requirements and the proposals prioritises the essential works that needs to be delivered. The 2021/22 investment plan has been informed by the Council's Transport Strategy and LIP3 which involved consultation with key stakeholders. The maintenance works programme has been prioritised through highway condition surveys by officers, visual inspections, and concerns raised by Members and by the wider community.

**468. STREET LIGHTING INVESTMENT PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Transformation and Public Realm Investment introduced the report which sought approval for the implementation of the Street Lighting Investment Plan for the 2021/22 financial year. An upgrade to the street lighting system was well overdue, and would contribute to the safe use of the highway for motorists, pedestrians, cyclists, including motorcyclists. It also supported strong and safe communities by reducing crime and the fear of crime. The programme included the implementation of a Smart Lighting System, an intelligent control system used to manage street lighting networks with benefits such as greater energy saving, fewer non-working lights and the flexibility to change and override setting to meet specific operational needs.

Councillor Bull thanked the team for highlighting roads in White Hart Lane ward where improved street lighting was needed. He referred to the issues on the Roundway and hoped that the new lighting would help to improve the lives of people living in the area.

Peter Boddy, Highways and Traffic Manager, responded to questions from Councillor Emery:

- The payback period for the scheme was dependent on the rate increase of energy costs. Projections had been made on low, medium and high energy inflation rates and assumptions were based on those projections. The payback period based on the worst case was 7-10 years.
- Actual savings in terms of the current budget were relatively low. The main savings would be achieved by protecting the Council from spiralling energy costs in the future.

## **RESOLVED to**

1. Approve the Street Lighting Investment Plan for the 2021/22 financial year, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report – Tables 1 to Tables 5
2. Give delegated authority to the Head of Highways and Parking, consequential on the Street Lighting Investment Plan:
  - To make decisions relating to scheme design and implementation;
  - To carry out consultation;
  - To consider representations received in response to consultation and to report significant or substantial concerns back to the relevant Cabinet Member; and
  - To make traffic management orders, where there are no valid objections.

## **Reasons for Decision**

Street lighting is an important element of the transport network because of the safety and confidence it brings to road users. Investment in the infrastructure is required to ensure that the Council maintains a fit-for-purpose highway infrastructure asset in accordance with nationally accepted asset management principles.

## **Alternative options considered**

There are no other relevant options. The 2021/22 investment plan has been shaped by Borough Plan priorities, as well as the Council's Transport Strategy and the draft Climate Change Action Plan. The lantern and column replacement programme has

been developed through electrical and structural condition surveys, scouting, visual inspections and lighting levels, ensuring that investment is targeted where most needed.

#### **469. PARKING INVESTMENT PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Transformation and Public Realm Investment introduced the report which sought approval for the Parking Investment Plan for 2021/22 financial year. There were a number of outcomes from the plan, including removal of footway parking, reviewing CPZs and reviewing visitors parking permit policies.

In response to Councillor Bull, the Cabinet Member advised that all signage was uniform across the county in accordance with the Department for Transport guidelines and could not be amended by the Council. Nevertheless, it could be possible to add additional signage to provide a clearer understanding of parking zone boundaries.

The Cabinet Member responded to questions from Councillor Emery:

- The Cabinet Member advised that she was aware of the issues with the two proposed CPZs in Muswell Hill where certain roads were not covered by either CPZ, and advised that officers were looking into how this could be best dealt with. Ward Councillors would be updated.
- Phase 1 and 2 of the contactless payments were identified by looking at footfall areas and how the parking bays were used. There was a wider framework document which could be circulated to Councillor Emery.

#### **RESOLVED to**

1. Approve the Parking Investment Plan for 2021/22 financial year as set out in section 6 of the report, subject to the consultations not raising any significant or substantial issues; and
2. Give delegated authority to the Head of Highways and Parking, consequential on the Parking Investment Plan:
  - To make decisions relating to scheme design and implementation;
  - To carry out consultation;
  - To consider representations received in response to consultation and to report significant or substantial concerns back to the relevant Cabinet Member; and
  - To make traffic management orders, where there are no valid objections.

#### **Reasons for decisions**

Parking matters to a wide range of stakeholders. Residents need sensible, safe and fair access to their homes, whether they are drivers or users of other forms of transport. For many residents, sustainable modes of transport will be the preferred option. It is therefore essential that the borough's controlled parking zones (CPZs) complement walking and cycling measures as well as improving public transport reliability.

For others, using the car is the only option to retain independence, necessary for work, to get around or to make busy and complex lives work. The approach to parking needs to balance all these demands so that residents feel we have given regard to their needs, whilst considering the Council's commitment through Haringey's Transport Strategy to increase journeys taken by walking and cycling, helping to improve air quality and the health and wellbeing of our residents.

Businesses require adequate loading provision for their servicing needs. Some also consider easy access to parking an important aspect to draw people into our town centres and shopping areas.

Parking is also considered important by partners, whether it is the emergency services and their need for quick access to situations, or cultural and arts organisations and their desire to attract audiences from outside as well as within Haringey.

However, the Council's Transport Strategy clearly identifies its vision for less reliance on the private car, especially for short journeys which can easily be undertaken (by most people) by walking, cycling and public transport.

A balance therefore needs to be struck to ensure modal shift and helping our town centres thrive, which is not just important for the businesses and organisations affected but also for the economic regeneration of an area. It is also important to consult with emergency services to ensure adequate access is provided for them.

### **Alternative options considered**

The proposed programme prioritises new CPZs having considered residents' views. The review of existing CPZs is in line with the Controlled Parking Policy agreed by Cabinet in March 2020 and will address concerns raised by residents. This will also support the Council's modal shift aspirations.

The programme will also be consolidated to take account of schemes delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Where possible, those schemes will now be implemented in the coming year, details of which are provided in Appendix 1.

Other programmes (such as removal of footway parking and provision of electric vehicle charging points and car club bays) will also help contribute towards supporting modal shift and use of less polluting vehicles. These measures will help increase walking and cycling, thereby reducing air pollution and help towards addressing the climate emergency.

## **470. DISABLED PARKING ACTION PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Transformation and Public Realm Investment introduced the report which sought approval to increase the length of existing disabled parking bays to 6.6 metres to achieve consistency with new parking bays and achieve compliance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016; and to provide exemptions in relation to parking restrictions for Blue Badge Holders awaiting replacement of stolen Blue Badges, for up to 3 weeks. The Disabled Parking Action Plan had been informed through feedback from disabled motorists and their

representative groups working either directly with the Cabinet Member, the service, or through the review carried out by the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel. The range of improvements being made to the delivery of disabled parking services in Haringey would make a real difference to the lives of many disabled residents.

Councillor Bull praised the pro-active response to the Blue Badge theft issue.

### **RESOLVED to**

1. Agree that Blue Badge Holders awaiting the replacement of a stolen Blue Badge are exempt from the parking restrictions for up to 3 weeks;
2. Agree the increase in length of existing disabled parking bays to 6.6 metres to achieve consistency with any new disabled parking bays that are provided and compliance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016; and
3. Give delegated approval to the Head of Highways and Parking:
  - To make decisions relating to scheme design and implementation;
  - To carry out consultation;
  - To consider representations received in response to consultation and to report significant or substantial concerns back to the relevant Cabinet Member; and
  - To make traffic management orders, where there are no valid objections.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Council has a statutory obligation to provide disabled parking facilities and to effectively manage the local delivery of the national Blue Badge scheme. This needs to be done in a manner that is meaningful and meets the requirements of disabled people.

This Disabled Parking Action Plan, including new proposals, will improve the service offer and ensure the delivery of a compliant and fit-for-purpose service.

### **Alternative options considered**

Disabled parking provision will be kept under constant review to ensure that the parking needs of disabled residents and visitors are met. The consolidated Disabled Parking Action Plan is comprehensive, and no other options were considered at this point in time.

## **471. ROAD SAFETY INVESTMENT PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Transformation and Public Realm Investment introduced the report for the Road Safety Investment Plan for the 2021/22 financial year. The plan included four key strands of work: Road Safety Strategy and Action Plan; road safety projects; pedestrian crossing projects; and ongoing behavioural change programmes and educational work. The four strands would be aligned to the draft Walking and

Cycling Action Plan, and also supplement the substantial investment set out within our investment plans.

In response to a question from Councillor Bull, the Cabinet Member advised that whilst it was frustrating that works had not commenced on The Roundway crossings, it was reliant on working with TfL, who had responsibility for traffic signalling. TfL currently had a large number of staff on furlough so it was not currently possible to proceed with any works.

The Cabinet Member responded to questions from Councillor Emery:

- Accident data was provided by the Met Police which gave a good evidence base to where accidents occurred.
- Walking was a versatile mode of transport and investment in pavements, crossings, street lighting was constantly happening to enhance the experience for all residents.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Corporate Services advised that where it was possible to convert cycle lanes to mandatory lanes without consultation the Council would do so as soon as possible.

## **RESOLVED to**

1. Approve the Road Safety Investment Plan for the 2021/22 financial year, as set out in paragraphs 6.13 to 6.34, subject to the consultations not raising any significant or substantial issues; and
2. Give delegated authority to the Head of Highways and Parking, consequential on the Road Safety Investment Plan:
  - To make decisions relating to scheme design and implementation;
  - To carry out consultation;
  - To consider representations received in response to consultation and to report significant or substantial concerns back to the relevant Cabinet Member; and
  - To make traffic management orders, where there are no valid objections.

## **Reasons for Decision**

The authority has a statutory duty under section 39 of the 1988 Road Traffic Act to “take steps both to reduce and prevent accidents”. It must also prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety.

This report recommends the programme for 2021/22, as well as identifying a new strategy document to assist in prioritisation in 2021/22 and in future years.

## **Alternative options considered**

None. The authority has a statutory duty as set out in 4.1.

The preparation of a Road Safety Strategy and Action Plan with a supporting evidence base (borough road safety assessment) will enable the authority to target its

investment where it is most needed. This strategy will set the direction for future investment plans.

#### **472. FLOOD WATER MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Transformation and Public Realm Investment introduced the report which sought approval for the Flood Water Management Investment Plan (FWMIP) for the 2021/22 financial year. In line with the Borough Plan 2019-23, the Flood Risk Management Strategy and Asset Management Strategy, the Council would be investing £869,000 into a range of proposals with the aim of flood prevention and drainage improvements to the public realm.

Councillor Bull asked for reassurance that the Council would work with Homes for Haringey to carry out works in Larkspur Close to look at flooding and protecting the culvert from future floods. The Cabinet Member advised that the Director for Environment and Neighbourhoods was looking at a range of issues and would ensure that joined up working with all partners took place to improve the area.

In response to a question from Councillor Emery, the Cabinet Member advised that paragraph 6.6 of the report outlined the joint bid with local residents to the Environment Agency for flood resilience proposals.

#### **RESOLVED to**

1. Approve the Flood Water Management Investment Plan for the 2021/22 financial year as set out in the attached Appendix 1 of the report.
2. Give delegated approval to the Head of Highways and Parking, consequential on the Flood Water Management Investment Plan:
  - To make decisions relating to scheme design and implementation;
  - To carry out consultation;
  - To consider representations received in response to consultation and to report significant or substantial concerns back to the relevant Cabinet Member; and
  - To make traffic management orders, where there are no valid objections.

#### **Reasons for Decision**

The FWMIP sets out the Council's flood water management and highways drainage resilience projects for the coming financial year and how they align with the Council's strategic objectives.

The report provides detail of the funding arrangements and seeks authority to proceed with the development and delivery of these projects. Some of those projects will be subject to appropriate consultation.

#### **Alternative options considered.**



No other options were considered. The Council has a statutory obligation to maintain the public highway network. The Council is the lead local flood authority in the borough and responsible for taking the lead in managing flood risk from surface water, groundwater, reservoirs, rivers and some of the smaller watercourses. This 2021/22 investment plan has been informed by the Council's Transport Strategy, Asset Management Strategy and Flood Risk Management Strategy. The projects proposed are those that have already been identified as priorities and start the process of reducing the risk of future flooding in the borough.

The funding for the proposed projects comes from Council resources approved by Cabinet in December 2020 as part of the Capital Programme and external grant received since the approval of the Highways Works Plan 2020/21

#### **473. STREET CLEANSING STRATEGY AND PLAN ADOPTION**

The Cabinet Member for Transformation and Public Realm Investment introduced the report which sought approval for a Cleaner Haringey Strategy to provide a high-level framework to deliver on the Council's ambition for Haringey to be a place with strong, resilient and connected communities where people can lead active and healthy lives in an environment that is safe, clean and green. The report set out a plan to tackle four priorities: fight illegal rubbish dumping; keep streets free from litter and detritus; tackle graffiti and flyposting; and ensure waste is sufficiently contained in bins.

In response to Councillor Bull, the Cabinet Member advised that accumulated rubbish around train stations was not a unique problem to Haringey. It was important to inform residents that this land did not belong to the Council, and it was time to put pressure on Network Rail to take responsibility for the accumulated rubbish on their land.

In response to Councillor Emery, the Cabinet Member advised that the Veolia pick up rate for flytipping was very high at 97%. It was important to note that not all waste reported by residents was in the public realm and so could not be removed by Veolia.

#### **RESOLVED to**

1. Approve the Cleaner Haringey Strategy as attached at Appendix 1 of the report.
2. Delegate authority to the Director of Environment & Neighbourhoods in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transformation & Public Realm Investment, to make minor amendments to the Strategy as and when required.

#### **Reasons for decision**

The challenges of waste management in Haringey are substantial and an ongoing key concern for our residents and business owners. We know that these challenges will increase as more people move into the borough and more businesses decide to locate to Haringey on the back of our successful regeneration plans.

We know from the work we have carried out over the last 18 months that a concerted effort, driven by clear priorities can deliver results. Our success in tackling problematic fly tips, waste containment issues and increasing our engagement with local communities is evident. We need to build on our work to date and believe that our Cleaner Haringey Strategy offers a framework that clearer sets out the challenges and concerns of our communities, understands the changing nature of our borough and offers four clear priorities, a set of deliverables and outcome measures for us to work towards and be held accountable for.

The Strategy has been informed by reviewing service data, resident surveys and member feedback. The Strategy outlines a number of short to medium term actions that will be undertaken within the remit of Waste Client that satisfy four priorities:

- Fight illegal rubbish dumping
- Keep our streets free from litter and detritus
- Tackle the blight of graffiti and fly posting
- Ensure waste is sufficiently contained in bins

### **Alternative options considered**

#### **Do Nothing**

There is clear ambition in Haringey for a cleaner environment, as captured in the Borough Plan's Place Priority. Doing nothing would not be consistent with this level of ambition. The delivery of a Strategy offers a set of commitments and action plans to guide all the activities around creating a more attractive, and cleaner borough.

#### **Alternative option**

The Council could continue to deliver a Waste Service and improve its offer to its many residents and businesses through a number of separate related Strategies, Policies and Action Plans. An overarching Strategy offers a joined-up framework for us to deliver on our promise, use resources effectively and more clearly link our waste improvement plans to wider priorities and strategies across the Council.

## **474. DISCRETIONARY HOUSING PAYMENTS POLICY 2021-22**

The Cabinet Member for Transformation and Public Realm Investment introduced the report which sought approval for Haringey's Discretionary Housing Payments Policy 2021/22, which set the methodology to determine the award of individual Discretionary Housing Payments during the financial year 2021/22. The needs of Haringey's residents had increased during Covid, and additional funding would be required to fill the gap if the allocation from the DWP was not increased.

In response to Councillor Emery, the Cabinet Member confirmed that Haringey had not returned any DHP allocation to the DWP. For the current financial year, the allocation was £2.02m, the Council had allocated £2.2m and topped up by a further £300k which was likely to be exceeded also.

### **RESOLVED to**

1. Approve Haringey's Discretionary Housing Payments Policy 2021/22 (set out in Appendix A of the report) as the methodology to determine the award of individual Discretionary Housing Payments during the financial year 2021/22 having regard to the Equalities Impact Assessment (set out in Appendix B of the report).
2. To note that at the time of writing this report the DWP have not confirmed the DHP allocation to Haringey for 2021/22. If notification arrives after this Cabinet meeting, Cabinet will be notified of the figure in the Quarter One budget monitoring report.

### **Reasons for Decision**

The DHP Policy must be reviewed and approved every year in line with the changing funding allocated by the DWP.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

None

## **475. NEW RIVER SPORTS GROUND - OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

The Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Equalities and Leisure introduced the report which sought approval for the 'run directly' option to establish an in-house leisure management operation to manage New River Sport and Fitness. The report also sought approval to vire £0.305m from the General Fund capital programme contingency to fund the capital costs.

Simon Farrow, Highways, Parking, Parks & Open Space Manager, responded to questions from Councillor Emery:

- Mr Farrow had previous experience of working as part of the team running New River. A close relationship had been maintained with Fusion over the years so the inhouse team had a good understanding of how it worked.
- Work had been carried out with consultants to put together the strategy and on balance it was considered to be a good business case.

### **RESOLVED to**

1. Approve the 'Run Directly' option outlined in paragraphs 6.15 to 6.46 of the report and establish an in-house leisure management operation to manage New River Sport and Fitness.
2. Delegate authority to the Assistant Director Direct Services to set the actual date of transfer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Equalities and Leisure.

3. Agree to vire £0.305m from the approved general fund capital programme contingency to fund the capital costs set out in paragraph 6.38 of the report.

### **Reasons for decision**

Run Directly is the option that can best deliver the Council's objectives of implementing the new management arrangement within the 12 months of the short-term lease. This option will allow the Council direct control and ensure that the management and activity programme is closely aligned to the Borough Plan Outcomes.

The business plan projects that the Council should, under stable operating conditions, be able to operate New River on a break-even basis. Allowing for mobilisation costs and essential capital upgrades, the cost of this option is less than the reintegration option.

This option allows the Council to review its actual performance in 2-3 years' time and consider in a post-pandemic period if this remains the best option for the Council.

### **Alternative options considered**

The Council set out to assess six options in line with its agreed insourcing policy. The following four options were ruled out as part of that assessment on the basis that they did not meet the high importance criteria set by the Council (see table at para 6.4):

1. Sale of the site
2. Leasing the site on similar terms
3. Tender to a new provider
4. Run via a local authority trading company

The options of Run Directly and reintegration with the existing leisure management contract are set out within this report.

The option to reintegrate New River within the existing leisure management contract is not being recommended for several reasons.

Firstly, the proposal from Fusion would require the Council to subsidise the cost of running New River by £399k over the next three years. This is more than the cost of the Council mobilising its own operation and making the business plan critical improvements identified in this report.

Secondly, running New River via Fusion would not afford the Council the direct control that it seeks to shape the operation and deliver both the commercial and social outcomes the Council believes are achievable.

Thirdly, reintegrating New River in to the leisure management contract would also place all the Council's "eggs in one basket" in a period of considerable uncertainty for the leisure providers.

#### **476. NEW DELIVERY MODEL FOR ADULT LEARNING DISABILITIES DAY OPPORTUNITIES**

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced the report which sought approval for a new model of learning disability day opportunities following a period of consultation.

The consultation process received feedback from a wide range of stakeholders, and the proposals were and would continue to be shaped by users, carers and other stakeholders as they were implemented.

Councillor Bull placed on record his thanks to Councillor James for her engagement with service users to shape a transformation to the previous offer.

Councillor James and Charlotte Pomery, Assistant Director for Commissioning, responded to questions from Councillor Emery:

- During the consultation, one of the important issues that was raised was around independent pathways. Due to this, a process of adaptation and redesign had already begun, taking into account the points raised in the consultation. The pathway would be renamed as a 'development' pathway, and would be co-produced. There would be access to a building space for all on the pathway, along with access to a dedicated team who would be responsible for looking after and monitoring the support for the cohort. It was important to ensure that a meaningful experience was provided.
- Written material on Care Act assessments and reviews was already provided to service users. Advocacy was available for those who needed it.

#### **RESOLVED**

1. To consider and take into account the feedback from the consultation undertaken as set out at Paragraphs 6.10 and Appendix 2 of the report;
2. To consider and take into account the equalities impact assessment of the proposals on protected groups and action proposed to mitigate the impact as set out in Paragraphs 8.3 and Appendix 3 of the report; and
3. To approve the following new model for Learning Disability Day Opportunities to take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021:
  - 3.1 In respect of Ermine Road
    - a) Transforming Ermine Road to be a centre of excellence supporting people with severe to profound and multiple learning disabilities (PMLD), complex health needs, physical and/or sensory impairments.
    - b) Decommissioning the autism support service at Ermine Road.
    - c) Supporting those who attend Ermine Road who have low or moderate support needs to plan alternative, more community focused support during the day, based on their needs, interests, friendships and life goals.

d) Creating greater capacity at Ermine Road.

### 3.2 In respect of Waltheof Gardens

e) Creating a dedicated service for people with complex learning disabilities and autism.

f) Creating an Autism Hub.

### 3.3 In respect of out of borough day opportunity users

g) Bringing some of the out of borough day opportunity users back to borough.

## **Reasons for decision**

Users and carers have been consulted on Haringey's new learning disability and autism day opportunities offer. 360 users and families were directly notified about the consultation. 11% of those notified of the consultation returned a completed survey. 5.5% of those notified about the consultation attended a consultation meeting. 20% of those notified of the consultation were contacted by officers for a telephone discussion about the proposals.

The survey feedback from the consultation shows that 50% of responses across all the proposals think they are better than the current offer. 18% of all responses believe the proposals to be worse than the existing offer. Proposals A, B and D had over 50% stating that these proposals are better. 44% of respondents thought proposals C and E were better than current provision; with 25% of responses stating proposal C was worse, and 14% stating proposal E was worse than the current provision. A detailed breakdown of responses can be found in appendix 2.

Implementing the proposed service changes will enable Haringey Council to increase the in-borough capacity of day opportunities for people with a learning disability and or autism, particularly for those with very high needs who often have to travel out of borough to receive a similar service. They will provide more buildings for day opportunities and increase options for both specialist and mainstream/ universal support for people with a learning disability. Specifically, the proposals allow for autistic people with no learning disability to receive support in Haringey through the development of an Autism Hub, in line with the emerging all-age Autism Strategy.

All of the proposals will provide person-centred support. Stakeholders agreed that this will better meet individual needs and provides value for public money.

People who currently receive and require support will not lose their day support offer – and any changes to an individual's support plan will follow a Care Act compliant strengths-based review by a social worker involving the individual and, wherever possible, their circle of support.

Compared with the current learning disabilities day opportunities the proposals will mean that the Council will be better able to:

- Achieve community inclusion, reduce social isolation and loneliness.
- Maintain or develop existing social networks, community links and activities.

- Provide flexible support that is well connected to community-based resources.
- Provide breaks for carers.
- Maintain and improve resident's health and wellbeing.
- Build capability for employment and stable accommodation.

#### **Alternative options considered**

The alternative option for day opportunities is not to respond to the consultation but to keep things as they are. The 'do nothing' option is that services stay the same. This is not an option as it does not provide for future service users nor for some current day service users who struggle to find support in the borough. The results of the consultation validate this assumption hence creating consensus for change. The Council will continue to coproduce Haringey's day opportunities offer with stakeholders, so they are fit for purpose and meet individual's needs.

### **477. ANNUAL CHILDCARE SUFFICIENCY REPORT: 2020**

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families set out the report which noted the Annual Childcare Sufficiency Report for 2020. The report set out the current landscape for childcare in Haringey in the context both of Covid-19 and wider patterns of take up and demand. It also considered the affordability, accessibility and quality of provision and how any gaps in childcare would be addressed.

#### **RESOLVED to**

1. Note the 2020 Annual Childcare Sufficiency Report.

#### **Reasons for decision**

The reason for the recommendation is that a decision to approve the proposed Annual Childcare Sufficiency Report 2020 (Appendix 1), will ensure that the Council is fulfilling its statutory duty, under the Childcare Act 2006.

In addition, the Annual Childcare Sufficiency Report will provide an updated representation of Haringey's childcare market, enabling the Council to develop childcare plans to support the market and maximise childcare participation in the future.

#### **Alternative options considered**

The requirement to complete an Annual Childcare Sufficiency Report is part of the statutory requirement placed on the Council by the Childcare Act 2006.

### **478. HIGHGATE SCHOOL SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) ADOPTION**

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Corporate Services introduced the report which sought approval for the adoption of the Highgate School Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) following the consultation process. The Cabinet Member advised

that the Regulatory Committee had been consulted at its meeting on 25 February and their comments had been included in the report and the SPD prior to publication.

Rob Krzyszowski, Interim Assistant Director for Planning, Building Services and Sustainability, responded to Councillor Emery's question regarding sustainability standards on site. Mr Krzyszowski advised that at planning applications must be determined using the planning policy in place at the point of determination so it would not be possible to future fit for when works may begin on site. The Council used the highest standards and was confident that a good standard would be achieved on this site.

### **RESOLVED to**

1. Note the representations received in response to the consultation on the Draft SPD, the Council's responses to these set out in Appendix A of the report, and the consequent changes proposed to the Draft SPD before adoption.
2. Note the comments and recommendations of Regulatory Committee of 25 February 2021 regarding the changes proposed to the SPD
3. Adopt the Highgate School SPD attached at Appendix B of the report.

### **Reasons for decision**

Public consultation took place on the Draft SPD for 8 weeks from 26 October 2020 to 21 December 2020. The responses to the consultation have been considered and it is recommended that a series of changes are made to the SPD before it is adopted. Once adopted the SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications relating to the School, a series of which are expected to come forward in the near future. The SPD will provide guidance to help preserve the special character, heritage and amenity of the local area in line with the adopted Local Plan's Site Allocation for the School and will discharge the Council's commitment in the Local Plan to prepare an SPD for the site.

### **Alternative options considered**

The alternative options considered are:

Option 1 – Not to adopt the SPD. The disadvantages of this are that the Council would not meet the commitment in the Site Allocations Local Plan document to bring forward an SPD for the School, it would not have specific adopted guidance to inform the submission and determination of future planning applications relating to the School, there would be no agreed strategic approach to the School's development as a whole, and an ad-hoc way of dealing with estate wide issues would not give the local community the overall picture of the School's development intentions and it would not enable the community to comment and input into the School's long-term development



in a meaningful way. Rather residents and businesses would only be able to comment on individual applications without this wider context.

Option 2: To adopt the SPD without any changes to the SPD following public consultation. This option would be contrary to legislation which requires the Council to take into account all consultation responses received before adopting the SPD. This would mean that not taking account of important feedback from the community and the stakeholders and would not allow changes to be made to the Draft SPD which would improve the robustness of the guidance within, including in relation to key land use principles.

Option 3: To adopt the SPD incorporating changes arising from responses to the public consultation on the Draft SPD. This would enable feedback from the community and other stakeholders to be incorporated within the adopted SPD.

Option 3 is being recommended as it will ensure that there is an agreed strategic approach in place for the future development of the School and that robust guidance is in place to support the making of future planning decisions for the School.

#### **479. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

**RESOLVED** to note the minutes of the following:

Cabinet Signing 15.02.2021

Urgent Decision 16.02.2021

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

None.

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

**RESOLVED** that the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the consideration of agenda items 28-29 as they contain exempt information as defined in Section 100a of the Local Government Act 1972; Paragraph 3 - information relating to the business or financial affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information), and Paragraph 5 – Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

#### **482. EXEMPT MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the exempt minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 9 February 2021 be approved as a correct record.

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

None.

CHAIR: Councillor Joseph Ejiofor

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....