

NOTICE OF MEETING

CABINET

**Tuesday, 14th September, 2021, 6.30 pm - George Meehan House,
294 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8JZ**

To watch the meeting, click [here](#)

Members: Councillors Peray Ahmet (Chair), Mike Hakata, John Bevan, Zena Brabazon, Seema Chandwani, Lucia das Neves, Julie Davies, Isidoros Diakides and Ruth Gordon

Quorum: 4

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

Please note that this meeting may be filmed or recorded by the Council for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by anyone attending the meeting using any communication method. Although we ask members of the public recording, filming or reporting on the meeting not to include the public seating areas, members of the public attending the meeting should be aware that we cannot guarantee that they will not be filmed or recorded by others attending the meeting. Members of the public participating in the meeting (e.g. making deputations, asking questions, making oral protests) should be aware that they are likely to be filmed, recorded or reported on.

By entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings.

The chair of the meeting has the discretion to terminate or suspend filming or recording, if in his or her opinion continuation of the filming, recording or reporting would disrupt or prejudice the proceedings, infringe the rights of any individual or may lead to the breach of a legal obligation by the Council.

2. APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of Urgent Business. (Late items of Urgent Business will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items of Urgent Business will be dealt with under Item 17 below. New items of exempt business will be dealt with at Item 24 below).

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

A Member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a prejudicial interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered:

- (i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, and
- (ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must withdraw from the meeting room.

A Member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Register of Members' Interests or the subject of a pending notification must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.

Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal interests and prejudicial interests are defined at Paragraphs 5-7 and Appendix A of the Members' Code of Conduct.

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

On occasions part of the Cabinet meeting will be held in private and will not be open to the public if an item is being considered that is likely to lead to the disclosure of exempt or confidential information. In accordance with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 (the "Regulations"), members of the public can make representations about why that part of the meeting should be open to the public.

This agenda contains exempt items as set out at **Item 18 : Exclusion of the Press and Public**. No representations with regard to these have been received.

This is the formal 5 clear day notice under the Regulations to confirm that this Cabinet meeting will be partly held in private for the reasons set out in this Agenda.

6. **MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 46)**

To confirm and sign the minutes of the meetings held on 13 July 2021 and 22 July 2021 as a correct record.

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

For Cabinet to note (*if any*)

8. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

To consider any requests received in accordance with Standing Orders.

9. 2021/22 FINANCE UPDATE QUARTER 1 (PAGES 47 - 92)

[Report of the Director of Finance. To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Transformation]

This report will provide an update on the Quarter 1 budget monitoring and Council's financial position. It will seek approval for any changes to the Council's revenue or capital budgets required to respond to the changing financial scenario and the delivery of the MTFS.

10. HOUSING DELIVERY SCHEME AT TEMPLETON: REVISED COSTS APPROVAL (PAGES 93 - 98)

[Report of the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning. To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for House Building, Place-Making and Development]

A report requesting agreement for additional costs for the delivery of new Council housing at Templeton Road.

11. STROUD GREEN PRIMARY SCHOOL - PHASE 2 EXTERNAL ENVELOPE AND BUILDING SERVICES IMPROVEMENT WORKS – AWARD OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT (PAGES 99 - 106)

[Report of the Director of Children's Services. To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Families]

To request approval for an award of contract to carry out Building Services Improvement and External Envelope Phase 2 works at Stroud Green Primary School, and to approve issuance of Letter of Intent.

12. SELBY URBAN VILLAGE DESIGN TEAM CONTRACT VARIATION (PAGES 107 - 114)

[Report of the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning. To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for House Building, Place-Making and Development]

For Cabinet to approve the variation of the existing contract with KCA as a result of an extension to the project's programme and extra work thereof.

13. OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF STAPLEFORD NORTH WING, BROADWATER FARM ESTATE (PAGES 115 - 158)

[Report of the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning. To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for House Building, Place-Making and Development]

This report will seek a decision on the preferred option for inclusion in a future ballot on the Broadwater Farm Estate, following consultation with residents

14. VARIATION OF CONTRACT FOR 1-35 HEADCORN ROAD AND 51-92 TENTERDEN ROAD FIRE SAFETY WORKS (PAGES 159 - 166)

[Report of the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning. To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for Planning, Licensing and Housing Services]

To seek approval to vary contract award for 1-35 Headcorn Road and 51-92 Tenterden Road Fire Safety Works.

15. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES (PAGES 167 - 184)

To note the minutes of the following:

Cabinet Member Signing 27 July 2021
Cabinet Member Signing 16 August 2021
Cabinet Member Signing 16 August 2021
Cabinet Member Signing 19 August 2021

Urgent Decision 14 July 2021

16. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS (PAGES 185 - 194)

To note significant and delegated decisions taken by Directors.

17. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items admitted at item 3 above.

18. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Note from the Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager

Items 19 to 24 allow for consideration of exempt information in relation to items 6 and 11-14.

TO RESOLVE

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as the items below, contain exempt information, as defined under paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 5, Part 1, schedule 12A of the Local Government Act:

Information relating to any individual

Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings

19. EXEMPT - MINUTES (PAGES 195 - 196)

To confirm and sign the exempt minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2021 as a correct record.

20. EXEMPT - STROUD GREEN PRIMARY SCHOOL - PHASE 2 EXTERNAL ENVELOPE AND BUILDING SERVICES IMPROVEMENT WORKS – AWARD OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT (PAGES 197 - 198)

As per item 11.

21. EXEMPT - SELBY URBAN VILLAGE DESIGN TEAM CONTRACT VARIATION (PAGES 199 - 202)

As per item 12.

22. EXEMPT - OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF STAPLEFORD NORTH WING, BROADWATER FARM ESTATE (PAGES 203 - 238)

As per item 13.

23. EXEMPT - VARIATION OF CONTRACT FOR 1-35 HEADCORN ROAD AND 51-92 TENTERDEN ROAD FIRE SAFETY WORKS (PAGES 239 - 240)

As per item 14.

24. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items admitted at item 3 above.

Felicity Foley, Committees Manager
Tel – 020 8489 2919
Fax – 020 8881 5218
Email: felicity.foley@haringey.gov.uk

Fiona Alderman
Head of Legal & Governance (Monitoring Officer)
River Park House, 225 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8HQ

Monday, 06 September 2021

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF MEETING Cabinet HELD ON Tuesday, 13th July, 2021, 6.30 - 7.40 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Peray Ahmet (Chair), John Bevan, Zena Brabazon, Seema Chandwani, Lucia das Neves, Julie Davies and Ruth Gordon

ALSO ATTENDING VIRTUALLY: Cllr Diakides, Cllr Palmer

552. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to the information as set out in the agenda and advised that the meeting was being filmed.

553. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Diakides and Hakata.

Councillor Diakides was present via the Teams meeting, however as he was not physically present at the meeting he would not take part in any decision-making.

554. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

555. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

On the basis of being a leaseholder in the borough, Councillor Chandwani declared an interest in relation to item 10 [New payment options policy for leaseholder] and advised that she would leave the meeting for the consideration of this item.

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

There were no representations made.

557. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 15 June 2021 be approved as a correct record.

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

None received.

559. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

None received.

560. HIGH ROAD WEST APPROVAL OF RESIDENTIAL OFFERS, LANDLORD OFFER AND LOVE LANE ESTATE BALLOT PROGRAMME

The Cabinet Member for House Building, Place - Making and Development introduced the report which sought approval of the final versions of the High Road West Local Lettings Policy, the Love Lane Leaseholder Offer and approval of the commitments to residents to be included within the 'Landlord Offer', which would form the basis of the resident ballot on the Love Lane Estate.

The report also sought approval to proceed to a resident ballot on the Love Lane Estate, in line with the requirements set out in Section 8 of the Greater London Authorities' Capital Funding Guide. It was noted that the resident ballot was an important milestone and would give residents the opportunity to decide if the scheme proceeds. If the vote was 'yes', the Council would be able to draw down the c.£90m of funding secured from the GLA for the High Road West scheme.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that the primary focus of the Council was to keep the community, at Love Lane, together and would include both secure tenants and those living in temporary accommodation on the estate.

The Cabinet Member committed to continue communication with estate residents to ensure that all residents understood the Landlord offer. This would include providing different language translations of the Landlord offer.

It was noted that where residents may be moved from the estate in the different phases of the development, they would not lose their offer on a home, and either be rehoused on the estate or nearby.

In response to questions from Councillors: Bevan, Brabazon, Davies and Palmer, the following information was provided by the Cabinet Member, the Director for Housing, Regeneration and Planning and the Assistant Director for Regeneration.

- Welcomed support from Homes for Haringey for communication activities with residents on the Landlord offer.
- The Cabinet Member had met with individually with residents and the Resident's Association at Love Lane. Feedback had been given to them on what elements of the offer they were not clear on. Some queries were responded to immediately at this meeting and other issues were to be followed up and responded to.

- The Cabinet Member would ensure communications with residents was in plain English with FAQs provided. She committed to oversee this process and to keep contact with the residents of the estate.
- Noted that there would be a small number of residents that would need to move off the estate, temporarily, during the first phase. It was noted that thereafter there would be more homes completed to allow tenants to move in. The aim of the phasing process was to minimise the numbers of potential moves. The Director would ask his team to provide more detail on the statistics of those likely to need a temporary move. However, it would be based on the particular housing needs of the families that needed to be moved at the time the development is brought forward.
- A proposal, in the attached report, was capping the rent increase to 10% and this figure had been arrived at as being commensurate with the savings expected in the energy costs. Officers were confident that tenants would not be worse off because of the proposal set out in the report. The rent cap of 10% also reflected the improvement to the properties and other standards.
- A further written response would be provided to Cllr Palmer on the housing circumstances that could be affected by the 10% increase and the considerations that would be taken forward.

RESOLVED

1. To note the consultation on the draft High Road West Local Lettings Policy and draft Love Lane Leaseholder Offer, and engagement with non-secure tenants, described in paragraphs 6.1-6.24 and set out in Appendix 1;
2. To note the engagement with residents and the wider community on the High Road West masterplan and the design of the new homes, described in paragraphs 6.25-6.29 and set out in Appendix 2;
3. To agree the adoption of the final High Road West Local Lettings Policy attached at Appendix 3;
4. To agree the adoption of the final Leaseholder Offer attached at Appendix 4;
5. To agree the commitments to residents which will be included in the Landlord Offer, attached at Appendix 5;
6. To note the proposed ballot programme and agrees to proceed to ballot Love Lane Estate residents on the High Road West Scheme;
7. To authorise the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for House Building, Placemaking and Development to agree the final ballot programme;
8. To authorise the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for House Building, Placemaking and Development to approve the ballot materials including the Landlord Offer;

9. To authorise the Assistant Director of Housing to approve equity loans to eligible resident leaseholders, as provided for in the Leaseholder Offer;
10. To authorise the Assistant Director of Housing, in accordance with the revised terms of the Leaseholder Offer, to approve equity loans to support the purchase of properties outside the borough or in excess of the limit set out in the Leaseholder Offer, or to approve leasehold swaps after taking into account the recommendation of the Discretion Panel;
11. To authorise the Director of Finance in consultation with the Leader, after consultation with the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, to set the initial rental charges for the new homes in High Road West let to eligible tenants living in the masterplan area, at:
 - no more than 10% above the average Council rent for an equivalent size property on the Love Lane Estate (to the bedroom size property that they are moving to) at the time of the move, and no less than that average Council rent.

Reasons for decision

The Council has made long-standing commitments to work with the community to develop and agree the Love Lane Leaseholder Offer and High Road West Local Lettings Policy. These policies are required to sit alongside the existing promises to secure Council tenants and ensure that clear policies and assurances are in place for residents affected by the High Road West Scheme.

This report recommends approval of the High Road West Local Lettings Policy (Appendix 3) as the consultation feedback has shown that a significant majority of those who responded to the consultation were in support of the Council's preferred option for the policy, both amongst Love Lane residents and those on the borough Housing Register. It is also the case that the policy supports the promotion of a strong and stable community through maintaining the existing community on Love Lane Estate and within the masterplan area. The report also recommends the approval of the Love Lane Leaseholder Offer (Appendix 4) as it is a fair offer that strikes a balance between providing support to existing leaseholders and funding other housing within the borough through the Council's Housing Revenue Account (HRA). It has also been developed through substantial consultation and engagement over several years.

The recommendations in this report related to implementation of the rehousing options in the Leaseholder Offer (recommendations ix – x) are in place to allow the Council to deliver on its commitments to leaseholders, by ensuring delegations exist to execute the approved policy without having to come to Cabinet for further approvals in individual cases.

The report seeks approval of the commitments to be included within the Landlord Offer (Appendix 5). These commitments clearly set out the housing offer and other promises to residents should the scheme go ahead. These commitments include the promises to secure tenants made in the Secure Tenant Guide agreed in 2014, the promises to leaseholders set out in the Love Lane Leaseholder Offer and the promises to non-secure tenants living in temporary accommodation in the masterplan

area including those contained in the High Road West Local Lettings Policy. The offer to non-secure tenants has been informed by consultation on the draft Local Lettings Policy and engagement with these residents on other potential elements of an offer.

These commitments to residents in relation to their housing offer will be incorporated into the Landlord Offer document, which will be sent to all residents that are eligible to vote in advance of the resident ballot, in line with GLA requirements. The Landlord Offer will also include information about the Council's broad vision of the scheme and the benefits it will bring to the neighbourhood and will include a statement of the design principles, estimated number of new homes, future tenure mix and proposed associated social infrastructure, commitments relating to ongoing consultation and engagement, as well as information on the ballot process and programme.

The recommendation (xi) within this report regarding the rents to be paid by eligible residents within the High Road West masterplan area who move to a new build home within the Scheme takes account of the Council's commitment (in the Love Lane Resident Charter) that residents will not be financially worse off as a result of the demolition of their home.

The Council has committed to ballot residents of the Love Lane Estate on whether to progress with the High Road West Scheme as set out in the Borough Plan. The Council is also required to secure a positive ballot result to draw down funding from the GLA, in line with the Mayor of London's Resident Ballot Requirement for funding of schemes which comprise the demolition of social homes and the construction of 150 or more homes.

Alternative options considered.

Not to adopt the Local Lettings Policy or Leaseholder Offer

The Council could decide not to adopt the resident offers. This approach has been rejected as it would not deliver on the Council's commitments to Love Lane residents and is not supported by the responses received to the consultation and engagement described in this report and set out in the Consultation and Engagement Report, see Appendix 1.

The Council's commitments to residents on their housing offer which form part of the Landlord Offer are only made possible by approval of the Local Lettings Policy and Leaseholder Offer. This option would therefore mean that the Council would not be able to put forward the offer to residents it believes to be generous and fair, and which has been developed based on feedback from residents over several years.

Not to proceed with the Love Lane Estate resident ballot

This option has been rejected as not undertaking a ballot would not deliver on the Council's commitment in the Borough Plan, which has been made to ensure that estate renewal only proceeds where residents are in favour of the proposals. It would also mean that the Council would not be compliant with the Mayor of London's Resident Ballot Requirement. As such, the Council would not be able to access the Greater London Authority funding secured to deliver the scheme, and therefore not be

able to bring forward the wide-reaching benefits that the High Road West scheme offers.

Not to make any changes to the draft Local Lettings Policy and Leaseholder Offer

This option was rejected as these changes are in response to feedback received in consultation and engagement. The change made to the policies either provide enhancements on the draft policies or clarifications. The proposed change in the Local Lettings Policy to reduce the duration of time that non-secure tenants need to have lived in the masterplan area to be eligible for a new Council home applies to only a small number of residents (less than 10) who were previously ineligible. This change to the policy will further support its purpose to protect the stability of the existing community in the area, which was supported by most respondents to the consultation, including applicants on the housing register who do not live in the masterplan area.

To make other changes to the Local Lettings Policy, Leaseholder Offer and Landlord Offer

The Council could make further changes to the policies and resident offers based on suggestions and ideas received during consultation and engagement. For resident leaseholders, this includes the Council making up the difference in value between their existing and new homes, and for the Home Loss Payment to be excluded from any requirement to invest equity into a new home in the development. A full discussion of the suggestions put forward can be found in the report in Appendix 1. These changes have not been made in the final policies, in the interests of putting forward an offer which is generous but also remains fair. The offer needs to strike a balance in both providing support to existing leaseholders and funding other housing within the borough, including for the borough's most vulnerable residents. It is believed that pursuing these proposals would unacceptably compromise the ability of the Council to provide housing across the rest of the borough to an acceptable standard, which would not be fair to residents living in Council properties elsewhere in the borough or those waiting on the housing register.

The Council also received requests from non-secure tenants in temporary accommodation that secure tenancies be offered to these residents now of their existing properties on Love Lane Estate, rather than only offered for the new Council homes in High Road West. The Council is not able to implement this request as part of the existing consultation process, as this would represent a significant deviation from the principles of the Housing Allocations Policy, which gives priority for accommodation to households with the greatest need, assessed according to banding, and then waiting time on the housing register. This could not be achieved without a change to the Allocations Policy or a new Local Lettings Policy, either of which would be subject to consultation and Cabinet approval.

Further, the offer of a secure tenancy to non-secure tenants living in the scheme area is only considered appropriate as part of delivering the High Road West scheme and the 500 new Council homes it includes. The 500 Council homes will be sufficient to rehouse not only all secure and non-secure tenants on the Love Lane Estate, but also 250 households with the highest priority on the wider housing register, which is considered to strike a fair balance between protecting the stability of the existing

community while also providing a substantial number of new Council homes for households with the most pressing housing needs in the borough.

Not to cap rents for eligible residents within the High Road West masterplan area

This option has been rejected as setting rent levels at formula rent would mean that eligible residents would pay a much higher weekly rent charge (see para 6.53). It would mean that the Council would not be able to deliver as fully on its assurance that it would seek to mitigate the financial impact of the regeneration scheme or its commitment in the Love Lane Resident Charter, which says that residents will not be financially worse off as a result of the demolition of their home.

561. NEW PAYMENT OPTIONS POLICY FOR LEASEHOLDERS

Councillor Chandwani left the meeting as per item 555.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Licensing and Housing Services introduced the report which sought approval to amend and improve the Council's leaseholder repayment options for major repair works. This was following a Cabinet approved consultation exercise with Leaseholders. The report provided details and feedback on the outcome of this exercise.

The Cabinet Member provided some context to the decision being sought, outlining the increasing programme of major works on the borough's estates in the next few years. The works would be completed on a holistic basis with major works completed as a whole on an estate rather than section by section . This would be less inconvenient and more cost effective. The capacity issues to deliver schemes had improved . The proposed payment options had been researched and compared these to other borough's terms for leaseholders, and they provided good options with the offer of flexible payments.

In response to questions from Cllr Palmer, the following was noted:

- With regards to equity loan succession to partners and not family members, this was likely to be a typical legal requirement. This was likely to be the typical approach followed by other Council's and organisations. However, the Director for Housing, Planning and Regeneration would explore this point and follow up in writing with a response to Cllr Palmer.
- In relation to the Council taking forward leaseholder bills, where there has been misinformation, it was noted that there was a further Cabinet report on the Noel Park Pods Major works to be considered by the Cabinet on the 22nd of July.
- The situation on charging some leaseholders for installation of fire doors and delay in completing works was a complex issue. There was confusion due to the inefficiency in the providers of fire doors, providing the required certifications and qualifications and this had caused confusion and issues. There were also various legal procedures on how to deal with accounts folding funds for these works and therefore not straightforward situation to resolve.

RESOLVED

To note the outcome of the consultation and approve the revised leaseholder repayments options set out at appendix A, which includes the proposed changes and enhancements as set out in detail in appendix B of this report.

Reasons for decision

It is important that that the Council offers fair and considerate terms that recognise the needs of residents and any debts incurred are recovered in an ethical, reasonable and just manner.

Approving the enhanced payment options will mean that the Council's new terms reflect some of the best options offered by other London Councils and will give leaseholders greater flexibility to choose a payment option that meets their financial circumstances. It also reduces the risk of the Council incurring debts that remain unpaid as well as the risk of lengthy and costly court proceedings to recover the debt.

Alternative options considered.

A do-nothing option will mean that some leaseholders will struggle to pay the monthly payments associated with bills, particularly bills in excess of £30,000. This is not in the Council's interest since this could result in lengthy court action to recover the debt.

The alternative of not introducing this scheme would mean the Council could run the risk of not providing sufficient options for leaseholders, to enable them to agree repayment terms that are affordable and reflect the full range of financial and other circumstances which households may find themselves in.

562. STAPLEFORD NORTH WING BLOCK SECTION 105 CONSULTATION - BROADWATER FARM

Councillor Chandwani returned to the meeting room.

The Cabinet Member for House Building, Place - Making and Development introduced the report which sought approval to undertake a consultation with residents within the Stapleford block to seek their views on the future of their homes. For secure Council tenants this consultation would be a statutory consultation under the s105 Housing Act 1985. This consultation would present two options for resident feedback. The first option put forward was to seek to retain the block and refurbish it alongside the development of new homes. The second option was to rehouse affected residents (secure Council tenants would be rehoused in existing Council properties), demolish the block and include the site within the emerging design proposals for new homes.

It was important to note that the proposals did not affect all residents living in Stapleford and only affected flat numbers (flats 25-36 and 61-72). This was the wing section of Stapleford block, which is attached by a small bridge to Northolt block which is a block that has been previously agreed to be demolished. It was recognised that,

during the plans for demolition works, this part of the Stapleford block would be in the middle of area full of dust and construction works. Therefore, it was important to seek the views of these 24 affected residents through a statutory consultation on whether they wanted the block to come down or have this refurbished. Once consultation was completed, a report would be considered by Cabinet in September.

The Cabinet Member provided assurance that, if the block were to be demolished, the Council would be extending the Rehousing and Payments policy to support these residents.

The Cabinet Member emphasised that the Council and Homes for Haringey were taking forward proactive contact with the residents in this block.

In response to questions from das Neves and Cllr Palmer, the following information was noted:

- There was a lot of engagement with residents affected and full understanding of the languages spoken, and translations needed. There was a sign language interpreter commissioned and Homes for Haringey were working with established interpreters in Turkish and Somali to ensure consistent dialogue. It was noted that Homes for Haringey were running one to one sessions with the resident housing team and also having drop-in sessions. There was also an independent tenant's advisor available to tenants that wanted to speak with someone external to the Council.
- Although, the consultation was taking place over the summer period, the availability of residents had been ascertained to ensure that they were around to speak with housing officers about the consultation. There had been a lot of work to ensure connect and engage with people.
- Noted that this decision would be included in the overall ballot that the Council were running towards the end of the year.
- The Council were seeking to maximise the number of social housing units available on the estate and would replace those demolished with social rented units. They were also ensuring that there was the right to buy properties available to residents when they wish to return. There would also be an increased number of family sized units factored in, if the decision was to refurbish and develop new homes.
- The Director for Housing, Planning and Regeneration reiterated that the decision being sought was on taking forward the Section 105 process and this was essentially a pre- stage to consultation. It was felt important to get residents views at this early stage on the choice of retention or refurbishment.

RESOLVED

1. To agree to consult with residents (including leaseholders) in the Stapleford North block (flats 25-36 and 61-72) under s105 Housing Act 1985 and otherwise presenting options as set out at 1.3.

2. To agree that a report should be brought to Cabinet in September 2021 following the consultation, recommending a decision on the future of Stapleford North.
3. To agree that the consultation proposals include extension of the existing Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy to residents of Stapleford North in the event that it is decided to demolish the block.
4. To delegate authority to the Director of Housing, Planning and Regeneration to agree the final consultation questions and materials.

Reasons for decision

The Council wishes to consult residents in the Stapleford North block (flats 25-36 and 61-72) due to the levels of disruption they will experience if they remain in their homes. Disruption is likely to persist for a prolonged period of time of between four to five years and will be caused by the following:

- the demolition of the Northolt tower, which is the nineteen-storey tower block situated directly north and approximately four metres from the Stapleford North block. Stapleford North and Northolt are joined via a link bridge, which is used to provide lift access from Northolt to properties in the Stapleford North block. The demolition of the tower is likely to take between 9-12 months to complete and significant hoarding will be required, which will surround the Stapleford North block. The demolition will lead to noise and dust disruption as the block is dismantled and removed from site. This will be caused as the panel system is deconstructed, craned to ground floor and removed by truck.

- the construction of new homes on the Northolt plot, which will take place following the demolition. The construction of the new homes is likely to take up to two years and will lead to further extensive hoarding surrounding the block, with dust and noise disruption caused by the construction process for new homes.

- the refurbishment works, which would be required to ensure that the Stapleford North block's structural issues are addressed and that the building meets existing building standards. This work is likely to take a further six to nine months to complete and is like to require the temporary decant of some residents within the block to facilitate.

It is important to note that it is possible for the residents of the Stapleford North block to remain in situ during the demolition and new build works if this is the preferred option and the Council will be seeking to minimise disruption for residents throughout the demolition and construction phases as far as possible. Further detail related to the disruption are set out in paragraphs 6.7 – 6.10.

In addition to the disruption residents in this block will face, the Design Team, led by Karakusevic Carsen Architects (KCA) have identified that retention of the block will impact the place shaping benefits that could be achieved surrounding the Northolt plot and Willan Road. They have identified that the demolition of the Stapleford North block could better address the issues that residents have identified including safety and security, ground floors that encourage activity (as opposed to ground floors solely

used for car parking as is the case now), attractive welcoming streets and spaces, and high-quality homes. Their reasoning is set out in paragraphs (6.12) below.

The consultation will set out for residents the likely level of disruption and invite them to state whether they would prefer the block to be demolished and to be rehoused under the existing Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Repayments policy, or whether they would prefer to remain in situ through the course of the works.

Alternative options considered.

Officers considered continuing to progress with the current design proposals for the new homes and not consulting residents of the Stapleford North block on an alternative option which would include them being rehoused. This would avoid further discussions with residents on the estate about demolition of properties. However, officers decided not to proceed with this option given the significant levels of disruption residents will face. Officers believe that it is right to ensure that residents fully understand the disruption that will be happening and are given the opportunity to consider an alternative, which in design terms could provide benefits to the layout of the estate as set out in paragraphs 6.12 below.

563. PARKING FEES AND CHARGES REVIEW

The Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Welfare and the Public Realm introduced the report which sought approval to commence the statutory notification process required to increase existing parking fees and charges. It also sought approval to commence statutory consultation where required for the introduction of some new charges.

The Cabinet Member and the Assistant Director for Direct Services responded to questions from Councillor Palmer:

- The 6% increase for hourly visitor permits worked out to roughly 5 pence, which was in line with other changes.
- The statutory consultation period for parking was usually around 4-6 weeks.
- In regard to Councillor Palmer's question on changes to Hornsey High Street, the Cabinet Member requested that the question be sent in writing so that a full response could be provided directly to Councillor Palmer.

RESOLVED

1. To authorise the publication of Variation Notices issued under Section 46A of the Road Traffic Regulation Act, to give effect to the increase to existing parking fees and charges as set out in Appendix A.
2. To approve the introduction of a 25% diesel surcharge for on street and off-street car park charges as set out in Appendix B, subject to the outcome of statutory consultation.
3. To approve the introduction of Sunday parking charges in those off-street (public) car parks where they currently do not apply as set out in Appendix C, subject to the outcome of statutory consultation.

4. To approve the introduction of Sunday parking charges in on-street “stop-and-shop” parking bays as set out in Appendix D, subject to the outcome of statutory consultation.
5. To give delegated authority to the Head of Highways and Parking, consequential on this report to:
 - carry out statutory notification and consultation where required.
 - consider representations received in response to consultation and to report significant or substantial concerns to the relevant decision-maker(s).
 - make traffic management orders, where there are no valid objections.

Reasons for decision

Haringey must ensure appropriate parking fees and charges (permit, on-street and off-street parking prices) are in place to continue to support the Council’s wider traffic management and environmental objectives and obligations.

The Council’s authority to operate and set parking-related charges is defined by legislation. It is important to note that on-street parking charges cannot be set purely and intentionally as a means to raise revenue and charges must have regard to the costs of administration and enforcement.

However, permit and on-street prices can be set to ensure the Council provides suitable and adequate parking facilities on the public highway, whilst ensuring this does not negatively affect traffic flow in the borough. The Council is, therefore, able to set charges to restrain demand and enable a more effective management of its kerbside for wider transport and environmental benefits.

Sections 45 and 46 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) provide the Council with the power to control parking by designating on-street parking places, charging for their use and restricting (or providing for) the use of such places by persons holding a permit for the purpose.

The setting of parking charges is a function which, like other functions under the RTRA, must be exercised in accordance with section 122 of the RTRA, to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:

- the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
- the effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity.
- the strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy)
- the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and
- any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

When exercising this function, the Council must have regard to the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy as provided by sections 142 and 144(1)(a) Greater London Authority Act 1999. That strategy emphasises the importance of reducing emissions and improving air quality.

Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 defines how any surplus from civil parking enforcement must be spent. This includes the provision of public transport services, highway maintenance and improvements, and environmental projects. Any additional revenue generated through parking permits will be invested to fund such activities.

This report recommends changes to existing fees, and the introduction of new fees and charges as set out under the following headings.

Inflationary increase to existing fees and charges

Appendix A recommends proposed increases to existing fees and charges that are in line with levels of inflation.

It is noted that most parking charges (e.g., resident and business permits) were reviewed and approved for inflationary increases in November 2020 and therefore this report only considers a small proportion of the Council's parking fees and charges, summarised as:

- Monthly resident visitor permit to increase to £31.70, an uplift of 2.26%
- Hourly visitor permits to increase to £0.88 per hour, an uplift of 6.00%
- Doctors permit to increase to £292, an uplift of 2.10%
- Courtesy car permit to increase to £31.70, an uplift of 2.26%
- Residential administration fee (Lost/Stolen/Change of vehicle and/or address/replacement) to increase to £12.25, an uplift of 2.08%
- Car Park season tickets
 - Bury Road, N22 - Quarterly Season Ticket to increase to £78, an uplift of 1.96%
 - Bury Road, N22 - Annual Season Ticket to increase to £299.90, an increase of 2.01%
 - Stoneleigh Road, N17 (A, B & C) - Annual Season Ticket to increase to £162.50, an increase of 2.01%
 - Lawrence Road Car Park to increase to £1190.35, an increase of 2.00%

The above charges were considered and approved in the preparation of the 2021/22 Budget and 2021-2026 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).

It is noted that the hourly visitor permits will be increased year-on-year at 6% for the term of the 2021-2026 MTFS.

This report seeks approval to carry out the publication of Variation Notices issued under Section 46A of the Road Traffic Regulation Act, in order to give effect to the changes to fees and charges.

Diesel surcharge for on-street parking and car parks

In March 2020, Cabinet approved¹, amongst other changes to parking fees and charges, the introduction of a 25% surcharge for diesel vehicles parking in off-street public car parks and in on-street paid parking bays (commonly known as pay-by-phone bays). This decision was subject to the outcome of statutory (traffic management order) consultation.

In response to the feedback received during the statutory consultation, Cabinet approved² to implement only some aspects of the proposed traffic management order. Of relevance to this report *“consideration was given to introducing the 25% diesel surcharge on on-street and car park charges from November 2020, as part of a package of measures to reduce diesel related pollutants. However, following due consideration of the feedback to the consultation, this will not be implemented at this point in time. This will also help support our town centres in their recovery from the impacts of the Covid 19 pandemic.”*

As national Covid-19 restrictions are lifted, Haringey’s parking services have returned to ‘business as usual’. In this context, the decision by Cabinet in September 2020 to pause the 25% diesel surcharge due for on-street and car park charges is no longer applicable. Therefore, this report recommends implementing that proposal subject to the completion of readvertising the proposal and a new round of statutory consultation.

In keeping with the aspirations of the Haringey Climate Change Action Plan, the Council is, through enhancing opportunities for active travel, pursuing a shift to less-polluting means of mobility. Exercising greater control and positive influence over emissions from diesel vehicles is a further component in addressing environmental concerns. By tackling air quality in this way, the Council will make the overall shopping experience more pleasant.

It is noted that in March 2021 an EqIA was carried out³ that identified that the proposal was robust and there is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact and that all opportunities to promote equality have been taken.

This report seeks approval for the Head of Highways and Parking to publish a proposal notice to introduce the 25% diesel surcharge charges for off-street and on-street paid parking, as outlined in Appendix B and to carry out statutory consultation in accordance with Road Traffic Regulation Act. It also recommends that the Head of Highways and Parking make the relevant traffic management orders and complete any associated statutory processes where no valid objections are made.

Should significant or substantial objections be received during the statutory consultation, it is recommended that these are reported to the relevant decision maker(s) before a decision is taken whether to make the relevant traffic management order.

Introduction of Sunday charges in off-street (public) car parks

¹ <https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=64336>

² <https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=65596>

³ <https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s121321/App%2010a.1%2020210112%20Diesel%20surcharge.pdf>

Appendix C recommends the introduction of Sunday parking charges in those off-street (public) car parks where they currently do not apply.

The main reasons for this proposal are to:

- Prevent all-day free parking and encourage turn-over of parking space on Sundays. In turn, this provides more parking 'sessions' per day.
- Help balance demand with supply across the busy weekend period, helping maximise opportunity for custom.
- Encourage sustainable modes of transport by ensuring that vehicle ownership is not seen as more economical than using sustainable transport.
- Ensure that those who receive benefit from the service (i.e., those who make use of parking spaces in a high value locations) also contribute to the overall cost of providing that service.
- Provide consistency across our public car parks where some already have Sunday charges.

Car Park opening and closing times remain unchanged by this proposal.

This proposal was subject to an equalities impact assessment (EqIA) in February 2021⁴. The EqIA demonstrated that the proposal was robust and there was no potential for discrimination or adverse impact and that all opportunities to promote equality had been taken.

The introduction of Sunday charging was included within the 2021/22 Budget and 2021-2026 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)⁵

This report seeks approval for the Head of Highways and Parking to publish a proposal notice to introduce the new charges and to carry out statutory consultation in accordance with Road Traffic Regulation Act. It also recommends that the Head of Highways and Parking make the relevant traffic management orders and complete any associated statutory processes where no valid objections are made.

Should significant or substantial objections be received during the statutory consultation, it is recommended that these are reported to the relevant decision(s) maker before a decision is taken whether to make the relevant traffic management order.

Introduction of Sunday charges in Stop and Shop bays

Appendix D recommends the introduction of Sunday parking charges in existing Stop and Shop parking bays.

Existing "Stop and Shop" parking bays are designated in various locations which are considered to be the areas of highest demand for visitor parking, i.e., destination areas such as town centres.

⁴ https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s121324/App%2010a.4%2020210115%20MNM%20Sunday%20charges_.pdf

⁵ <https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=67501#mgDocuments>

The parking bays are located in the town centres of Crouch End, Green Lanes, Hornsey, Muswell Hill, Tottenham, Turnpike Lane, West Green, and Wood Green, as well as on the High Roads and other streets near destination locations, as listed in Appendix D.

Stop and Shop bays allow visitors to pay for short-term parking (with a maximum stay of 1, 2 or 3 hours) by phone or app via the Council's service provider RingGo. Contactless parking is also being made available across the borough.

Most Stop and Shop bays operate Monday to Saturday, but some already operate Monday to Sunday.

It is recommended that all existing Monday to Saturday Stop, and Shop bays are changed to operate Monday to Sunday for the following reasons:

- encourage turn-over of parking space on Sundays, by preventing all-day parking. In turn, this increases the number of parking 'slots' that are available for visitor parking and therefore helps maximise the opportunity for custom in the town centres.
- encourage sustainable modes of transport by ensuring that vehicle ownership is not seen as more economical than using sustainable transport - this is achieved by setting of appropriate parking charges.
- ensure that those who receive benefit from the service (i.e., those who make use of a parking space) also contribute to the overall cost of providing that service.

This proposal was subject to an equalities impact assessment (EqIA) in February 2021⁶. The EqIA demonstrated that the proposal was robust and there was no potential for discrimination or adverse impact and that all opportunities to promote equality had been taken.

In response to earlier scrutiny, the economic impact of this proposal has been considered. Various studies have looked at the impact of parking policy upon the economy and, in general terms, concluded that parking controls are essential to the success of urban town centres and that other factors, such as a good mix of shops and services and a quality environment, are more important than parking. Extracts from those studies include:

- *"critics often claim that parking pricing spoils local economic activity by discouraging customers, but it actually provides both economic benefits and costs. It increases turnover of parking spaces which makes finding a space easier, reduces the number of parking spaces required at a location which can provide financial savings, and can reduce traffic problems such as congestion. General levels of provision may affect access modes, in turn, impacting on the quality of the shopping environment"*⁷.
- the economic consequences of not implementing parking controls are reflected in the time costs incurred while searching for a parking space, and

⁶ https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s121324/App%2010a.4%2020210115%20MNM%20Sunday%20charges_.pdf

⁷ <https://www.britishparking.co.uk/write/Documents/Library/Reports%20and%20research/parkingreport.pdf>

in time losses from traffic congestion caused by searching for parking and loading⁸.

- *“car drivers spend more on a single trip; walkers and bus users spend more over a week or a month. In 2011, in London town centres, walkers spent £147 more per month than those travelling by car”*⁹
- *“Shopkeepers consistently overestimate the share of their customers coming by car. In some cases, this is by a factor of as much as 400%. In London, as well as other cities, the share of those accessing urban centres on foot or by public transport is much greater. Walking is the most important mode for accessing local town centres”*; ¹⁰

The introduction of Sunday charging was included within the 2021/22 Budget and 2021-2026 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)¹¹.

This report seeks approval for the Head of Highways and Parking to publish a proposal notice to introduce the new charges and to carry out statutory consultation in accordance with Road Traffic Regulation Act. It also recommends that the Head of Highways and Parking make the relevant traffic management orders and complete any associated statutory processes where no valid objections are made.

Should significant or substantial objections be received during the statutory consultation, it is recommended that these are reported to the relevant decision maker(s) before a decision is taken whether to make the relevant traffic management order.

Paid parking – purchase in 15-minute blocks.

Paid parking, via the RingGo pay by phone / pay by app facility, is currently purchased in 15-minute blocks of time.

This report notes that these 15-minute blocks are an existing arrangement which will be formalised within the traffic management orders at the same time as other statutory processes arising from this report.

Alternative options considered.

A 30-minute paid parking block was considered but was rejected at this time on the basis that it was not an existing arrangement and may deter some customers from paying for parking.

564. RENEWAL OF DPS FOR RESIDENTIAL AND NURSING

The Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Wellbeing introduced the report which sought approval for the extension of the Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) procurement sourcing tool for the provision of Residential and Nursing care requirements. The proposal was to extend the DPS for Residential and Nursing categories for a period of 1 year to 31 July 2022, with provision to extend for up to a further 6 months.

⁸ https://repository.lboro.ac.uk/articles/report/The_environmental_and_welfare_implications_of_parking_policies/13352660

⁹ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/services/parking-services/parking-and-traffic/parking-information-professionals/review-relevance>

¹⁰ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/services/parking-services/parking-and-traffic/parking-information-professionals/review-relevance>

¹¹ <https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=67501#mgDocuments>

The Cabinet Member and the Assistant Director for Commissioning responded to questions from Councillor Palmer:

- The past year had been a difficult year, which had resulted in a shift in how services and processes were managed.
- The service had been engaging with the market and built good relationships through the North Central London network and it was hoped that this would help other service providers to recognise the benefits of a DPS. Other boroughs did not yet have access to the DPS at this stage, but it was hoped that through engagement, the benefits of this procurement route would be recognised.

RESOLVED

1. That pursuant to Contract Standing Order 10.02.1(b) to approve the extension of the Dynamic Purchasing System for 1 year with the option to extend for 6 months for the following care provision in the values outlined below:

Care Category	Up to 18 months £	Full value over life of the DPS £
Residential	6,935,000	20,805,000
Nursing	2,565,000	7,695,000
Total	9,500,000	28,500,000

Reasons for decision

The Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) is a supplier e-sourcing tool and a compliant route to market under the Public Contract Regulations, which enables suppliers to enrol, accredit and be approved to bid for Council contracts. The Council's overall spend for residential and nursing over the past financial year was in the region of £25,545,000 and £9,496,000 respectively (a combined value of £35,041,000) the Council already holds a DPS enterprise license through until November 2022 and would not incur any additional expenditure on licenses for this period.

Due to the exigencies of the Covid-19 pandemic a significant amount of additional work was generated for the commissioning team, which meant insufficient time was available to enable a tender process to renew fully the DPS for this market. Moreover, Commissioning had to rationalise work and focus on the renewal of the Home Support DPS, as well as managing the daily communications with the provider market around testing, PPE, infection control and vaccinations. Had there been sufficient resources DPS renewals could have been undertaken simultaneously.

The DPS provides a compliant route to market for care provision, which ensures transparency in the procurement process, equal treatment of suppliers and that the requirements of both the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Council's Contract Standing Orders (CSO) can be met, particularly as much of care provision is

purchased on an individual basis and the Regulations do not provide for hitherto 'spot contracts. Purchasing compliantly outside of a DPS would require either a resource intensive approach, whereby each requirement would be commissioned separately, and suppliers would go through the accreditation checks for each opportunity. This could prevent suppliers from bidding for the services and place the provision of these services at risk or we would need to establish a framework, which could exclude many local SMEs from meeting the criteria to qualify under a framework. In addition, a framework does not allow for suppliers to join at any time and prevents new start-ups and entrants from accessing Council contracts during the term of the framework.

A DPS is beneficial in that it enables supply chain expansion as suppliers can join at any time during its lifetime, unlike a traditional framework where only suppliers at inception remain within it until expiry. This means that the supply chain can be renewed and replenished throughout its term, which lends itself to more competition and therefore better value for the Council and its users.

A DPS enables the Council, to undertake time efficient tender processes, which facilitates speed of award and service delivery. The DPS streamlines the Council's procurement/commissioning, contract administration and finance processes, which can be undertaken under the one system.

Importantly, extending the DPS for up to eighteen months in total will provide an opportunity for the Commissioning and Strategic Procurement teams to review their strategies going forward, and identify what sourcing and contractual arrangements options will provide access to high quality care, best value and process efficiency. Additionally, Commissioning will be able to assess the impact caused by the recent Covid pandemic, as well as update documentation to account for current circumstances, emergent need, or identified gaps in provision, for example to meet specialisms like dementia care, end of life and palliative provisions.

Moreover, Strategic Procurement will support the care supply chain during the extension period by holding market events to identify any issues and assist suitable economic operators to enrol, accredit and effectively use the DPS system to compliantly deliver the Council's Residential/Nursing Care requirements

Alternative options considered.

Do Nothing – this option would require the Council to seek alternate procurement arrangements incurring significant additional costs and resource effort to facilitate procuring over 714 placement per year, each needing the supplier to re-present accreditation requirements, that will then need to be evaluated.

Establish a framework for Residential and Nursing Care – this option was discounted in preference to the use of a DPS for commissioning these services. This is primarily due to the restrictions applied to the duration of a framework and the limitation of suppliers only being able to be admitted at the point of establishment of the framework. In comparison to a framework, a DPS enables an unlimited number of suppliers to join at any time; provided they meet the accreditation and enrolment criteria. The call off process from a framework is much more administratively intensive than that of a DPS.

565. 2020/21 FINANCE UPDATE AND PROVISIONAL OUTTURN

The Leader introduced the report on behalf of the Cabinet Member for Finance and Transformation. The report set out the provisional outturn for 2020/21 for the General Fund, HRA, DSG and the Capital Programme compared to budget. It provided explanations of significant under/overspends and also included proposed transfers to/from reserves, revenue and capital carry forward requests and any budget virements or adjustments.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Transformation was available online and commented that the report indicated a small underspend and that the contingency reserve earmarked to cover the risk of overspending had not been used. There were some concerns in relation to the relatively high underspend in the capital programme budget. However, the Cabinet Member advised that no external funding had been lost as a result of the underspend.

The Director of Finance responded to questions from the Committee:

- The Government had announced considerable funding to cover any overspends as a result of Covid-19. The Council had received significant emergency funding in last year and was also supported in regard to the loss of fees and charges usually collected. Further such support was also being received in this financial year. However, whether this support would be enough would depend on the ongoing situation with Covid-19.
- General Fund capital receipts can continue to be used to fund one-off costs to improve operations and make ongoing savings within the Council. The report provided a full explanation on capital receipts.

The Director of Finance responded to questions from Councillor Palmer:

- In regard to applying for a disapplication on the DSG higher needs block, it was explained that the Council was trying to be at the forefront of Local Authorities lobbying the Government for better, more realistic funding of this area.
- In response to Cllr Palmer's second question, it was requested that this be put into writing to the Director of Finance for a written response.

RESOLVED

1. To note the provisional revenue and capital outturn for 2020/21 as detailed in the report.
2. To approve the capital carry forwards in Appendix 3 of the report.
3. To approve the appropriations to/from reserves at Appendix 4 of the report.
4. To approve the budget virements as set out in Appendix 5 of the report.
5. To note the debt write-offs approved by officers in Quarter 4 2020/21 as set out in Appendix 6 of the report.

Reasons 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.

It is necessary at year end to resolve the treatment of related balance sheet accounts, in light of the experience during the year and knowledge of the Council's future position and requirements.

Alternative options considered.

The Director of Finance, as Section 151 Officer, has a duty to consider and propose decisions in the best interests of the authority's finances and that best support delivery of the agreed borough plan outcomes whilst maintaining financial sustainability.

This report of the Director of Finance has addressed these points. Therefore, no other options have been presented.

566. AWARD OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES (CYPS) CONTRACT

The Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Families introduced the report which sought approval to award a new contract for the Children, Young People and Families Drug and Alcohol Service as allowed under Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1 (d). The Cabinet Member highlighted paragraph 6.7 of the report which set out the opportunities provided for youth involvement and co-production.

In response to a question from Councillor Palmer, the Director for Public Health explained that there were a number of service level indicators related to the contract, along with a number of other measures used to monitor substance misuse.

Further to considering exempt information at item 21,

RESOLVED

1. To agree to award the contract for the provision of Children, Young People and Families Drug and Alcohol Services to the successful bidder as outlined in the exempt part of this report.
2. The contract will be for a period of 4 years from 1st December 2021 to 30th November 2025, with option to extend for a further period of 3 years.
3. The value of the contract for the initial 4 years is £1,264,541.00; the total value over the life of the contract is £2,212,911.00.

Reasons for decision

The current contract expires on 30th November 2021. The contract was due to expire on 31st March 2021 and a tender process was planned to start in Spring 2020 however, this was put on hold due to the disruption caused by the pandemic. The extension until 30th November 2021 was agreed by Cabinet.

An open tender process was undertaken. It is proposed to award the contract to the winning bidder which was selected based on the quality of the service being offered

and the delivery price as set out within the invitation to tender documents. The Council is satisfied that the successful tender represents value for money.

Alternative options considered.

Do nothing.

The Council is not mandated to commission this service and so it could decide to no longer commission this service for its residents. However, there is high demand for this service and no alternative project /programme. Both a Care Quality Commission report and a review by Haringey Healthwatch concluded that this service is highly valued by children, young people and families.

In-house provision

A report was presented to the Insourcing Board to ensure the Council had considered the insourcing of this service. It was agreed that due to nature of this service it was better delivered by a specialist substance misuse provider.

567. ASHLEY ROAD DEPOT - AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR DESIGN WORKS

The Cabinet Member for House Building, Place Making and Development introduced the report which sought approval for the extension of the appointment of a Lead Designer to take forward the Ashley Road Depot Project to deliver c. 298 new homes.

In response to questions from Councillor Palmer, the Cabinet Member and the Director for Housing, Regeneration and Planning advised that all stakeholders would be consulted on their views for the scheme, and that these views would be taken into consideration for the final proposals.

Further to considering exempt information at item 22,

RESOLVED

1. To approve the extension of appointment of a Lead Designer for RIBA Stage 3 at a cost of £ 730,373.
2. To delegate to the Director of Housing, Planning and Regeneration, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for House-Building, Place-Making and Development, to agree any further extension of the appointment of the Lead Designer for RIBA Stage 4 up to a cost of £ 637,684.

Reasons for decisions

Based upon the tender returns, officers have approved the first stage of design and the appointment of a cost consultant. However, to achieve planning we will need to instruct works and costs that require Cabinet approval. Without Cabinet approval to appoint RIBA Work Stage 3 we cannot develop the scheme design to submission for Planning Permission.

The site will be empty from January 2022 and there is a strong desire to achieve a

start on site as soon as possible following that date. Given the potential number of homes that can be built, this scheme is a great opportunity for the Council to demonstrate its ability to deliver genuinely affordable homes. We have also been allocated £8,600,000 grant funding by the GLA, and bid for a further £6,300,000, which we expect to be allocated. The drawing down of grant will require the Council to achieve a material start on site no later than March 2023.

In addition, we are seeking Delegated Authority to appoint further design work to maintain progress, ensure design quality and de-risk the works tender to assist with securing a more competitive build price. For example, we may wish to design some elements to a greater level than is required for planning to ensure that the tender package protects the design quality and prevents crude value engineering by the contractor. Plus, it may help to accelerate the delivery of the new homes, since the work can be carried out during the planning decision period. While the scheme is in its initial design stages, we cannot be certain of the best approach to these details, and therefore Delegated Authority is sought to allow a flexible approach.

Alternative options considered.

This supplier of lead designer services was procured via a competitive tender through the Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS), which is the recommended route for a contract of this value. An alternative option would have been to appoint directly, but this option was rejected due to the value of the estimated contract. Given the scale of costs, procuring competitively gave us an opportunity to demonstrate best value and procure from a wide selection of potential suppliers.

The procurement combined a number of services including Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Engineering and Planning Consultancy. These services could have been separated and tendered separately. However, this would have posed significant risks of delay and a lack of clear accountability. By combining these services within one appointment we can mitigate these risks and are able to appoint a team with a track record of working together who can start immediately.

568. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES

RESOLVED

To note the minutes of the Cabinet Member Signings held on
28 June 2021
2 July 2021

569. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS

RESOLVED

To note the significant and delegated decisions taken by Directors in April to July 2021.

570. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

571. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the consideration of agenda items 21-24 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.

572. EXEMPT - AWARD OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES (CYPS) CONTRACT

The Cabinet noted the exempt information and the resolutions were agreed as per minute 566.

573. EXEMPT - ASHLEY ROAD DEPOT - AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR DESIGN WORKS

The Cabinet noted the exempt information and the resolutions were agreed as per minute 567.

574. EXEMPT MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the exempt minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 15 June 2021 be approved as a correct record.

575. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

None.

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair

Date

MINUTES OF MEETING Cabinet HELD ON Thursday, 22nd July, 2021, 6.30 - 7.55 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Peray Ahmet (Chair), Mike Hakata, John Bevan, Zena Brabazon, Seema Chandwani, Julie Davies, Isidoros Diakides and Ruth Gordon

576. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to the information as set out in the agenda and advised that the meeting was being filmed.

577. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor das Neves.

578. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

579. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Chandwani advised that as she was a Haringey Leaseholder, she would recuse herself from the meeting for the consideration of items 10 and 13.

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

There were no representations made.

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

None received.

582. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

None received.

583. BOROUGH PLAN UPDATE AND FAIRNESS COMMISSION RESPONSE

The Leader introduced the report which provided an update on the Borough Plan and sought approval in regard to the council's approach to implementing the Fairness Commission recommendations.

Cabinet Members and Officers responded to questions from Councillor Barnes:

- The Council was committed to the provision of clean air on school streets. An extensive LTN and air quality monitoring programme would be implemented in order to maximise the quality of air in the borough.
- A 'good economy recovery plan' had been published which set out how investment would be made in local businesses and jobs.
- Homes for Haringey had an extensive transformation programme for properties in poor conditions and were working in consultation with tenants and leaseholders. Work was also taking place with Housing Associations to improve conditions in properties owned by these organisations.

RESOLVED that Cabinet

1. Note the Borough Plan Update Report at Appendix A and agree that the next full Borough Plan should now be prepared for adoption in the financial year 2022/23.
2. Note the Covid-19 Community Impact Assessment at Appendix B and agree that this, alongside other data insight projects, should inform our ongoing response to Covid-19 and preparations for our next Borough Plan.
3. Accept the findings of the Fairness Commission; note progress in implementing the recommendations; and agree that the council should continue to implement these recommendations as explained in the report in Appendix C.

Reasons for decision

The Borough Plan 2019-2023 was adopted in February 2019. The Cabinet Report stated that the Plan should be seen as 'a living document'. In December 2020, Cabinet agreed that officials should 'refresh' and consult upon an updated Borough Plan 2019-2023.

Officers have reviewed the Borough Plan and presented an Update Report at Appendix A. Due to changes in circumstances since the Recovery and Renewal Report, including another wave of the Covid-19 pandemic, continued uncertainty about the pandemic's impact on the borough and the limited time left in the Borough Plan cycle, and with a new Cabinet now in place, it is no longer deemed beneficial to undertake a full refresh of the Plan. Instead, Cabinet is asked to agree that this Update Report should continue to inform the Council's delivery of our current programme as well as the development of a full new Borough Plan over the next 18 months to be adopted in the financial year 2022/23.

The Fairness Commission ('the Commission') was launched in July 2018 and made a series of recommendations in February 2020 to address inequality in the borough.

Cabinet received an update report in March 2021 on our progress in implementing these recommendations. The Council's Borough Plan Update Report at Appendix A now explains the lessons we have learned around equality and fairness during the pandemic and Appendix C sets out in full technical detail the progress the Council has made so far in implementing the recommendations of the Commission.

Cabinet is now asked formally to accept the findings of the Fairness Commission and agree that the council should continue to implement these recommendations as explained in Appendix C. Not every recommendation can be accepted in full for practical reasons. Where this is the case, alternative options are being explored.

Alternative options considered

Publish and consult upon a refreshed Borough Plan

It would be possible to refresh the Borough Plan 2019-2023 in full and consult as originally envisaged. However, given the continued uncertainty caused by the long-tail of the Covid pandemic, and the limited time left on the current Borough Plan cycle, this is no longer deemed feasible or desirable. The Borough Plan Update Report and the Council's delivery planning and Performance Monitoring processes (explained in paragraph 6.4) will achieve the necessary purpose.

Not accept the findings or recommendations of the Fairness Commission

It would be possible not to accept the findings or recommendations of the Fairness Commission. However, this would run counter to the council's strategic objectives. The Commission was launched to better understand the causes of unfairness in our borough and to reconsider the actions that we could take to counter this. The evidence and findings are robust and have already informed a number of our significant organisational agendas and should continue to do so going forward.

584. HARINGEY EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP CONTRACT EXTENSION

The Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Families introduced the report which sought approval to extend Haringey Council's contract with Haringey Education Partnership (HEP) to deliver school improvement services for three years from 1st September 2021 to 31st August 2024.

In response to a question from Councillor Barnes, the Cabinet Member explained that the report outlined which schools were a member of the HEP. The schools which were not members were in academy chains and had their own arrangements for support.

RESOLVED that Cabinet

1. Approve the extension of the Haringey Education Partnership contract for three years from 1st September 2021 to 31st August 2024 with a total contract value of £2.118m as allowed under Contract Standing Order 10.01.1(b).

Reasons for decision

In 2017, the Council began working in partnership with schools across the borough to develop detailed proposals for a schools led school improvement company, known as the Haringey Education Partnership (HEP), to drive school improvement from 1st September 2018. Haringey Education Partnership work in close collaboration and partnership with the Council to build on the existing strengths of schools in Haringey. The model is aimed at creating an exceptional school system with a higher proportion of outstanding schools and continuing to tackle attainment gaps within and across schools in the borough.

The Council entered into a three-year contract with Haringey Education Partnership to deliver the Council's ongoing statutory and strategic school improvement functions from September 2018. This contract expires on 31st August 2021 and requires a decision to renew the contract to continue to the services provided by HEP in the next three academic years. HEP's new three year contract will provide strategic and operational certainty for the Council (in delivering its statutory and strategic functions) and schools in the borough.

Alternative options considered

The contract is not extended and the Council insources its own school improvement service. The council is not resourced and structured to provide the existing level of service as the HEP. If the Council were to insource the service it would need to provide the statutory school improvement services within the allocated DSG.

The Council outsources its statutory and strategic functions for school improvement to a private contractor. This would run counter to the Council's preferred approach to service delivery. Any external provider would have no existing connection to the borough and have to establish relationships with Haringey schools from scratch. They would also need to raise significant income from Haringey schools to be sustainable and generate an operating profit.

585. AUTHORITY TO COMMENCE CONSULTATION WITH RESIDENTS ON THE COUNCIL'S PROPOSAL TO BRING HOMES FOR HARINGEY (HFH) BACK IN-HOUSE

Councillor Chandwani left the meeting for the consideration of this item.

The Cabinet Member for Employment, Skills and Community Services introduced the report which set out a proposal to insource Homes for Haringey and sought approval for a resident consultation process to inform a future decision. The Cabinet Member added that this was the next step in removing barriers to ALMOs. Tenants were last consulted in 2017, and it was planned to carry out a thorough consultation with maximum access and engagement with residents. A final decision was due to be considered by Cabinet in December 2021.

The Cabinet Member and Director for Housing, Regeneration and Planning responded to questions from Councillor Barnes:

- It wasn't currently known which services were duplicated across the Local Authority and Homes for Haringey, but these would be identified as the consultation process evolved.

- The consultation with residents would be as wide as possible to take in as many views as possible.
- There was no intention of slowing down the pace of Council house building. The building programme was the biggest house building plan of any London borough.

RESOLVED that Cabinet

1. Approve the consultation with tenants and leaseholders the proposal to insource Homes For Haringey.
2. Approve the consultation processes set out in paragraph 6.11 of the report.
3. Note complementary proposals to establish a cross-party Member working group, as set out in paragraph 6.14, and two regular resident participation meetings, a Housing Sounding Board and a Resident Housing Forum, as set out in paragraph 6.15. This is to further engage with all stakeholders on the proposal.

Reasons for decision

The proposal to bring HfH back in-house is rooted in four key rationales:

- Robust governance – accountability to the regulator and residents.
- Value for money – efficiency and quality of services.
- Integrated services – housing as part of a wider customer service offer.
- Improvement – enhancing organisational transformation to deliver better outcomes.

These objectives are explored in further detail in the four following paragraphs.

Robust Governance

The rationales for bringing HfH back in-house to ensure robust governance are based on the following:

- The Council is the legally liable landlord for its 20,000 tenants and leaseholders;
- As a Registered Provider, the Council is accountable directly to the Regulator of Social Housing and the regulation of local authority landlords is now being strengthened;
- The Council is the “accountable person” for building safety under the new post-Grenfell regulations now progressing through parliament;
- The Social Housing White Paper 2020 seeks a stronger local voice for residents in both building safety and housing management and maintenance services;
- Direct delivery in-house will streamline and strengthen governance and accountability structures to meet the changing regulatory climate.

Value for Money

The rationales for bringing HfH back in-house to deliver VFM are based on the following:

- Efficiency savings may be anticipated by eliminating areas of duplication and potentially revising existing back-office service level agreements;
- Corporate services supporting the HfH Board and subgroups will no longer be needed;
- Client-side monitoring resources in the Council can be repurposed;
- Some HfH functions may be integrated with Council functions to deliver added value;
- Any efficiency savings to the HRA can be reinvested in resident services or add value by funding capital investment in estate improvements and new homes.

Integrated Services

The rationales for bringing HfH back in-house to integrate services are based on the following:

- An integrated management structure within the Council can facilitate a faster and more responsive decision-making process across the housing service, including the new build delivery programme;
- Service improvement resources will be strengthened and focused by bringing the Housing Client team and HfH Business Improvement team together;
- Bringing Housing Demand services back in-house will enable closer alignment with the Council's social care and housing-related support services as well as Haringey Connects;
- Integrated services will be more responsive to external demands (such as those within the charter for social housing residents: social housing white paper) and customer requirements, due to the direct strategic and operational control and direction of the services, with clear lines of accountability to elected Members;
- A range of other service integration opportunities can be explored where appropriate including with Environment and Neighbourhoods; Customers, Transformation and Resources; Housing, Regeneration and Planning; etc.

Improvement

The rationales for bringing HfH back in-house to improve service delivery are based on the following:

- Closer alignment between the existing HfH transformation programme and the Council's transformation programme, in particular in terms of use of technology and office spaces.
- Strengthened resident voice including co-production will lead to increased customer satisfaction.

Consultation approach

The rationales for the proposed consultation approach are as follows:

- The Council's existing corporate commitment to resident consultation sets out clear principles and requirements, based on the definition that "consultation is a process of dialogue that helps lead to a decision".
- This includes communicating the purpose of the proposal, providing information about how the proposal will affect people, seeking their views and communicating the results of the consultation and the decision.
- In addition, there is legislation and Government guidance to be considered when consulting on bringing HfH back in-house.
- The detailed legal requirements in this case are set out in section 8 below.
- In summary, the consultation should include all Council tenants and leaseholders and be no less extensive than the 2017 consultation process undertaken when the HfH management agreement was extended.

Alternative options considered

As explained in the legal comments, there is not an option to proceed to a decision on insourcing Homes For Haringey without consulting residents first. In any case, the Council is already committed to resident consultation over decisions of this significance (see the Haringey Consultation Charter).

Where the Council has a clear proposal and set of rationales to bring services in-house, it is considered sufficient to consult on this proposal and no alternatives. There is no legal requirement to consult on a range of different options, even though there are a range of different possible approaches to organising and procuring housing management and maintenance services (e.g. transfer ownership to a housing association; transfer management to a housing association; procure a private sector managing agent; bring services in-house; continue with HfH) and these alternatives will be included in the report to Cabinet for decision following consultation on the insourcing proposal.

586. INSOURCING OF TRAVEL BUDDIES TO SUPPORT SEN YOUNG PEOPLE

The Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Families introduced the report which reported on work carried out to evaluate the Council's travel buddy service and sought approval for the creation of an inhouse team in line with the Council's Insourcing Policy. This had been a long journey in reforming SEN travel, and the in-house service would provide 62 support staff for young people every day. All members of staff would be employed directly by the Council.

The Cabinet Member responded the questions from the Cabinet:

- The staff employed by the service were mainly local people who had previously been employed on zero-hour contracts without the benefits of proper employment.
- Paragraph 7.3 of the report outlined how the service would improve active travel – by encouraging people to walk or use public transport where possible.

RESOLVED

1. That Cabinet approves the insourcing of the Council's travel buddies service from the current interim DPS arrangement brought about by the withdrawal of services from the previous provider.
2. That the service be brought inhouse before September 1st 2021 to coincide with the new academic year.

Reasons for decision:

The Haringey special educational needs and disability (SEND) School Transport Service provides an important service to children, young people, and their families. One important part of this service is our travel buddy team who are responsible for accompanying children with special educational needs to their place of learning with the goal of promoting independent travel.

Until June 2020, the travel buddy service was facilitated by an external provider. Due to emerging concerns about COVID, and the future viability of the service, at that time of the UK's first national lockdown the provider informed the Council that they no longer wished to continue providing the service.

In order to preserve the service and to provide continuity for affected children, Haringey promptly committed to keeping all our 62 travel buddies employed via an interim framework facilitated by Procurement colleagues under a Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) arrangement.

It was acknowledged from the outset that this DPS arrangement would be a temporary measure while a full commissioning review of suitable options for the future travel buddy service was undertaken. That commissioning process was subsequently carried out in line with the measures set out in the Council's Insourcing Policy.

Haringey's Insourcing Policy was approved and adopted by Cabinet in October 2019. 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.

Bringing travel buddies inhouse will lead to a new operating model and potential future alignments with existing teams within the SEN service. The Council will have more control over the new inhouse service and will be able to manage staff to the same standards as other colleagues within the Children's Services directorate.

As part of the proposed transition process, it was recognised that any decision to bring Travel Buddies inhouse would be a significant change for staff who were self-employed under the previous external provider and maintain that status under the DPS arrangement. In order to ensure a collaborative approach and successful co-production of an improved inhouse operating model, the SEND service and project team undertook a thorough and meaningful consultation with Travel buddies over a six-week period in November and December of 2020.

The consultation took the form of group consultation and individual conversations with all 62 travel buddies to set out the rationale behind the insource and to get their opinions on how we move forward with the service. The results of a confidential online survey were overwhelmingly positive in favour of a move towards an insource with 92% of respondees confirming that they wished to transfer to direct employment with Haringey.

Haringey's approach to Community Wealth Building 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.

A future inhouse service represents a significant improvement in the social value calculator contained in the Enabling Framework set out in Appendix 1. Over 80% of the current travel buddy workforce live in the borough and the remainder live in neighbouring boroughs. Rather than paying substantial management costs and fees to an external travel provider, we will invest in locally based staff whilst allowing them to benefit from Haringey's excellent terms and conditions.

The inhouse service is achievable at a lower operating cost than the previous external spend.

The financial breakdown of the inhouse service, including the new full time equivalent management post, is set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Financial Cost for inhouse Travel Buddies Service

Item	Value
Total cost per year per Travel Buddy inc. on-cost (SC1 pro-rata)	£8,960
Number of travel buddies	62
Total staff cost per academic year	£555,120
Total Annual Travel Allowance	£60,784
Assistant Travel Buddy Coordinator (inc. on-costs)	£25,137
Total Service Cost (per academic year)	£641,041

This compares to the previous external spend of £664,810, which includes £233,890 of additional management and administrative fees.

The SEND transport budget is informed by demand for children who meet criteria to access support with transport. This budget has been under pressure over recent years resulting in an overspend. The SEND transport budget in 2019/20 was £4.08m and the spend totalled £5.30m. In 2020/21 the budget was £3.80m and the spend was £4.30m.

Lower expenditure within 2020-21 is attributed to reduced transport requirements as a result of schools and colleges being closed due to the coronavirus pandemic. The travel buddy service was maintained wherever possible but a number of children were in the clinically and extremely vulnerable group (CEV) therefore unable to access provision on site due to shielding.

The SEND transport budget has been allocated growth in 2021/22 to meet the pressures in the service, resulting in a total budget of £4.6m. The inhouse model detailed above has added benefits of service improvement, improved experience for families, opportunity for further innovation and cross directorate working and should lead to a reduction of the SEND Transport budget overspend, longer term.

Alternative options considered:

Maintain existing service externally – this option does not deliver in terms of the Council's Insourcing Policy objectives. Third party provision of travel buddies does not provide a sufficient level of control to ensure that it is managed in line with Haringey's rigorous safeguarding standards. Market conditions do not provide significant assurances about LLW employment for travel buddies and did not deliver

on either the affordability or the social value calculator contained within the Enabling Framework set out in Appendix 1.

Service Provision through Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) – 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 within both the commercial and the VCS sector. 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. A VCS option was discounted after initial investigation into the local market where a provider with the required capacity and child protection assurances could not be found.

587. COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME (CTRS) ADMINISTRATION

The Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Welfare and the Public Realm introduced the report which summarised the process and content of proposed potential changes to the administration and policy of the Haringey Council Tax Reduction Scheme to be introduced in 2022/2023. The report also set out a series of options to amend the current scheme, with a preferred option recommended, and the timescales for consultation processes to be undertaken should any changes be sought. The proposed changes would simplify Council Tax documents and make the process more transparent.

The Cabinet Member responded to questions from Councillor Barnes:

- The service had been reviewing letters sent out to residents and were looking to take on board a range of languages to translate documents into. A suggestion was to include a small box at the top of every letter with a short, translated summary in the five most commonly spoken languages in the Borough, with an offer of a full translation of the letter.

RESOLVED that Cabinet

1. Agree to consult on the following changes to the existing Council Tax Reduction Scheme:
 - i) Simplifying the claims process by adding a new channel for residents on Universal Credit to claim council tax reduction automatically as set out in paragraph 4.3.1
 - ii) Stabilising entitlement for residents by simplifying what happens when a resident's income changes by a small amount during the financial year as set out in paragraph 4.3.2
 - iii) Simplifying the scheme by changing the way that council tax support can be backdated to allow more time for residents to claim as set out in paragraph 4.3.3

- iv) Simplifying the scheme through improved transparency by publishing a revised statement of the scheme written in plain English as set out in paragraph 6.17
2. Note that, following consultation with the Greater London Authority (“GLA”) and having considered the GLA’s response:
 - i) A draft CTRS will be published;
 - ii) A consultation on that draft CTRS will be carried out with persons likely to have an interest in its operation; and
 - iii) The findings of the consultation and an Equalities Impact Assessment will inform the final CTRS, which will be put to members to consider at full Council in December 2021.
 3. Note that care leavers are especially vulnerable to debt and the Council will review and improve the communication of the existing relief scheme and review, simplify, and improve the claim process and its administration.

Reasons for decision

The Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) is a way the Council can redistribute the financial burden on Council Taxpayers and provide additional support to those in need.

It is important that the CTRS is simple and easy to claim to maximise uptake and reduce the burden on our residents. A scheme that is easy to access can help residents to minimise debt, assist household budgeting, and increase the ability to pay council tax.

The proposed amendments to the rules for working age claimants would have the following benefits:

Simplifying the claims process. The proposed change is to add an additional way for residents to claim council tax support automatically when they start receiving Universal Credit. This would have a positive effect because it would simplify claiming for most residents and reduce the difficulty and anxiety for residents who claim Universal Credit. It would also make sure as many people as possible claim the support to which they are entitled.

Stabilising entitlement for residents. The proposed change is to simplify what happens when a resident’s income changes by a small amount. This would have a positive effect because constant changes in a council tax bill can make household budgeting difficult for residents as well as imposing a significant and costly administrative burden on the council. As explained in paragraph 6.12 to 6.14, most residents would receive the same support as now with 6% receiving a slightly smaller amount of support and 6% receiving a slightly higher amount of support. On balance, it is considered that the significant benefit to residents of making the scheme more accessible and reducing the number of bills merits these changes.

Simplifying the scheme. The main proposed change is to extend the period an award of CTRS can be backdated from six months to twelve months. It is also proposed to simplify the scheme by publishing a revised version written in plain English. The current regulations are complex and run to 214 pages. Simplifying the language so that it is easier to understand for residents will help to improve transparency and uptake.

These changes predominantly relate to ways to simplify the administration of the scheme and maximise uptake. The Council is not seeking to reduce the generosity of the current scheme or to reduce the maximum entitlement awarded since 2019.

The affordability to the Council of the CTRS scheme continues to be an important consideration, balanced with the need to support as many residents as possible. The changes will reduce the number of transactions that the Council must administer.

The Council is obliged to consider whether to revise or replace its CTRS each year. However, it is not obliged to revise or replace it. If any revision or replacement is to be made, the Council must follow the consultation process set out in the legislation and the decision must be made by Full Council. To give the Council sufficient time to implement any changes, Full Council should formally agree the proposals in December.

Alternative options considered

There are a range of ways that the Council could alter its CTRS. The Council updated its CTRS policy in 2019/2020 which included providing more financial support to working age claimants with children. The Council is not seeking to reduce the generosity of the current scheme or to reduce the maximum entitlement awarded since 2019. Instead, the Council has explored a variety of options to make the scheme simpler to administer and to assist in reaching everyone who is entitled to support.

No change to the existing CTRS

This is not recommended because amending the scheme will help residents to access the support to which they are entitled, improve their experience, and reduce the administrative burden on the Council.

Do not simplify the claims process.

This is not recommended because simplifying the claims process to introduce an automatic claims channel for those on Universal Credit will improve uptake of council tax support and improve the experience for residents. It will also improve access to the scheme for those for whom, for a variety of reasons, such as digital exclusion or language barriers, may struggle to access it.

Do not simplify the scheme by reducing backdating restrictions

It would be possible to not simplify the scheme by changing backdating rules. However, reducing backdating restrictions is likely to improve resident's experiences, reduce complaints and appeals, and remove barriers to the take-up of the scheme.

588. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR HOMES FOR HARINGEY NOEL PARK PODS REPLACEMENT AND MAJOR WORKS PHASE 2

Councillor Chandwani left the meeting for the consideration of this item.

The Leader introduced the report which sought approval for the award of a contract to Engie Regeneration Ltd "Engie", to carry out external major works on Noel Park estate for phase 2, a variation to the original contract award value and for the issue of a letter of intent to Engie, this will be for an amount up to, but not exceeding £1,012,644 which would enable detailed design work to be undertaken in advance of the contract being finalised.

The Leader advised that there was a typo in recommendation 3.1 of the report in that the value of the increase was £5,115,697 and not £5,116,697 as published in the papers.

The Leader made reference to paragraph 2.5 of the report and apologised to leaseholders for the quality of communication and engagement on the project and hoped that the revised proposals struck a balance of fairness to leaseholders and Council tenants.

The Leader and the Assistant Director for Housing responded to questions from the Cabinet and Councillor Barnes:

- All contract costs were fixed. The only way that costs would increase would be if more work was carried out.
- Officers were confident that the programme was sensible and that timescales would be met. However if there were any delays, these would be a matter of months and not years.
- In regard to paragraph 8.11 of the report, it was not accepted that the Council or HfH had failed to carry out necessary repairs and maintenance to ensure resident safety.
- In regard to roof repairs, it was anticipated that a good number would need to have works carried out. It made practical sense to carry out these works whilst the scaffolding was in situ, so surveys would be completed and approvals for works sought where required.
- The lifespan of the new PODs would be minimum 60 years.

Further to considering exempt information at item 20 it was,

RESOLVED that Cabinet

1. Approve a variation of the original Contract to Engie Regeneration Ltd by increasing the value from £16,342,419 to £21,458,116. This is an increase of

£5,115,697 to enable the completion of Phase 2 works in accordance with Contract Standing Order (CSO) 10.2.1 (b).

2. Note that of the original contract, £11,331,675 was approved for phase 1 by cabinet in January 2021.
3. Approve the award of contract for Phase 2 of the works on the Noel Park Estate to Engie Regeneration Ltd up to the value of £10,286,961, inclusive of fees (£160,520), for the replacement of bathroom pod extensions in accordance with Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1 (d). This includes bathroom suites and associated works, renewal of kitchens, roof replacement and repairs, window and door replacement, rewiring, boiler replacement and central heating installation works, fire protection works, brickwork and concrete repairs and external decoration, where required and for works in leaseholder owned properties to be completed in line with work detailed in the section 20 notices.
4. Approve the issue of a letter of intent for an amount of up to, but not exceeding, £1,012,644. This represents 10% of the contract sum and will enable detailed design and planning work to be undertaken in advance of the contract being finalised.
5. Consider observations made by leaseholders in response to the Section 20 consultation with leaseholders regarding the scope of works and estimated charges, as set out in section 8.
6. Consider the results of consultation on the proposed offer to cap service charge payments as set out in section 9, to approve the proposed associated estimated expenditure as set out in the exempt report, and to note that Council officers will exercise discretion in reaching a final settlement where appropriate in individual cases.

Reasons for decision

The properties identified in Noel Park Pods Replacement and Major Works Project Phase 2 need their bathroom pod extensions replaced. This includes bathroom suites and associated works, renewal of kitchens, roof replacement and repairs, window and door replacement, rewiring, boiler replacement and central heating installation works, fire protection works, brickwork and concrete repairs and external decoration. This will enable the essential safety works to be completed for all properties and for the rented, Council owned properties to be brought up to the Decent Homes Standard in line with the Borough Plan objective 3.

Homes for Haringey requires Cabinet approval for the award of this contract which is deemed to represent value for money. This is following a tender process undertaken with Haringey Council's Procurement team via the London Construction Programme (LCP) Major Works (MW14) framework.

A compliant tender process was carried out in accordance with the framework terms and conditions which incorporate price and quality. The evaluation process was based on 60% quality and 40% price. The recommended contractor Engie Regeneration Ltd

scored the highest in relation to these criteria in the associated Lot 3 (NH3) Housing. Lot 3 enables 8 contractors to review and submit tender proposals ensuring we have value for money across the marketplace.

At the first stage tender an estimate of £16.1m was submitted by Engie, following further surveys of the properties, adjustments had to be made to the programme (see 7.15 for details). Following the final surveys carried out on site in June 2020 the final contract proposal was put forward at approx. £21.048m. The main increase was the recommendation to replace all the existing main roof coverings to the properties in Gladstone Avenue and the need to remove the AIB asbestos panels prior to lifting the existing pod structure over the property.

In response to representations by leaseholders about the significant scale of estimated service charges relating to this contract, officers have prepared proposals to cap charges as a basis for a settlement with leaseholders. The detailed rationale for making settlement offers to leaseholders are set out in section 9.

Alternative options considered

An alternative option would be for Homes for Haringey to use third party industry frameworks or a compliant tender process to deliver the construction works on the Noel Park Estate. Homes for Haringey sought support and advice from Haringey's Strategic Procurement team and determined the London Construction Programme (LCP) Major Works framework as being the optimum route to the market. This was due to the LCP framework being leasehold compliant, value for money and offering speed of access to quality-checked contractors.

The Council undertook an analysis in February 2020 to compare the costs of a permanent modular built extension against a traditional brick-built extension. This is the primary alternative to the use of a modular solution. It demonstrated that excluding decanting costs, it would cost an additional £7,308 per property to install a traditional brick-built extension as opposed to modular extensions. The choice of traditional brick-built construction would also increase the related costs for all properties as the decant period could be circa 3 months, due to the requirement to decommission the bathrooms. The cost of decanting tenants would be borne by the project. However, leaseholders would have to make their own arrangements and non-resident leaseholders may also incur loss of rental income as they would likely be required to vacate rented properties during the period of the works. In such circumstances leaseholders may claim against the landlord for their costs and loss of income. Decanting residents, while necessary in some cases, does also cause disruption to the lives of the residents, especially those with school age children.

The pods are now beyond the end of their useful life. If the Council does not undertake the proposed works, it will not be able to deliver the planned capital investment works to bring these properties up to the Decent Homes Standard, in accordance with the Asset Management Strategy 2020-25.

By committing to effective consultation with the affected leaseholders, this should enable the delivery of phase 2.

Phase 2 is to be delivered as an addition to phase 1. All mobilisation works undertaken during phase 1 will be utilised for the delivery of phase 2 preventing additional associated costs. Although, phase 1 and 2 will be delivered by separate contracts, it is recommended that the works are conducted by the same contractor to ensure consistency, value for money and a high standard quality of works.

589. THE ACQUISITION OF S106 RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION IN TOTTENHAM HALE N17

The Cabinet Member for House-Building, Place-Making and Development introduced the report which sought approval for the acquisition at pre-construction phase of 177 homes in six blocks at Hale Wharf in Tottenham Hale for housing purposes as Council homes at Council rent. If approved, the acquisition would provide high quality homes in a development which would not otherwise meet the need for socially rented homes, 27 of which would be wheelchair accessible.

The Cabinet Member and Officers responded to questions from the Cabinet and Councillor Barnes:

- If the decision was approved, it was anticipated that work would begin on site within six months.
- There may be opportunities to acquire further units in the future, but this was not the case at the moment. Any further acquisitions would require Cabinet approval.
- Value for Money would be achieved with the acquisition, and a substantial grant from the GLA would contribute to the budget for purchasing the units, which will be acquired within market value.

Further to considering exempt information at item 21 it was,

RESOLVED that Cabinet

1. Approve the acquisition of the long leasehold interests in six residential blocks in Hale Wharf Phase 2 from Waterside Place Limited Partnership for the Package Price and based on the Heads of Terms and Business Case as set out in Exempt Appendix 2. The blocks consist of 177 residential units contained within the S106 agreement for Hale Wharf Phase 2 which will be converted for use as Council homes at Council rent and also 14 private for sale units which will be retained by the developer.
2. Approve delegated authority to Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning and after consultation with the Head of Legal and Governance (Monitoring Officer) and Cabinet Member for House-Building, Place-Making and Development to agree legal documentation and complete the transaction.

Reasons for decision

The acquisition of these residential units will allow the Council to secure the rapid delivery of another 177 new Council homes at Council rents.

There is an overwhelming need for social rented homes in Haringey. This acquisition will help the Council to meet that need by converting 143 shared ownership and 34 Affordable Rent properties in this development to 177 homes at Social Rent for rent to those on the Council's Housing Register who most need them.

The conversion of shared ownership homes to homes for Social Rent will also deliver an improved mix of genuinely affordable homes within the scheme as a whole and in Tottenham Hale more widely, better meeting the needs of local people.

The homes to be delivered are very well located and will be of an extremely high quality. Delivering them as Council homes would help to create an inclusive environment in a development that has adopted the Healthy Streets Approach to embed public health in public realm.

The acquisition is supported by the HRA Business Plan and by GLA grant funding.

Alternative options considered

Not to acquire the homes. This option was rejected because it would represent a missed opportunity for the Council to:

- Secure 177 Shared Ownership and London Affordable Rent homes for conversion to use as Council rent tenancies.
- Avail of substantive GLA grant funding from the Building Homes for Londoners Programme.
- Assist in maintaining momentum and progress in the overall Tottenham Hale regeneration area.

590. MOBILE NETWORK SERVICES & EQUIPMENT CONTRACT EXTENSION

The Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Welfare and the Public Realm introduced the report which sought approval under CSO 10.02.1 b), for the extension to the Mobile Network Services & Equipment contract awarded to EE Ltd.

Further to considering exempt information at item 22 it was

RESOLVED that Cabinet

1. Approve the award of the final years extension, pursuant to Contract Standing Order 10.02.1(b), of the Mobile Network Services & Equipment contract, from 01/04/2021 to 31/03/2022, to EE Ltd. The estimated value of the final year is approx. £280,00.00, this will mean that the estimated total spend, over the four year life of the contract, will be approx. £814,000.00.

Reasons for decision

The reason this extension is before Cabinet is to maintain the mobile contract for the Council into its final year, whilst a full tender process is being carried out.

We are seeking Key Decision approval from Cabinet to award the final year's term, as aggregated contract spend is over £500,000.00.

Alternative options considered

There are 2 alternative options available:

Retender – not an option as we have no time to carry out the procurement. It would also take up to 6 months to replace the 4000 sim cards if a new provider were successful.

No Action – do not award a contract extension and allow the existing contract to end. This option has a high level of risk, the implications of not having a contract are:

- No longer covered by procurement framework terms and conditions
- Special tariff rates and discounts will revert to increased standard rates
- Possible disruption to mobile network services

591. ACQUISITION OF TWO PIECES OF LAND KNOWN AS 6-40 DUNFORD STREET, N15 5NQ AND LAND TO THE REAR OF 728 SEVEN SISTERS ROAD, N15 5NH IN SEVEN SISTERS, ST ANN'S WARD FOR GENERAL FUND PURPOSES

The Cabinet Member for House-Building, Place-Making and Development introduced the report which sought approval for the acquisition of freehold interests known as 6-40 Durnford Street, N15 5NQ and Land to the Rear of 728 Seven Sisters Road, N15 5NH in Seven Sisters, using funding secured as part of MHCLG's Future High Streets Fund (FHSF) Programme.

The Cabinet Member and the Director for Housing, Regeneration and Planning responded to questions from the Cabinet and Councillor Barnes:

- This report was to seek approval for the acquisition of properties – detailed proposals for the future of the properties would be provided in a future report.
- This was the start of a long process and it would be a minimum of 2-3 years before any work would begin on site in a phased development.
- The acquisition provided value for money in that it provided a valuable asset in terms of the commercial property portfolio.

Further to considering exempt information at item 23 it was

RESOLVED that Cabinet

1. Note the Draft Masterplan Objectives outlined in Section 6.
2. Agrees to acquire for General Fund purposes "the Site" for a sum (as reported in Part B of the report) based on the draft Heads of Terms which are set out in Appendix 4 (in Part B of this report).

3. Note that the seller will take a lease back of the Site from the Council on acquisition for a period of 2 years (with break clause) as set out in the draft Heads of Terms in Appendix 4 (in Part B of this report).
4. Give delegated authority to The Director of Housing, Planning and Regeneration after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Transformation and the Cabinet Member for House Building, Placemaking and Development to agree the final heads of terms and the legal documentations for the acquisition.

Reasons for Decision

The Gourley Triangle site is an important site allocation in the Tottenham Area Action Plan. It has long been identified as having the potential for renewal and placemaking given the quality of the current built environment. At its heart, the future of Gourley Triangle will aim to reflect employment and workspaces that meet the contemporary post-Covid economy. There is also potential to meet wider Council objectives of placemaking, delivering council homes and sustainability.

Due to complex and fragmented land ownership, it is considered that the Gourley Triangle site could not come forward without public sector intervention. The Council is able to lead this intervention by developing a coherent masterplan and land acquisition programme. This report sets out the draft key objectives informing the development of the masterplan and brings forward for decision the first land acquisition.

An opportunity has arisen to make an early acquisition of a critical land interest at the heart of the Gourley Triangle and adjacent to existing Council freehold interests. There are a number of 3rd party interests in the Gourley Triangle area and the proposed acquisition of “the Site” enables the Council to take the lead in land assembly of the Gourley Triangle. The Council has secured external funding from MHCLG’s ‘Future High Streets Fund’ to cover the cost of this acquisition.

The acquisition price and associated business case is based on an ‘existing use value’ approach and covers the fallback position of what would happen in the event the Council were unable to take a wider redevelopment forward.

Alternative Options Considered

Not acquiring The Site

This option was rejected because the Site is central to achieving the Council’s strategic objectives for the wider Gourley Triangle site allocation as set out in the Tottenham Area Action Plan. There are further risks that the Site could be acquired by another third party, who may not be willing to work with the Council to secure those

outcomes. Additionally, the Council understands that the long-standing third party local business is actively constrained in its current site, and there is an important opportunity to facilitate their future growth through agreeing to purchase the Site at this time.

Acquiring The Site at a later date

This option was considered and rejected. There is a current opportunity to acquire and the vendor has indicated that they have a compelling business reason to dispose at this time. The risk is that the Site could be sold on were the Council not to take the opportunity to acquire from a willing vendor at this time. In this case the Council would need to, should it wish to redevelop the Gourley Triangle site in the future, seek to acquire the Site first by private treaty with the possibility of exercising its CPO powers as part of a land assembly exercise where that is not possible.

592. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES

RESOLVED

To note the minutes of the Urgent Decision on 13 July 2021 and the Cabinet Member Signing on 14 July 2021.

593. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

594. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the consideration of agenda items 20-25 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.

595. EXEMPT - AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR HOMES FOR HARINGEY NOEL PARK PODS REPLACEMENT AND MAJOR WORKS PHASE 2

The Cabinet noted the exempt information, and the resolutions were agreed as per minute 588.

596. EXEMPT - THE ACQUISITION OF S106 RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION IN TOTTENHAM HALE N17

The Cabinet noted the exempt information, and the resolutions were agreed as per minute 589.

597. EXEMPT - MOBILE NETWORK SERVICES & EQUIPMENT CONTRACT EXTENSION

The Cabinet noted the exempt information, and the resolutions were agreed as per minute 590.

598. EXEMPT - ACQUISITION OF TWO PIECES OF LAND KNOWN AS 6-40 DUNFORD STREET, N15 5NQ AND LAND TO THE REAR OF 728 SEVEN SISTERS ROAD, N15 5NH IN SEVEN SISTERS, ST ANN'S WARD FOR GENERAL FUND PURPOSES

The Cabinet noted the exempt information, and the resolutions were agreed as per minute 591.

599. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

None.

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair

Date

Report for: Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Title: 2021/22 Finance Update Quarter 1 (Period 3)

Report

Authorised by: Jon Warlow – Chief Finance Officer & Section 151 Officer

Lead Officer: Frances Palopoli – Head of Corporate Financial Strategy & Monitoring

Ward(s) Affected: N/A

**Report for Key/
Non-Key Decision** Key

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This budget report covers the position at Quarter 1 (Period 3) of the 2021/22 financial year including General Fund (GF) Revenue, Capital, Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budgets. The report focuses on significant budget variances including those arising as a result of the forecast non-achievement of approved MTFS savings as well as the best estimates of the ongoing impact of the Covid-19 pandemic (C19) on the Council's financial plans.
- 1.2 The Budget/Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2021/22-2025/26 report agreed by Full Council in March 2021 continued to assume that the Council could rely on general and specific grants from government to address the financial impact of the pandemic on 2021/22 budgets. The Budget also continued to acknowledge and respond to forecast demands and take as realistic a view of its circumstances as possible and as a consequence £8.6m (before savings) was invested primarily into Adults and Children's services.
- 1.3 The forecasts provided in this report are as up to date as possible and continue to differentiate between the impact of Covid-19 on agreed budgets and MTFS savings as distinct from other base budget issues. The former are based on the most recent (June 2021) return to central government (i.e. at month 3 of the financial year) although it should be noted that there still remains uncertainty about the eventual impact of the pandemic on the final 2021/22 outturn position, not least associated with the identification of new variants and any further restrictions.
- 1.4 The overall forecast General Fund variation from budget for the year as at Qtr1 stands at **£19.1m** with **£13.9m** attributable to C19 and **£5.2m** base budget pressure. The Council has received £9.1m un-ringfenced emergency C19 grant to date, other specific grants and will be able to claim for Sales, Fees & Charges (SF&C) losses compensation at least for the first quarter of the year. It is assumed that these specific C19 grants will offset the **£13.9m** in full. The £5.2m base budget pressure is largely manifesting in the People priorities and Directors are focussing urgently on strategies to mitigate these pressures.
- 1.5 The financial pressure on the DSG budgets has not abated and at Qtr1 **£6.6m** overspend is forecast. The Council is currently finalising the DSG Management Plan

which will be a live document that will be shared periodically with the DfE. This remains a national issue impacting many councils which the Government will need to address.

- 1.6 Following the 2020/21 outturn and carry forwards approved by Cabinet in July, capital programme budgets have been reviewed and reprofiled, taking into account scheme specific progress and external factors. Excluding framework budgets which are held to allow the Council to respond to opportunities, the spend forecast in the adjusted capital programme for the 2021/22 financial year is 67% of budget.

2. **Cabinet Member Introduction**

- 2.1 The report indicates that, although there is no room for complacency, the broad picture is within the parameters we have set out and that, despite the disruptions and uncertainties due to the pandemic and BREXIT challenges, there are some further small improvements in comparison with previous years.
- 2.2 The report indicates that, as is always the case at this stage of the annual cycle, there are budget pressures carrying the risk of overspending; these have been split between the usual base budget pressures and the exceptional ones directly related to the pandemic,
- 2.3 As regards the pandemic related pressures, at the time of writing we anticipate that the in-year impact of the pandemic will be offset by various government funding streams; however, a great deal of uncertainty surrounds how the pandemic will unfold over the remaining course of the year, and the impact this will have on our finances. The Council will continue to monitor and report on this as we continue through the year.
- 2.4 As regards the pressures related to the main budget, these are comparatively smaller than at the same stage in previous years; however, there is no room for complacency and the service is working closely with the relevant directorates to ensure that all the necessary steps are taken throughout the year to minimise the risk of ending up with any significant overspends.
- 2.5 A particular historical problem is in relation to the financial pressure on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budgets, predominately in the High Needs Block, which continues, despite concerted efforts by Council Officers to contain it. This remains an issue of national significance to the sector, and while there have been developments in recent years, the sector will require additional funding from the government to properly address this. This issue will continue to be highlighted by ourselves as one of the many Councils, experiencing pressure in this area.
- 2.6 The report also covers the regular issue of significant debt “write offs” (the standard process, within every council and large organisation, of deleting from its accounts historical debts that are deemed to be either uncollectable or more costly to continue pursuing than the potential income). I have asked for further scrutiny of each one and have been assured that all the proper procedures have been followed to the letter and that the levels in our case are well within the parameters of comparable organisations; whilst there is no evidence of any grounds for concern, we are working with the relevant sections to ensure that all lessons to be learnt from such cases have been drawn and taken into account in our evolving procedures.

3. Recommendations

Cabinet is recommended to:

- 3.1. Note the forecast base budget revenue outturn for the General Fund of **£5.2m** and that Directors are seeking actions to bring the forecast down before the end of the year. (Section 6, Tables 1a and 1b, and Appendix 1).
- 3.2. Note that the **£13.9m** forecast Covid pressure on the GF is expected to be offset by Government funding (Section 6 and Table 1a).
- 3.3. Note the net Housing Revenue Account (HRA) forecast of £0.6m overspend (Section 6 and Appendices 1 and 2).
- 3.4. Note the net DSG forecast of £6.6m overspend. (Section 6 and Appendix 1).
- 3.5. Note the forecast budget savings position in 2021/22 which indicates that £2.86m (27%) may not be achieved. (Section 6 and Appendix 3). This is incorporated in the GF budget pressures addressed in recommendations 3.1 and 3.2 above.
- 3.6. Approve the proposed budget adjustments and virements to the capital programme as set out in Table 2 and Appendix 6.
- 3.7. Note the 2021/26 Revised GF Capital MTFS budget after virements and budget adjustments proposed in recommendations 3.6 above (Appendix 5)
- 3.8. Note the forecast expenditure of £342m in 2021/22 which equates to 72% of the revised capital budget (Section 8 and Appendix 4).
- 3.9. To approve the revenue budget virements and receipt of grants as set out in Appendix 6.
- 3.10. To note the debt write-offs approved by officers in Quarter 1 2021/22 (Appendix 7) and approve the >£50,000 debt write-offs (Appendix 7a).
- 3.11. To note the C19 grants schedule (Appendix 8).

4. Reason for Decision

- 4.1 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 on-going financial implications placed on the Council by the Covid-19 crisis.

5. Alternative Options Considered

5.1 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.

6. Revenue Outturn

6.1. Covid -19 Financial Impact

6.1.1 As highlighted in Section 1 above, the Council continues to plan on the basis that government support will offset the forecast financial impact of C19 which was the case for 2020/21. However, it remains imperative that the forecast impact on agreed plans is carefully monitored throughout the year alongside receipt of government funding.

6.1.2 Table 1a below summarises the forecast pressure and government funding assumed at Qtr1 on the GF.

Table 1a

	Qtr1/P3
General Fund	2021/22
	(£m)
Covid Pressure	13.95
Less: Un-ringfenced Emergency Grant received	(9.10)
Less: Income Loss Compensation Grant estimate	(2.52)
Government Funding Assumed	2.34

6.1.3 The estimated Income loss compensation figure in the table above is based on the scheme operating purely for the period April – June 2021 and within the same parameters as last year. Given the national delay to the final phase of the government's pandemic road map, the scheme may be extended beyond the end of June. The Council has also received £2.4m Contain Outbreak Management Fund (COMF) grant this year which will offset some of the currently forecast cost pressures. Based on this, and the fact that current C19 budget forecasts may improve ahead of Qtr2, it seems reasonable to continue to assume that Government funding will be sufficient to offset final C19 budgetary impact. This will be kept under close review and an updated position provided to Cabinet in Qtr2.

6.1.4 It should be stressed that the impact of C19 on the Council's **Collection Fund** continues, with in year collection estimated at 95.5% for Council Tax and 94% for Business Rates well below the 96.5% & 98% targets pre-pandemic. The Council received £3.6m Local Council Tax Support grant for 2021/22 which Haringey plans to utilise to fund increased CTRS claimant numbers (and therefore reduced Council Tax collection). The Introduction of a Local Welfare Assistance Scheme, Haringey Strategy for Tacking Debt and Haringey Ethical debt Reduction Policy are tools being used to support residents struggling financially. Government S31 grants continue to be paid to offset the on-going reliefs provided to businesses which continue to be significantly impacted by the pandemic.

6.1.5 The 2021/22 Budget and MTFs assumed lower collection rates for both of these revenue streams and bad debt provisions overall were augmented as part of the 2020/21 account closure process. The impact of lower than planned collections will manifest on GF revenue budgets in 2022/23 and 2023/24 and therefore any forecasts

at variance to current assumptions will need to be built into the 2022/23 Budget and MTFS refresh.

6.2 General Fund Forecasts

6.2.1 Table 1b below sets out full year projections at priority level.

Table 1b – Revenue Budget Monitoring Forecast for Quarter 1 2021/22

Priority	Revised 2021/22 Budget	Total SAP Forecast	Base Budget Pressure / (Saving)	Covid Pressure	P3 Total Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Housing	17,317	18,536	22	1,197	1,219
People - Children's	65,553	71,377	2,774	3,050	5,824
People - Adults	87,194	90,058	1,375	1,489	2,864
Place	29,159	35,653	1,032	5,462	6,494
Economy	5,294	7,029	39	1,696	1,735
Your Council-Service	8,586	10,130	484	1,060	1,544
Your Council-Corporate	35,973	35,453	(519)		(519)
General Fund Total (before funding & DSG)	249,076	268,236	5,206	13,954	19,160
External Finance	(249,076)	(249,076)			
General Fund Total		19,160	5,206	13,954	19,160
DSG	203,076	209,655	6,579		6,579
HRA	104,455	105,069	614		614
Haringey Total	307,530	333,884	12,399	13,954	26,353

6.2.2 Regarding the forecast £5.2m non-Covid base budget pressure identified in the table above it is assumed at this point in the year that Directors will have time to identify measures to mitigate these.

6.2.3 A detailed analysis at directorate level is attached in Appendix 1 along with relevant commentary.

MTFS Savings Delivery

6.2.4 Officers continue to monitor delivery of all agreed MTFS savings as part of their monthly budget monitoring processes. At **Qtr1 £8.1m (76.1%)** of the 2021/22 savings programme is forecast to deliver and Appendix 3 provides a detailed RAG rated analysis by Priority. The impact of any forecast non-achievement of savings is reflected in the full year projections in the table above. Services also continue to monitor deliverability of savings agreed for 2022/23 and beyond and a more detailed analysis will be provided in the Qtr2 report.

7 Debt and Write Offs

- 7.1 Appendix 6 provides a summary of the debts under £50,000 written off in Qtr1 totalling £0.561m. These have been approved by the Director of Finance under his delegated authority and all are adequately provided for.
- 7.2 Under Haringey's constitution debts of £50,000 or more require the approval of the Cabinet member for finance or Cabinet. This quarter there are 3 such debts being recommended for approval. These have arisen for different reasons and all available recovery action has been undertaken. All are fully provided for and as per appropriate accounting practice, this position needs to be recognised in the Council's accounts and the debts written off. The detail surrounding each of these debts is set out in Appendix 6a.

8 Capital Expenditure Forecast at Quarter 1

- 8.1 The starting point for the 2021/22 capital programme is the Council's budget setting meeting in March 2021. That set a general fund budget of £288.9m and a HRA budget of £277m. In July 2021 Cabinet agreed the carried forward resources from the 2020/21 capital programme which added £172m to the General Fund capital programme (there was no HRA carry forward). The addition of the carry forward budget to the approved capital programme results in a programme of £737m.
- 8.2 The capital programme has been reviewed to more closely align the financial performance of the programme with actual progress. The review has taken into account the effects of the pandemic (such as labour shortages, material shortages, lengthened lead in times, inflation etc.) and a range of other factors. The review highlighted that the current 2021/22 budgets do not match the expected physical progress and budgets have been reprofiled.
- 8.3 In addition, the capital programme contains a number of framework budgets. These budgets, such as the Strategic Acquisitions Fund, are there to enable the Council to respond to opportunities as they arise but still be within the budget and policy framework.
- 8.4 These budgets are inherently difficult to forecast and if not accounted for will distort the performance of the capital programme. The table below restates the programme taking the review and the reprofiling into account as well as adjusting for the framework budgets.

Table 2 - 2021/22 Capital Expenditure Analysis as at Quarter 1

Priority	2021/22 Revised Budget (£'000)	2021/22 Budget Adjustments (£'000)	2021/22 Framework Budget (£'000)	2021/22 Revised Budget (after adjustments) (£'000)	2021/22 Qtr. 1 Forecast (£'000)	2021/22 Budget Variance (£'000)
People (Children's)	46,478	(5,138)	0	41,340	37,107	(4,233)
People (Adults)	40,996	(26,323)	0	14,673	10,923	(3,750)
Place	46,360	(3,630)	0	42,730	38,822	(3,907)
Economy	278,051	(46,816)	(161,908)	69,326	48,696	(20,630)
Housing (GF)	13,050	0	(13,050)	0	0	0
Your Council	35,507	(3,274)	0	32,233	25,223	(7,011)
General Fund Total	460,441	(85,181)	(174,958)	200,302	160,771	(39,531)
Housing (HRA)	277,033	0	0	277,033	181,189	(95,844)
Total	737,474	(85,181)	(174,958)	477,335	341,959	(135,375)

8.5 At this point in the year, the forecast is for a spend level of £342m, or 72% of the restated budget which is a significant spend level.

9 **Statutory Officers Comments** **Finance**

9.1 This is a report of the Director of Finance and therefore all financial implications have been highlighted in the body of the report.

Strategic Procurement

9.2 Strategic Procurement notes the contents of this report and will continue to work with services to enable cost reductions.

Legal

9.3 The Head of Legal & Governance has been consulted on this report, and makes the following comments.

9.4 The Council is under a duty to maintain a balanced budget. Pursuant to section 28 of the Local Government Act 2003, the Council is under a statutory duty to periodically conduct a budget monitoring exercise of its expenditure and income against the budget calculations during the financial year. If the monitoring establishes that the budgetary situation has deteriorated, the Council must take such remedial action as it considers necessary to deal with any projected overspends. This could include action to reduce spending, income generation or other measures to bring budget pressures under control for the rest of the year.

9.5 The Council must act reasonably and in accordance with its statutory duties and responsibilities when taking the necessary action to reduce the overspend. The Council is facing an unprecedented situation due to the pandemic and there is a risk

of the financial impact on the Council if the government does not provide the Council with sufficient funding in year to cover the Council's costs due to the pandemic.

- 9.6 Pursuant to the Executive 'Financial management and resources' function set out at Part Three, Section C of the Constitution, the Cabinet is responsible for approving both virements and debt write offs in excess of certain limits as set out in the Financial Regulations at Part Four, Section I, Regulations 5.31 / 5.32 & 8.15(c) respectively.
- 9.7 Pursuant to Part Four, Section J (Contract Procedure Rules – Rule 17.1) of the Constitution, the Cabinet is responsible for approving grants from external bodies above £500,000.
- 9.8 In light of the above, there is no legal reason why Cabinet cannot adopt the Recommendations contained in the report.

Equalities

- 9.9 The Council has a public sector equality duty under the Equalities Act (2010) to have due regard to:
- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not
 - Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.
- 9.10 The three parts of the duty applies to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty.
- 9.11 This budget report covers the position at Quarter 1 (Period 3) of the 2021/22 financial year including General Fund (GF) Revenue, Capital, Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budgets. The report focuses on significant budget variances including those arising as a result of the forecast non-achievement of approved MTFS savings as well as the best estimates of the ongoing impact of the Covid-19 pandemic (C19) on the Council's financial plans.
- 9.12 It also includes proposed budget virements or adjustments. The recommendations in the report are not anticipated to have a negative impact on any groups with protected characteristics. In addition to this the Councils saving programme is subject to an equality assessment, which acts to mitigate against any potential impacts for those living and working in the Borough.

10 Use of Appendices

Appendix 1 – Directorate Level Forecast

Appendix 2 – HRA Forecast

Appendix 3 – MTFS Savings Delivery

Appendix 4 – Capital Programme Level Forecast

Appendix 5 – 2021/26 Revised General Fund (GF) Capital MTFS Budget

Appendix 6 – Virements (Revenue and Capital)

Appendix 7 & 7a – Debt Write Off

Appendix 8 – Covid-19 Related Grant Support

11 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

11.1 For access to the background papers or any further information, please contact
Frances Palopoli – Head of Corporate Financial Strategy & Monitoring extn 3896

Directorate Level Forecast P3

Appendix 1

PRIORITY	Revised 2021/22 Budget	P3 Outturn Forecast	P3 Forecast to Budget Variance
PEOPLE : CHILDREN'S	65,553,068	71,377,027	5,823,959
Childrens	53,232,394	58,914,592	5,682,198
Children's Commissioning	3,192,390	3,395,535	203,145
Children's Public Health	6,004,600	6,004,600	0
Schools & Learning	3,123,684	3,062,300	-61,384
PEOPLE : ADULTS	87,194,251	90,057,814	2,863,563
Adults Social Care	71,217,226	73,697,591	2,480,365
Adults Commissioning	4,490,350	4,825,490	335,140
Adults Public Health	11,486,675	11,534,733	48,058
PLACE	29,158,781	35,652,804	6,494,023
Environment & Neighbourhood	21,893,414	28,289,758	6,396,344
Culture and Libraries	5,510,367	5,604,046	93,679
Chief Finance Officer (Alexandra Palace)	1,755,000	1,759,000	4,000
ECONOMY	5,294,140	7,029,176	1,735,036
Housing Regeneration & Planning	254,950	254,950	0
Housing	110,647	110,647	0
Planning Building Standards	2,337,781	2,580,484	242,703
Property & Capital Projects	-2,074,641	-582,308	1,492,333
Regeneration & Economic	4,665,403	4,665,403	0
HOUSING	17,317,201	18,535,969	1,218,768
Housing Demand	8,111,713	8,111,713	0
Housing Commissioned Services	-204,880	1,349,126	1,554,006
Commissioning	8,950,374	8,615,136	-335,238
Environment & Neighbourhood	459,994	459,994	0
YOUR COUNCIL	44,558,821	45,583,199	1,024,378
Chief Finance Officer	36,022,915	35,825,644	-197,271
Corporate Governance	1,788,274	1,818,274	30,000
Corporate & Customer Services	6,212,961	7,387,281	1,174,320
Chief Executive	297,450	297,450	0
Strategy & Communication	363,173	254,463	-108,710
Human Resources	190,966	279,179	88,213
IT Digital Services	127,053	155,915	28,862
Transformation & Resources	416,110	416,110	0
Strategic Procurement	-860,081	-851,117	8,964
PRIORITY TOTAL	249,076,262	268,235,989	19,159,727

Further detail on the drivers of the Priority variances follow:-

PEOPLE: CHILDREN'S

Over budget £5.82m

A large proportion (£3.05m) of the budget pressure relates to a COVID-19 pressures in the services. This pressure has been driven by a significant increase in social care activity with additional numbers and unit cost increases for placement costs and SEND transport. In addition, there is anticipated loss of income across a few services such as Pendarren and Children's Centres.

Safeguarding and Social Care is reporting a pressure of £4.16m. This pressure is largely increasing pressure complexity and cost of placements and an increase in staffing and legal pressures linked to increased child protection cases in the service.

Early Help and Prevention service is reporting a pressure of £1.53m which is a combination of SEN transport pressures and shortfalls in Nursery and Children centres' income.

PEOPLE : ADULTS & PUBLIC HEALTH

Over budget £2.864m

Adult Social Care, the Q1 adverse variance is £2.480m which includes £1.489m of COVID-19 related expenditure and £1.015m slipped savings carried forward from 20/21: these savings were not delivered in the previous year due to the impact of the pandemic, and relate to step down activity that was unable to be completed. Projected expenditure has increased by £0.412m since P2. The main drivers for the movement is an increase in activity and complexity of care package costs due to legacy COVID-19 pressures.

Adults Commissioning overall variance at Q1 is £0.335m. This is comprised of £0.215m COVID-19 related expenditure and £0.149m additional brokerage expenditure incurred to deliver client contribution income.

Adults Public Health is projected to break even with additional COVID-19 related expenditure being met by specific government grants.

It should be noted that there is an additional risk of a further increase in demand due to COVID-19 for packages of care that we are unable to quantify at this point in time: pressures arising through additional clients, care complexity, increased hours and carer breakdown. Dealing with COVID-19 continues to create unforeseen pressures on the service which ASC and health partners are dealing with. The impact and pressure are likely to change over the coming months as we begin to understand long-term and legacy implications of COVID-19. This poses additional risks to the budget position for 2021/22 and beyond.

PLACE

Over budget £6.494m

Place Priority is forecasting an overspend of £6.494m for Qtr1. This is due to base budget pressure issues of £1.032m, and pressures from COVID of £5.462m.

Parking, & Highways is forecasting an overspend of £4.972m. This is mainly due to on-going impact of COVID on parking income compounded by delays to implementations of new schemes (further analysis to be done to see if impact will result in on-going impact to base-budget due to change in activity). There is also a base budget pressure in Parking income from delay to roll-out of new parking IT system and on-going issues around Nuisance Vehicle Contract and in Highways from additional grounds maintenance costs.

Parks & Leisure is forecasting an overspend of £1.255m. This is mainly due to the impact from COVID on events and swimming income and the subsequent delay of Leisure Concession MTFS savings.

A further £0.251m pressure is forecast across the remaining service areas in this Priority mainly due to on-going C19 impacts.

ECONOMY

Over budget £1.735m

The key pressure remains Covid-19, which continues to significantly impact key income streams in Commercial Property (£0.900m) and Planning income (£0.243m).

The other key area of overspend remains in Hard FM Services as a result of costs rising in Health and safety works (£0.427m) and additional security costs at the Civic Centre of £0.1m.

The cost for the health and safety works are being closely monitored with HfH and are subject to fluctuations.

**HOUSING (General Fund)
£1.219m**

Over budget

Housing Priority forecasts a net adverse variance of £1.219m which continues to be driven by the impact of Covid.

Due to current social distancing requirements the TA Lodges are not operating at full capacity which is estimated will lead to an under recovery of income. This, coupled with the additional cost in TA due to the “everyone in policy”, is projected to have an adverse variance of £0.8m. This forecast may reduce as social distancing requirements change.

It is also projected that TA numbers will increase due to the end of the ban on evictions. Its impact is estimated to lead to an overspend of £0.4m.

It is expected that, as the pandemic impact abates, some of these forecasts will reduce and the TA reductions initiatives (HCBS, Capital Letters) will resume full scale operation to provide further mitigation.

HOUSING (Housing Revenue Account - HRA)

Over budget £0.614m

Table 3 – HRA Budget Forecast (Quarter 1)

HRA BUDGET 2021/22	2021/22 Revised Budget	p.3 (Q1) 2020/21 Forecast	HRA Projected Variance - directly related to Covid19	HRA Projected Variance - inherent base budget variance	p.3 (Q1) 2021/22 Forecast Variance
	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
UE0721 Managed Services Income TOTAL	(106,809)	(106,542)		266	266
UE0722 Managed Services Expenditure TOTAL	13,204	13,552		348	348
UE0731 Retained Services Expenditure TOTAL	84,821	84,821			0
Surplus HRA Services (within Retained)	8,784	8,784			0
Balance of HRA Account	0	614	0	614	614

The HRA is forecasting an overspend at Qtr1 of £0.614m. This is made up of 1) £0.266m under recovery of income - primarily due to loss of income from hostel rents and service charges as a result of decants from Brunel Walk to facilitate site redevelopment and 2) £0.348m forecast overspend due to increased TA hostels security costs and responsive repairs cost.

Your Council - Service**Over budget £1.544m**

The Pandemic continues to impact on some of the services in this Priority notably in Benefits (£0.175m) where additional resources are forecast to manage on-going increased demand. The Revenues service is forecasting under-recovery of income (£0.809m) due to courts are not expected to be fully operational for some time, which will impact on income streams.

The net base budget pressure forecast in Qtr1 is predominately caused by staffing capacity in the Finance Directorate (£0.3m) with smaller pressures spread across the other services.

Your Council - Corporate**Under budget £0.5m**

The forecast underspend is mainly due to actual levy charges coming in lower than budgeted plus receipt of some unplanned income.

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)**Over budget £6.58m**

The DSG budget is forecasting an in year overspend of £6.58m as highlighted in the table below, showing the pressure within the High Needs Block (HNB).

Table 4 – DSG Position Quarter 1

	Budget £'000	Forecast £'000	Variance £'000
Central Block	2,912	2,912	0
Early Years Block	21,036	21,036	0
High Needs Block	42,865	49,443	6,579
Schools Block	136,263	136,263	0
Grand Total	203,076	209,654	6,579

The main driver for the pressure in the High Needs block remains the increasing number of Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP) in recent years. Approximately 25% of our children who are looked after have an EHCP. Where we have children who are looked after with an EHCP and who require an out of borough placements e.g. specialist residential, the social cost is higher than in borough.

The DSG reserve is ringfenced and outside the council's general fund reserves. The cumulative DSG deficit is detailed in the table below.

Blocks	Opening DSG at 01/04/21	Schools Forum agreed trf between blocks	Qtr1 Forecast Outturn Variance	Drawdown Request	Qtr1 Forecast Closing Balance
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Schools Block	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Central Block	(0.08)	0.00	0.00	0.00	(0.08)
High Needs Block	16.87	0.00	6.58	0.00	23.45
Early Years Block	0.11	0.00		0.00	0.11
Total	16.90	0.00	6.58	0.00	23.48

The Council is producing a DSG Management Plan which will be coproduced with various stakeholders, and shared with the DFE and which will detail the various actions the Council is taking to manage the level of DSG overspend. The plan will be a live document which will continue to be shared periodically with the DFE. Whilst Council actions will mitigate the level of overspend, it is not anticipated that the Council will be able to ameliorate this completely given the very significant difference between government funding, and demand for services within the High Needs Block in particular.

The DFE have agreed 'Safety Valve' deals with a small number of Councils which have significant levels of DSG overspend: these arrangements provide for the DFE to fund or repay Council's historic DSG deficit positions, subject to the Councils managing to eradicate overspends in future years' allocations. Council Officers have met with representatives from the DFE earlier this year to engage with them over the council's DSG position. It has been fed back to the Council that the DFE will not look to engage with Haringey in the near future around a 'Safety Valve' deal, as the Council's overspend position is not as significant as other authorities.

HRA Budget 2021/22	2021/22 Revised Budget	Q1 2021/22 Actual	Q1 2021/22 eoy Forecast	Q1 2021/22 eoy Forecast Variance	notes
Total for AH04 - Housing Revenue Account	0	(2,511)	614	614	
UE0721 Managed Services Income	(106,809)	(14,114)	(106,542)	266	
H39404 Service Charge Income - Hostels	(320)	(20)	(288)	32	The Forecast for all HRA Managed Services Income is to £266k overspend. Due to Hostels rents and service charge less income due to decants. Please note that due to IT issues & problems regarding the NPS- Northgate OHMS replacement system change . There are only 3 weeks and four days income processed in the p.3 year to date actual figures , the budget assumption was to have processed 12 weeks and 4 days by the end of p.3 (i.e. they are 9 weeks behind on processing these weekly Rent week journals for 2021/22 due to the current non-availability of relevant rental reports from the new system). Therefore all of the other income budgets are forecast to budget.
H39002 Rent - Hostels	(1,943)	(99)	(1,709)	235	
H39001 Rent - Dwellings	(82,030)	(5,623)	(82,030)	0	
H39101 Rent - Garages	(861)	(201)	(861)	0	
H39102 Rent - Commercial	(756)	(339)	(756)	0	
H39103 CBS - Lease Rental Income	(1,984)	0	(1,984)	0	
H39201 Income - Heating	(617)	(41)	(617)	0	
H39202 Income - Light and Power	(1,016)	(69)	(1,016)	0	
H39301 Service Charge Income - Leasehold	(7,562)	(7,073)	(7,562)	0	
H39401 ServChgInc SuppHousg	(1,495)	(102)	(1,495)	0	
H39402 Service Charge Income - Concierge	(1,741)	(107)	(1,741)	0	
H39405 Grounds Maintenance	(2,201)	(152)	(2,201)	0	
H39406 Caretaking	(1,943)	(130)	(1,943)	0	
H39407 Street Sweeping	(2,338)	(157)	(2,338)	0	
H40102 Water Rates Receivable	(1)	(0)	(1)	0	
UE0722 Managed Services Expenditure	13,204	1,124	13,552	348	
S14400 Supported Housing Central	291	30	291	0	The Forecast for all HRA Managed Services Expenditure is £348k overspend is due to the TA Hostels security costs are the primary reasons for the £166k overspend also the Responsive Repairs - Hostels Repairs & Maintenance costs are the primary reasons for the £182k overspend , all of the other HRA Managed Services Expenditure budgets are currently forecast to Budget.
H31300 Housing Management WG	24	(0)	24	0	
H32300 Housing Management NT	28	2	28	0	
H33300 Housing Management Hornsey	0	5	0	0	
H33400 TA Hostels	252	26	418	166	
H34300 Housing Management ST	10	3	10	0	
H35300 Housing Management BWF	12	0	12	0	
H36300 Rent Accounts	0	207	0	0	
H37210 Under Occupation	171	19	171	0	
H40001 Repairs - Central Recharges	2	(17)	2	0	
H40004 Responsive Repairs - Hostels	387	(11)	569	182	
H40101 Water Rates Payable	31	3	31	0	
H40104 HousMgmtRechg Cent	110	0	110	0	
H40111 Other RentCollection	138	10	138	0	
H40202 Management Special - Nth Tott	0	(0)	0	0	
H40206 HousMgmtRechg Energ	1,128	154	1,128	0	
H40208 Special Services Cleaning	3,189	526	3,189	0	
H40209 Special Services Ground Maint	2,075	58	2,075	0	
H40212 HRA Pest Control	297	30	297	0	
H40213 Estate Controlled Parking	145	1	145	0	
H40303 Supporting People Payments	1,861	(10)	1,861	0	
H40309 Commercial Property - Expenditure	0	10	0	0	
H40401 Bad Debt Provision - Dwellings	2,535	0	2,535	0	
H40404 Bad Debt Provision - Leaseholders	91	0	91	0	
H40406 Bad Debt Provisions - Hostels	68	0	68	0	
H40801 HRA- Council Tax	359	78	359	0	
UE0731 Retained Services Expenditure	93,605	10,479	93,605	0	
H25600 Housing Delivery Team	0	502	0	0	At this early stage (p.3) of the 2021/22 financial year the Budget eoy Forecast for all HRA RETAINED Services Expenditure is to Budget.
H38002 Anti Social Behaviour Service	611	0	611	0	
H39601 Interest Receivable	(304)	0	(304)	0	
H40112 Corporate democratic Core	601	0	601	0	
H40301 Leasehold Payments	(142)	(39)	(142)	0	
H40305 Landlords Insurance - Tenanted	326	0	326	0	
H40306 Landlords - NNDR	138	0	138	0	
H40308 Landlords Insurance - Leasehold	1,939	0	1,939	0	
H40501 Capital Financing Costs	16,242	0	16,242	0	
H40601 Depreciation - Dwellings	20,197	0	20,197	0	
H40805 ALMO HRA Management Fee	39,271	9,772	39,271	0	
H40900 Community Benefit Society (CBS)	0	33	0	0	
H49000 Housing Revenue Account	8,784	2	8,784	0	
H60002 GF to HRA Recharges	3,265	0	3,265	0	
H60003 Estate Renewal	1,370	210	1,370	0	
H60004 HIERS/ Regeneration Team	1,307	0	1,307	0	

Appendix 3 provides progress on savings 2021-22 delivery on a more detailed level.

MTFS Savings Ref	Saving proposal	Description	2021/22 £'000s	Detail on forecast saving has been achieved YTD	2021/22 Saving achieved YTD £'000s	2021/22 Projected Full Year Savings £'000s	2021/22 Savings (surplus)/ shortfall £'000s	RAG Status (Delivery of 2020/21 Saving)
People - Children								
PC2	Reduce operational costs	Reduce operational costs through streamlining management and staffing and improving efficiency in teams	(250)			(250)	0	Amber
20/25-PE03	Invest to Save - Edge of Care	Savings Approved at July 2019 Cabinet	(241)			(241)	0	Amber
20/25-PE04	Invest to Save proposal - In-House Fostering		11	-		11	0	Green
20/25-PE05	Invest to Save - SEND Transport		(216)	-		(216)	0	Green
20/25-PE06	Invest to Save - Pause Project		(1)	-		(1)	0	Green
20/25-PE09	0-19 year old public health commissioned services - a new integrated commissioned service delivery model		Public Health is working with the commissioned service provider to change the current service provision of three separate services into one integrated service model. Currently three commissioned services are within the Council's Section 75 Agreement with the CCG. These are the Health Visiting Service (including the HENRY programme), the School Nursing Service and the Family Nurse Partnership programme. All services are provided by Whittington Health NHS Trust.	125	-		125	0
20/25-PE12	Reduce operational costs in Schools and Learning and Commissioning	Identify any residual discretionary spend in Schools and Learning and reduce to deliver savings. Identify and reduce operational costs in Commissioning.	25	-		25	0	Green
CH102	Maya Angelou Assessment and Contact Centre Traded Service	This proposal identifies an opportunity to develop a traded service and provide contact facilities for children and parents. We are currently the only local-authority run contact centre in North London and there is significant demand identified through partners for use of this type of facility, particularly at peak times (Saturdays and Sundays). The centre provides good facilities with activities for children. Parents would be required to pay for the use of the facility and these parents would be those in private law who were divorcing and needing to make arrangements for contact. This would be achieved initially by extending hours to allow flexibility for external service provision and room bookings, then by developing a virtual offer for supervised contact online.	82	-		82	0	Amber
CH103	Delivering residential mother and baby assessments	The service set up the Maya Angelou Family Assessment Centre as part of the previous programme of Invest to save projects. Through this facility the service is undertaking parenting assessments in the community as planned. This project brought the service in-house and reduced spot purchasing of speciality parenting assessments. Assessments completed by the team of skilled social workers are now of a higher quality and there are fewer repeat assessments required as a result. As of the end of August this service has commenced 45 parenting capacity assessments in-house, with 17 closed in the current financial year. The service is on track to avoid costs in the region of £480K.	239	0		239	0	Amber
Total: People (Childrens)			(226)	0	0	(226)	0	

MTFS Savings Ref	Saving proposal	Description	2021/22 Target £'000s	2021/22 Saving achieved £'000s	2021/22 Variance £'000s	RAG Status (Delivery of 2021/22 Saving)
People (Adults)						
B2.7	Haringey Learning Disability Partnership	The Haringey Learning Disability Partnership, working jointly with Children's Services and with key partners such as the Clinical Commissioning Group and the London Borough of Islington, will implement a coherent strategy that aims to bring Haringey's demand and spending on adults with learning disabilities in line with our statistical neighbours and limit growth in spending in line with population growth.	1,340	236	(1,104)	Amber
B2.8	Mental Health	Working with our delivery partner, BEHMT, CCG and our communities to strengthen the prevention and 'enablement' pathways for mental health and to ensure the support we provide minimises the long-run dependency of adults with mental health issues. For those whose needs require a social care intervention, we will develop the market and look at new commissioning arrangements to improve value for money as well as promoting choice and control for the service user.	490	0	(490)	Red
B2.9	Adults OP / PS / SS	Working with the CCG, acute providers and primary care to extend independence, choice and control to those with physical support needs and further strengthen the pathways that prevent, reduce and delay the need for social care.	1,454	317	(1,137)	Amber
PA4	Transfer of High Cost Day Opps	Lease three ex-day centre premises to a local provider to support 15-20 service users at reduced cost, and closer to their existing support networks (Ermine Road).	426	0	(426)	Amber
	Fast Tracking Financial Assessments	Generating additional income through client contributions and charging for services through more timely discussions with client & processing.	1,082	0	(1,082)	Amber
			4,792	553	(4,239)	

MTFS Savings Ref	Saving proposal	2021/22 £'000s	2021/22 Saving achieved YTD £'000s	2021/22 Projected Full Year Savings £'000s	2021/22 Savings (surplus)/ shortfall £'000s	RAG Status (Delivery of 2020/21 Saving)
Place	Place					
PL9	Leisure centre concessions	50			50	Red
PL13	Parking Transformation Programme to deliver significant improvements to this service over the coming three years. Includes a CPZ rollout programme taking the borough to 100% coverage, and extending parking permit charging models to tackle emissions from Diesel vehicles	500	0	450	50	Amber
20/25-PL03	CCTV enforcement of weight limits and emissions through ANPR/DVLA check. Use of new technology cameras to record vehicle reg plates and immediately look up DVLA database to establish vehicle weight and emissions. Will require significant investment in infrastructure and back office arrangements.	280	0	140	140	Amber
20/25-PL04	Increase permit charges for highest emitting 'petrol' vehicles. A flat fee increase in Permit charge for the most polluting petrol emission band(s).	25	0	25	0	Green
20/25-PL06	Contact Centre Efficiencies	50	0		50	Red
20/25-PL07	Mechanisation of High Street Cleansing	150	0		150	Red
20/25-PL09	Hybrid Mail proposal	77	0	77	0	Amber
20/25-PL11	New Lease Income v2	20	20	20	0	Green
20/25-PL14	Parking Transformation Programme. Various workstreams - contactless £376, diesel n 2nd subsequent vehicle £300k and escalated essential permits, suspensions, carparks £164k MHCLG escalated 2021-22	840	0	500	340	Red

PL20/9	Full Cost recovery of services	130	0	20	110	Red
PL20/18	Crematorium Lease and Parks Property	20	20	20	0	Green
PL20/21	Review of Events team	45	45	45	0	Green
PL20/22	Visitors Vouchers Pricing Structure change	198	0	99	99	Amber
PL20/31	Concessionary Fares	1,200	0	1,200	0	Green
PL20/32	Diesel surcharge - Pay for Parking	(10)	0	(10)	0	
PL20/35	Night Time Enforcement	(5)	0	(5)	0	
PL20/39	Management and Support structure review	160	160	160	0	Green
PL20/3	Management of ASB Enforcement & Remodel of ASB & Waste Enforcement and Waste Services	78	78	78	0	Green
PL20/25	Pay for Parking - Introduce a minimum 30 minute purchasable sessions, (currently 15 minutes)	250	0	125	125	Red
PL20/27	Back office services efficiencies.	100	0	44	56	Red
PL20/28	Introduce Sunday charges - Car Park Pricing Structure	27	0	14	14	Amber
PL20/29	Introduce Sunday charges - Pay for Parking Pricing Structure	63	0	32	32	Amber
PL20/30	Targeted recovery of PCNs issued to persistent evaders. Dedicated resources introduced as part of new operational model and PMIS	80	0	80	0	Green
20/25-YC09	Maximising income from filming and venue management. This proposal is in two parts. The first is to make Haringey more attractive to film companies by identifying vacant buildings for meanwhile use as production bases, and by making parking easier in order to generate income. The second is to consider employing staff, as an invest to save bid, to market the council's venues for events (currently uncosted).	6	0	6	0	Green
YC104	Highway Searches	24		16	8	Amber
Total: PARKING		4,358	323	3,135	1,223	

MTFS Savings Ref	Saving proposal	Description	2021/22 £'000s	2021/22 Saving achieved YTD £'000s	2021/22 Projected Full Year Savings £'000s	2021/22 Savings (surplus)/ shortfall £'000s	RAG Status (Delivery of 2020/21 Saving)
Economy							
20/25-EC08	Strategic Property Unit – New Income Outdoor Media	This proposal comprises an opportunity to achieve new income potential by securing rental payments from outdoor media companies. This includes digital billboards and an innovative building wrap with a digital display for advertising purposes and council messages.	(100)			(100)	
PL8	Soft FM Efficiency	Re-commissioning of soft FM services and services delivered through Amey contract (e.g. efficiencies in postage & franking, front of house, security).	(25)			(25)	
20/25-PL08	FM Transformation	Terminating the Amey contract for FM Services and bringing Soft FM back in-house, and transferring Hard FM to Homes for Haringey. Approximately 100 staff will be in scope for a TUPE transfer. The proposed saving will be achieved through improved efficiency and returning Amey overhead and profit to the council. The transformation will include purchase of a new Property IT system, and service improvements particularly relating to building repairs and maintenance.	(150)			(150)	
EC101	Additional Recharge to Housing Services		300			300	Green
EC102	Additional Planning income from introducing new charges		200			200	Amber
EC103	Reduction in Energy Consumption on corporate buildings		50			50	Amber
Total: Economy			275	0	0	275	

MTFS Savings Ref	Saving proposal	Description	2021/22 £'000s	2021/22 Saving achieved YTD £'000s	2021/22 Projected Full Year Savings £'000s	2021/22 Savings (surplus)/ shortfall £'000s	RAG Status (Delivery of 2020/21 Saving)
Housing							
HO1	Temporary accommodation reduction plan	Reduce TA costs, as detailed in the TA Reduction Plan. Proposals include initiatives to prevent homelessness, improve economic position of those in TA, and help support those in TA to move on. Revenue costs covered by the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant. Plan also includes proposals to increase supply of low cost TA through new purchase, repair and management joint venture partnership, and capital investment in new Community Benefit Society. Please note that due to the additional costs incurred due to unforeseen works at BWF, it may not be possible to meet the projected savings.	573			573	Green
20/25-HO01	Transferring PSLs to HfH	Private Sector Leasing properties are leased by the Council from private landlords for between one and five years with a guaranteed rent for the term of the lease. Leases are mainly based on 90% of the 2011 LHA plus a £40 a week management fee (the latter being a transfer from FHSG). The CBS has been established to lease properties purchased by the Council to use them as TA or to discharge homelessness. Unlike the Council, the CBS can charge the current (2019) Local Housing Allowance (LHA) for the area the property is located in. Therefore moving these leases could mean total additional rental income of £1.19m if all leases were transferred. This would require, in each case, the landlords agreement to do so and additional incentives may be required. A reduction in savings of 25% has thus been included to account for this and additional costs	272			272	Amber
HO101	Housing Team Salaries - increase HRA contribution		274			274	Green
HO102	HfH taking over the lease of PSL properties on their expiry		209			209	Amber
Total: Housing			1,328	0	0	1,328	0

MTFS Savings Ref	Saving proposal	Description	2021/22 £'000s	2021/22 Saving achieved YTD £'000s	2021/22 Projected Full Year Savings £'000s	2021/22 Savings (surplus)/shortfall £'000s	RAG Status (Delivery of 2020/21 Saving)
Your Council (incl Council-Wide)							
A6.2	Audit and Risk Management	Reduction in the value of the externally procured internal audit contract; potentially changing the assurance model, or reducing the number of audits completed.	20		0	20	Amber
YC1	Out of home advertising income generation	The proposal is to recommission the street furnishing advertising contract. Moving to digital display to ensure communication messages can be updated quickly, and to remove printing costs.	5		5	0	Green
20/25-YC02	Income from joining the London Counter Fraud Hub	The London Counter Fraud Hub, managed by CIPFA, is a counter fraud service developed to supply data analytics, investigations and recoveries service for London local authorities and the City of London Corporation. Unlike traditional data matching hubs, this project is an end-to-end service providing expert advice and operational support around sophisticated analytics. The overarching objective for the service is to increase fraud and corruption detection, and improve fraud prevention, share common risks across London, minimise losses and maximise recovery, so that fraud and corruption does not pay. Three data sources (Council Tax - Single Person Discount, Housing Tenancy and Non Domestic Rate records are entered into the analytics part of the Hub through a secure transfer. Using sophisticated technology, the Hub will analyse the data to identify frauds against the 32 London local authorities and the City of London Corporation.	25		25	0	Green
20/25-YC10	Additional sites for on street digital advertising	The proposal is to generate an income from the advertising opportunities in the borough. While we have recently awarded contract for our digital on street advertising, we are now looking at other forms of advertising, which are sympathetic to the surroundings and maximise the councils commercial returns. This is in the form of street advertising, out of home advertising, and libraries/customer services advertising.	52		26	26	Amber
YC106	Reduction in Legal Services Support		163		163	0	Green
YC105	Digital Services - Establishment Savings		250		250	0	Green
YC101	Finance Savings		202		202	0	Green
YC109	HR Savings		105		105	0	Green
Total: Your Council			822	0	776	46	0
	Digital Together	Cross-Cutting Saving Proposal	750	757	758	(8)	Amber/ Red

2021/22 Capital Monitoring, @ Quarter One (June 2021) Projection Sheet		Scheme Description	21/22 Full year Revised Budget (after Framework Budget adjustment)	2021/22 Full year Forecast Outturn	Budget Variance (Underspend) / Overspend
SCHEME REF	SCHEME NAME		£,000	£,000	£,000
101	Primary Sch - repairs & maintenance	A range of repairs to various schools covering boiler replacement, rewiring and other items.	6,845	5,753	(1,091)
102	Primary Sch - mod & enhance (Inc SEN)	A range of larger, substantial repairs to schools such as re roofing works, new windows, and major fabric replacement	24,126	24,075	(51)
103	Primary Sch - new places	To fund expansion of schools if required	362	51	(311)
104	Early years	To provide funding to increase/secure early years places	205	0	(205)
109	Youth Services	This budget is provision for the borough's Youth Services projects.	229	57	(172)
110	Devolved Sch Capital	This is passed 100% to schools	531	531	0
114	Secondary Sch - mod & enhance (Inc SEN)	A range of larger, substantial repairs to schools such as re roofing works, new windows, and major fabric replacement	5,029	3,110	(1,919)
117	Children Safeguarding & Social Care	This scheme is designed to increase the capacity to retain LAC in-borough	495	(15)	(510)
118	Special Educational Needs Fund (New Provision Fund)	This scheme is to fund the SEND programme and the budget has been transferred scheme 102.	0	0	0

121	Pendarren House	Works to the facility to bring it to a high standard of repair	858	857	(1)
122	Alternative Provision Strategy	To fund capital works that increase the number of AP places in the borough	1,300	1,300	0
123	Wood Green Youth Hub	This budget is provision for the new W.G Youth Hub	1,263	1,263	(0)
199	P1 Other (inc Con't & Social care)	This is a small programme contingency budget.	98	125	27

People - Children's			41,340	37,107	(4,233)
----------------------------	--	--	---------------	---------------	----------------

The Children's Services capital programme has reprofiled resources of £5.138m into future years. The significant budgets that have been reprofiled are the primary school modernisation and enhancement budget which has reprofiled £2.627m into the next financial year and the secondary school modernisation and enhancement budget which has reprofiled £0.968m into the next financial year. The Pendarren project is only anticipated to spend £0.86m in this financial year so £1.4m of resources have been reprofiled into next year.

The quarter 1 forecast outturn is showing a an under budget position of £4.2m which is largely due to the Primary School repairs & maintenance budget at £1.1m variance. This budget has not been reprofiled as the spend in this area is unpredictable and it would not be prudent to reduce the budget along with the secondary school budget.

2021/22 Capital Monitoring, @ Quarter One (June 2021) Projection Sheet		Scheme Description	21/22 Full year Revised Budget (after Framework Budget adjustment)	2021/22 Full year Forecast Outturn	Budget Variance (Underspend) / Overspend
SCHEME REF	SCHEME NAME		£,000	£,000	£,000
201	Aids, Adap's & Assistive Tech -Home Owners (DFG)	Grant funded programme of aids and adaptations to enable people to remain in their home	3,581	3581	0
207	New Day Opp's Offer	This budget is funding for The Haven/Roundways project	66	41	(24)

208	Supported Living Schemes	Funding to convert property to supported living schemes reducing high cost placements with no loss of quality of service	456	0	(456)
209	Assistive Technology	The funding for AT will provide a greater range of Assistive Technology interventions that will enable individuals to live independently and safely for longer in their own homes, as well as greater opportunity for improved outcomes through better information and proactive intervention.	1,759	980	(779)
211	Community Alarm Service	This is the funding for the capital element of the service	177	177	0
212	Linden House Adaptation	This project is complete with a minor retention	35	53	18
213	Canning Crescent Assisted Living	This project is to provide a number of assisted living places	3,581	3,581	(0)
214	Osborne Grove Nursing Home	The scheme is in development to provide a 70 bed nursing home.	1,783	1,776	(6)
217	Burgoyne Road (Refuge Adaptations)	This project is to provide a new women's refuge	736	233	(502)
218	Social Emotional & Mental Health Provision	This budget is to provide funding to provide additional in borough provision	900	0	(900)
221	Social Care System Implementation	This budget is to provide funding for the implementation of a new social care system	1,600	500	(1,100)
People - Adults			14,673	10923	(3750)

The Adults Services capital programme has reprofiled resources of £26.3m into future years. The Osborne Grove Nursing Home budget has reprofiled resources of £16m into future years. This will more closely reflect the extended co design and co development of the scheme. The Burgoyne Road scheme is being redesigned in the light of the feasibility study which concluded that the original aspiration of a 16 unit facility was not possible.

A 10 unit facility is now proposed and design development is underway. As there will be limited spend this financial year of £2.0m have been reprofiled into next year. The Canning Crescent project is now on site with a contractor appointed and a revised budget of £3.6m for this financial year has been set.

The supported living scheme is a framework budget to enable the service to respond to opportunities as they present themselves. 57 White Hart Lane has been identified as a suitable building for this programme and a budget of £3.65m has been set for the scheme. At this stage of development, it is not anticipated that there will be very much spend this financial year so £6m of resources have been reprofiled into future years.

The quarter 1 forecast is showing an under budget position of £3.75m. The single largest variance is in relation to the Social Care System Implementation (formerly the Mosaic Implementation) budget variance of £1m. There are a range of minor underspends across the rest of the programme. It is anticipated that these two budgets will increase expenditure during the year.

2021/22 Capital Monitoring, @ Quarter One (June 2021)Projection Sheet		Scheme Description	21/22 Full year Revised Budget (after Framework Budget adjustment)	2021/22 Full year Forecast Outturn	Budget Variance (Underspend) / Overspend
SCHEME REF	SCHEME NAME		£,000	£,000	£,000
301	Street Lighting	This is the annual investment in capital maintenance	1,513	1,513	0
302	Borough Roads	This is the annual investment in capital maintenance	4,716	4,716	(0)
303	Structures (Highways)	This is the annual investment in capital maintenance	526	526	(0)

304	Flood Water Management	This is the annual investment in capital maintenance	734	734	(0)
305	Borough Parking Plan	This funding underpins the borough parking plan	714	545	(169)
307	CCTV	This funding underpins the borough CCTV plan	1,784	1,784	0
309	Local Implementation Plan(LIP)	This funding is provided by TfL for infrastructure works called the Local Implementation Plan (LIP)	284	284	(0)
310	Developer S106 / S278	This funding is provided by developers to offset the deleterious effect of their development so that it is acceptable in planning terms	869	650	(219)
311	Parks Asset Management:	This is the annual investment in capital maintenance	433	433	0
313	Active Life in Parks:	This is the annual investment in capital maintenance	1,014	914	(100)
314	Parkland Walk Bridges	Investment in the refurbishment of a number of bridges	1,133	1,133	0
317	Down Lane MUGA	This budget is to cover investment in Down Lane Park	57	57	0
321	MOPAC - Crime & Disorder Reduction	This is a grant funded scheme	49	0	(49)
322	Finsbury Park	This budget is to cover investment in Finsbury Park funded through the events income	135	100	(35)
323	Parking Strategy	This funding underpins the borough parking strategy	1,160	1,160	(0)
325	Parks Vehicles	This budget is to be used for the procurement of energy efficient park vehicles. It is self-funding and is aimed to reduce carbon emissions.	720	0	(720)

328	Street & Greenspace Greening Programme	This is an annual programme of investment in street & greenspace tree planting programme. The programme is used to match fund other external funds and sponsorship opportunities to deliver circa 200-250 trees per year. The current programme is much greater than this due to a large grant from the Urban Tree Challenge Fund and NCIL funding in four wards.	283	283	0
329	Park Building Carbon Reduction and Improvement Programme	A four year programme to improve the quality of the parks operational estate (13 buildings) including reducing the energy consumption and water usage by installing new technologies to reduce the carbon emissions to Zero in line with the Climate Action Plan targets for 2027.	1,050	1,050	0
331	Updating the boroughs street lighting with energy efficient Led light bulbs	This budget supports the upgrade of the borough's lighting to LED bulbs	4,151	4,151	0
332	Disabled Bay/Blue Badge	The scheme is to fund new disabled bays and to upgrade existing ones.	552	300	(251)
333	Waste Management	To upgrade waste infrastructure in the public realm	270	270	0
334	Parks Depot Reconfiguration	A one off programme to facilitate the rationalisation of the parks operational depots across the borough.	400	400	0
335	Streetspace Plan	This scheme is to improve the street environment within Haringey.	5,100	5,100	0
419	NPD Phase 2 LBH Match Funding	This scheme is now concluded.	5	0	(5)
119	School Streets	The funding is to support the roll out of the schools streets initiative	1,105	1,105	(0)
444	Marsh Lane	The scheme is to provide a new depot on Marsh Lane, to be completed by November 2021	8,754	8,460	(294)

447	Alexandra Palace - Maintenance	The funding is made up of a regular £470k capital maintenance budget for the upkeep of the palace. In addition there are two projects underway	1,328	1,328	0
472	JLAC Match Fund	The scheme is to refurbish elements of Jackson Lane Arts Centre	880	880	0
606	Hornsey Library Refurbishment	This scheme is now concluded.	16	16	0
621	Libraries IT and Buildings upgrade	This is a programme of upgrades to the libraries in the borough	1,996	929	(1,067)
623	Wood Green Library	The funding is to undertake upgrades to Wood Green library	1,000	0	(1,000)
652	Libraries - Re-imagining our Libraries offer for a better future	This is a self funding budget to drive greater use in the libraries	0	0	0
Place - Safe & Sustainable Places			42,730	38,822	(3,907)

The Place capital programme has had reprofiled resources of £3.47m. The Parkland Walk Bridges project has slipped £1.1m due to extended design development, the Finsbury Park capital programme is dependent on the achievement of event income. As there have been few events the income cannot support the capital expenditure plan, so this budget has been reduced by £1m. The Libraries Reimagining budget of £0.65m has been reprofiled to future years.

The quarter 1 forecast is showing an under budget position of £3.9m. The two largest variances relate to the branch libraries programme, £1.1m, and the Wood Green Library scheme, £1m. There have been delays to the branch libraries programme as upon investigation additional condition works have been identified that would be best corrected as part of the upgrade programme. The Wood Green Library repairs are being specified and may take place later this year and so the forecast may improve.

2021/22 Capital Monitoring, @ Quarter One (June 2021) Projection Sheet	Scheme Description	21/22 Full year Revised Budget (after Framework Budget adjustment)	2021/22 Full year Forecast Outturn	Budget Variance (Underspend) / Overspend
--	--------------------	---	------------------------------------	--

SCHEME REF	SCHEME NAME		£,000	£,000	£,000
401	Tottenham Hale Green Space	This budget is to deliver improvements to Down Lane Park and the Paddock green spaces	1,352	1,338	(13)
402	Tottenham Hale Streets	This budget is to deliver public realm improvements in Tottenham Hale	1,759	1,759	(1)
404	Good Economy Recovery plan	This scheme is to provide interventions in high streets, to promote economic activities.	1,637	1,055	(582)
406	Opportunity Investment Fund	The budget is provided by the GLA and is used to provide loans to businesses	542	542	0
411	Tottenham Heritage Action Zone (HAZ)	This budget funded by Historic England is to deliver shop front improvements, heritage restoration and public realm improvements within Bruce Grove Conservation Area	1,579	1,578	(1)
415	North Tott Heritage Initiative	This budget funded by National Heritage Lottery Fund is to deliver shop front improvements in Northumberland Park Conservation Area	360	322	(38)
418	Heritage building improvements	This scheme is largely grant-funded, to undertake works to private properties, to safeguard heritage buildings.	1,589	1,589	(0)
421	HRW Acquisition	The budget is for the acquisition of properties as part of the HRW redevelopment. The costs will be met by the developer.	8,297	8,297	0
429	Site Acq (Tott & Wood Green)	The budget is to provide the capacity to respond to opportunities to acquire properties. The spending of the budget is subject to a business case.	14,780	14,780	0
430	Wards Corner CPO	The budget is to provide resources to undertake the CPO process on Wards Corner.	3,500	3,500	0
435	Wood Green Station Road	this scheme is to undertake master planning on WG station road.	0	2	2

438	Vacant possession Civic Centre (Woodside House Refurbishment)	This is a retention budget for this completed scheme.	22	22	(0)
452	Low Carbon Zones	This budget is used to undertake works pertaining to the neighbourhood of the future projects, which is solely funded by TfL	50	51	0
453	New workspace scheme at Stoneleigh Road car park	This budget is for the provision of mixed use workspace and housing. This budget is for the workspace element	0	0	0
454	HALS Improvement Programme	The scheme is to improve the physical environment of the service and to improve its on line offer	125	209	84
455	Replacement Cloud based IT solutions for Planning, Building Control & Land Charges	The funding is to be used for a replacement IT solution for planning	642	412	(230)
457	Future High Street Project	This budget funded by MHCLG is to deliver site acquisition, public realm improvements, workspace, market, community spaces and CCTV investments in Seven Sisters, Tottenham Green and Bruce Grove.	6,302	223	(6,079)
458	SIP - Northumberland PK BB & WorkSpace/Biz Support	This is a grant funded project to deliver broadband and Workspace/business support.	30	26	(4)
459	Wood Green Regen Sites	This scheme is to deliver the WG cultural quarter, WG central and Turnpike lane improvement plan.	788	788	0
464	Bruce Castle	The funding it to match fund eternal funding (should there be any) and spend is subject to a successful business case	557	0	(557)
465	District Energy Network (DEN)	The funding is to support the creation of a decentralised energy network and is subject to a successful business case	560	560	(0)
470	Wood Green HQ, Library & Customer Service Centre	This budget is for the development of the WG headquarters and associated works	7,788	0	(7,788)

471	Tailoring Academy Project	This is a grant to the Tailoring Academy	15	9	(5)
473	Enterprising Tottenham High Road (ETHR)	This budget funded by GLA is to invest in workspace in Bruce Grove	1,181	1,181	(0)
474	Tottenham High Road Strategy	The budget is the LBH contribution to support delivery of projects within Tottenham High Road strategy area	807	740	(67)
475	Heart of Tottenham (HOT)	This budget is for the delivery of the Tottenham Green phase two works, which entails the creation of a new public square (behind the old town hall), hard & soft landscaping and a new Library garden.	173	124	(49)
478	Wood Green Good Growth Fund	This is a GLA funded scheme to promote growth in WG area.	277	291	14
479	54 Muswell Hill Health Centre	The Council is leasing the property to the NHS and the funding is to undertake some remedial works to the property and cover professional fees	100	100	0
480	Wood Green Regen (2)	This budget is to facilitate the wider regeneration of the WG area.	696	696	(0)
481	Strategic Investment Pot	This is funding provided the Corporation of London for economic development purposes	2,031	0	(2,031)
482	Strategic Property	This is funding for works to the commercial portfolio	5,202	3170	(2032)
483	Production Valley Fund (SIP)	This budget provides loans to businesses and is funded by the Corporation of London	643	643	0
488	Liveable Seven Sisters (LSS)	This budget is to deliver public realm and parks improvements in Seven Sisters	0	0	0
493	Bruce Grove Yards (BGY)	This budget is to deliver public realm improvements in Bruce grove	0	0	0
4001	Maintenance of Tottenham Green Workshops	This is to undertake landlord works at the site	681	679	(2)
4002	Northumberland Park estate area public realm	This funding is to improve the public realm in this area	500	500	0

4003	Tottenham Hale Housing Zone Funding	This budget funded by GLA is to invest in public realm within the Tottenham Hale Housing Zone	500	500	0
4005	SME Workspace Intensification	The funding is to intensify use of the Council's industrial estate and spend is subject to a successful business case	684	683	(1)
4006	Acquisition of head leases	The funding is to acquire headleases and any acquisition will be subject to a successful business case	0	0	0
4007	Tottenham Hale Decentralised Energy Network (DEN)	The funding is to support the creation of a decentralised energy network and is subject to a successful business case	685	685	0
4008	Wood Green Decentralised Energy Network (DEN)	The funding is to support the creation of a decentralised energy network and is subject to a successful business case	1,085	1,085	0
4009	Additional Carbon Reduction Project	This budget is to assist other capital schemes to become more carbon efficient and it is self-funded.	500	0	(500)
4010	Selby Urban Village Project	The funding is to support the redevelopment of the Selby Centre and associated works	1,197	448	(748)
4011	Commercial Property Remediation	Funding to undertake landlord obligations.	109	53	(56)
4993	Pride in the High Road (PITHR)	This budget is to deliver placemaking / identity projects along Tottenham High Road	0	0	0
Economy - Growth & Employment			69,326	48,697	(20,629)

The Economy capital programme has reprofiled resources of £43.4m into future years. The schemes that have been reprofiled are: acquisition of headleases, £13m. The early engagement with the head lessors has not been encouraging as they are seeking to command premium prices to give up their interests so the budget has been reprofiled.; the Wood Green budget has been reprofiled by £8.5m; the Tottenham Housing Zone funding is a GLA grant programme and has been reprofiled by £7.4m as it is not anticipated that all the payments will be made this year; the Bruce Castle budget, which is a self-financing budget, has reprofiled £5.0m into future years as the level of spend is going to be lower than previously thought; the additional carbon reduction project budget, a self-financing budget, has had £4.0m of its budget reprofiled to future years; the Selby Urban Village project budget, a self-financing budget, has had £4.1m of its budget reprofiled into future years.

The quarter 1 forecast is for an under budget position of £20.6m. The significant variances relate to the Wood Green HQ scheme, £7.8m, DEN projects, £5.7m, slippage on the Future High Streets Fund projects, £6.1m, Strategic Property commercial property repairs, £2m. There are range of other smaller slippages.

2021/22 Capital Monitoring, @ Quarter One (June 2021)Projection Sheet		Scheme Description	21/22 Full year Revised Budget (after Framework Budget adjustment)	2021/22 Full year Forecast Outturn	Budget Variance (Underspen d) / Overspend
SCHEME REF	SCHEME NAME		£,000	£,000	£,000
509	CPO - Empty Homes	The budget is to allow the Council to undertake CPO on properties should it be required	0	0	0
512	Wholly Owned Company	The funding is to enable the establishment of a company should it be decided to establish one.	0	0	0
Housing (GF) Homes & Communities			0	0	0
<p>The Housing General Fund budget is reporting no spend and no forecast spend. The budgets contained within this area are framework budget, the CPO budget, £8.1m and the budget for the Wholly Owned Company, £5m.</p>					
2021/22 Capital Monitoring, @ Quarter One (June 2021)Projection Sheet		Scheme Description	21/22 Full year Revised Budget (after Framework Budget adjustment)	2021/22 Full year Forecast Outturn	Budget Variance (Underspen d) / Overspend

SCHEME REF	SCHEME NAME		£,000	£,000	£,000
601	Business Imp Programme	This budget is funding IT development to support the new ways of working	122	48	(74)
602	Corporate IT Board	This budget is funding IT development to support the new ways of working	1,396	1,056	(341)
604	Continuous Improvement	This budget delivers upgrade to the council's IT infrastructure.	1,245	714	(531)
605	Customer Services (Digital Transformation)	This budget is to provide capital works at the WG Customer Services centre.	471	471	(0)
607	Financial Management System Replacement	The budget is to fund upgrades to the existing SAP system to enhance functionality	2,522	1,806	(716)
622	Customer First	This budget is to support the delivery of the councils Customer First strategy.	2,101	694	(1,407)
639	Ways of Working	This budget is to support the delivery of the councils accommodation strategy.	483	56	(427)
640	Accommodation Move	This budget supports capital expenditures associated with office moves.	0	0	0
650	Connected Communities	This budget provides capital funds to support the Connected Communities initiative.	1,258	0	(1,258)
653	Capital Support for IT Projects	This budget provides IT support to other schemes in the programme and it's self-funding.	784	400	(384)
698	Responsiveness Fund	The budget is to allow the Council to respond to in year match funding opportunities	2,000	2,000	0
316	Asset Management of Council Buildings	This scheme funds works to the council's operational buildings.	9,222	7,348	(1,874)
330	Civic Centre Works	This scheme is for the Civic centre refurbishment works	7,703	7,703	(0)

699	P6 - Approved Capital Programme Contingency	This is the approved capital programme contingency.	2,926	2,926	0
Your Council			32,233	25,223	(7,011)
<p>The Your Council capital programme has reprofiled £2.4m to future years and transferred £0.874m from the contingency to the Alexandra Palace and Park capital maintenance budget.</p> <p>The quarter 1 forecast is an adverse variance of £7m. The main contributors to the variance are slippage on the following programmes: replacement of the financial management system, £0.7m, the connected communities programme, £1.3m, and the customer first programme, £1.4m. The asset management of council buildings budget is projecting to underspend by £1.9m. However, there it is possible that expenditure will improve throughout the year. Within this area the current forecast is that both the responsiveness fund and the approved capital programme contingency will spend to budget.</p>					
TOTAL GF CAPITAL PROGRAMME			200,302	153,334	(46,968)
Housing (HRA) Housing Revenue Account					
2021/22 Capital Monitoring, @ Quarter One (June 2021) Projection Sheet		Scheme Description	21/22 Full year Revised Budget (after Framework Budget adjustment)	2021/22 Full year Forecast Outturn	Budget Variance (Underspend) / Overspend
SCHEME REF	SCHEME NAME		£,000	£,000	£,000
202	HRA - P2 Aids, Adap's & Assist Tech -Council	Adaptations capital works for Council HRA properties to enable identified residents to help live an independent life.	1,100	1100	0
550	New Homes Acquisition	Acquisition of new homes to supplement the existing HRA housing stock	75,441	43,766	(31,675)
551	Existing Home Acquisitions - TA	Acquisition of existing homes to supplement existing HRA housing stock	33,877	31,292	(2,585)

552	HRA – P5 Carbon Reduction	HRA capital programme contribution to the authorities overall climate change action plan to substantially reduce carbon emissions in the housing stock (managed by HfH)	5,892	5,220	(672)
553	HRA – P5 Fire Safety	HRA capital programme fire safety essential compliance works to the housing stock. (managed by HfH)	15,329	6,131	(9,198)
554	Broadwater Farm Project	Demolition and re-building of identified blocks within the Broadwater Farm estate due to urgent health & safety issues.(managed by HfH)	14,529	8,929	(5,600)
590	HRA - P5 Homes for Haringey (HFH)	HRA housing stock original capital existing stock programme , includes internal and external major , legacy decent homes and Noel park pods works programmes. (managed by HfH)	64,178	43,029	(21,149)
599	New Homes Build Programme	Building of new homes to supplement and increase the existing HRA housing stock	66,687	41,721	(24,966)
TOTAL HRA CAPITAL PROGRAMME			277,033	181,188	(95,845)
<p>The overall HRA Capital programme is reporting a projected total underspend of £96m. The significant variances relates to New Homes build & Acquisitions, and Existing stock maintenance programme. These are caused by programme slippages due to the impacts Covid and Brexit have had on supply of materials and building costs. These led to delays on some onsite activity and procurement processes. Additionally, Covid has impacted on resources in the various teams tasked with delivering the programmes, as well as supporting Teams.</p>					
OVERALL CAPITAL PROGRAMME			477,335	341,960	(135,375)

2021/26 REVISED GF CAPITAL MTFS BUDGET (INCLUDING 2020/21 C/F's) AS AT QUARTER ONE

		2021/22 Revised Budget	2021/22 (IN-YEAR) Budget Virement	2021/22 (FUTURE YEARS) Budget Virement	2021/22 Revised Budget (after Virement)	2022/23 Budget	2023/24 Budget	2024/25 Budget	2025/26 Budget	2021/22 - 25/26 Total
SCHEME REF	SCHEME NAME	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
101	Primary Sch - repairs & maintenance	5,091	1,754		6,845	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	10,845
102	Primary Sch - mod & enhance (Inc SEN)	28,755	(2,002)	(2,627)	24,126	20,152	17,480	15,000	8,000	84,758
103	Primary Sch - new places	362			362	0	0	0	0	362
104	Early years	205			205	0	0	0	0	205
109	Youth Services	229			229	0	0	0	0	229
110	Devolved Sch Capital	531			531	531	531	531	531	2,655
114	Secondary Sch - mod & enhance (Inc SEN)	5,997		(968)	5,029	1,078	0	0	0	6,107
117	Children Safeguarding & Social Care	495			495	0	0	0	0	495
121	Pendarren House	2,276		(1,418)	858	2,243	2,913	70	0	6,084
122	Alternative Provision Strategy	1,300			1,300	2,500	3,500	3,500	1,200	12,000
123	Wood Green Youth Hub	1,015	248		1,263	0	0	0	0	1,263
199	P1 Other (inc Con't & Social care)	223		(125)	98	125	0	0	0	223
People - Children's		46,478	0	(5,138)	41,340	27,629	25,424	20,101	10,731	125,225
201	Aids, Adap's & Assistive Tech -Home Owners (DFG)	3,095	486		3,581	2,193	2,193	2,193	2,200	12,360
207	New Day Opp's Offer	66			66	0	0	0	0	66
208	Supported Living Schemes	6,456		(6,000)	456	4,500	3,000	3,000	0	10,956
209	Assistive Technology	1,759			1,759	500	0	0	0	2,259
211	Community Alarm Service	177			177	177	177	177	177	885
212	Linden House Adaptation	35			35	0	0	0	0	35
213	Canning Crescent Assisted Living	6,390		(2,809)	3,581	100	0	0	0	3,681
214	Osborne Grove Nursing Home	17,783		(16,000)	1,783	6,036	34,504	2,545	1,094	45,962
217	Burgoyne Road (Refuge Adaptations)	2,736		(2,000)	736	2,250	0	0	0	2,986
218	Social Emotional & Mental Health Provision	900			900	600	600	600	0	2,700
221	Social Care System Implementation	1,600			1,600	1,600	0	0	0	3,200
People - Adults		40,996	486	(26,809)	14,673	17,956	40,474	8,515	3,471	85,089

		2021/22 Revised Budget	2021/22 <u>(IN-YEAR)</u> Budget Virement	2021/22 <u>(FUTURE YEARS)</u> Budget	Revised Budget (after Virement)	2022/23 Budget	2023/24 Budget	2024/25 Budget	2025/26 Budget	2021/22 - 25/26 Total
SCHEME REF	SCHEME NAME	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
119	School Streets	1,105			1,105	600	600	600	0	2,905
301	Street Lighting	1,513			1,513	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	6,713
302	Borough Roads	4,716			4,716	4,769	6,044	6,924	6,924	29,377
303	Structures (Highways)	526			526	0	0	0	0	526
304	Flood Water Management	734			734	680	710	0	0	2,124
305	Borough Parking Plan	714			714	321	321	321	321	1,998
307	CCTV	1,784			1,784	1,000	550	0	0	3,334
309	Local Implementation Plan(LIP)	1,949	(1,665)		284	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,284
310	Developer S106 / S278	869			869	250	250	250	250	1,869
311	Parks Asset Management:	433			433	300	300	300	300	1,633
313	Active Life in Parks:	1,014			1,014	230	230	230	230	1,934
314	Parkland Walk Bridges	2,252		(1,119)	1,133	1,615	85	0	0	2,833
317	Down Lane MUGA	57			57	0	0	0	0	57
321	MOPAC - Crime & Disorder Reduction	49			49	0	0	0	0	49
322	Finsbury Park	1,135		(1,000)	135	600	600	1,000	0	2,335
323	Parking Strategy	960	200		1,160	0	0	0	0	1,160
325	Parks Vehicles	720			720	0	0	0	0	720
328	Street & Greenspace Greening Programme	283			283	100	100	100	0	583
329	Park Building Carbon Reduction and Improvement Programme	1,050			1,050	800	800	0	0	2,650
331	Updating the boroughs street lighting with energy efficient Led light bulbs	4,151			4,151	0	0	0	0	4,151
332	Disabled Bay/Blue Badge	552			552	0	0	0	0	552
333	Waste Management	270			270	200	0	0	0	470
334	Parks Depot Reconfiguration	400			400	0	0	0	0	400
335	Streetspace Plan	5,370	(270)		5,100	0	0	0	0	5,100
419	NPD Phase 2 LBH Match Funding	5			5	0	0	0	0	5
444	Marsh Lane	8,754			8,754	266	0	0	0	9,020
447	Alexandra Palace - Maintenance	470	858		1,328	470	470	470	470	3,208
472	JLAC Match Fund	880			880	0	0	0	0	880
606	Hornsey Library Refurbishment	0	16		16	0	0	0	0	16
621	Libraries IT and Buildings upgrade	1,996			1,996	0	0	0	0	1,996
623	Wood Green Library	1,000			1,000	1,000	0	0	0	2,000
652	Libraries - Re-imaging our Libraries offer for a better future	650		(650)	0	650	0	0	0	650
Place - Safe & Sustainable Places		46,360	(861)	(2,769)	42,730	16,151	13,360	12,495	10,795	95,530

		2021/22 Revised Budget	2021/22 (IN-YEAR) Budget Virement £,000	2021/22 (FUTURE YEARS) Budget £,000	2021/22 Revised Budget (after £,000	2022/23 Budget £,000	2023/24 Budget £,000	2024/25 Budget £,000	2025/26 Budget £,000	2021/22 - 25/26 Total £,000
SCHEME REF	SCHEME NAME	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
401	Tottenham Hale Green Space	810		542	1,352	4,406	2,055	4,849	0	12,661
402	Tottenham Hale Streets	11,221		(9,461)	1,759	9,143	800	1,319	0	13,021
4003	Tottenham Hale Housing Zone Funding	6,735		460	7,195	4,326	0	3,203	0	14,724
404	Good Economy Recovery plan	1,637			1,637	500	100	0	0	2,237
406	Opportunity Investment Fund	542			542	0	0	0	0	542
411	Tottenham Heritage Action Zone (HAZ)	1,319	260		1,579	2,000	1,200	0	0	4,779
415	North Tott Heritage Initiative	360			360	0	0	0	0	360
418	Heritage building improvements	1,589			1,589	0	0	0	0	1,589
421	HRW Acquisition	107,738			107,738	3,940	6,830	6,000	4,600	129,108
429	Site Acq (Tott & Wood Green)	57,072			57,072	14,000	10,000	12,000	0	93,072
430	Wards Corner CPO	10,000			10,000	0	0	0	0	10,000
435	Wood Green Station Road	0			0	0	0	0	0	0
438	Vacant possession Civic Centre (Woodside House Refurbishment)	22			22	0	0	0	0	22
452	Low Carbon Zones	50			50	0	0	0	0	50
453	New workspace scheme at Stoneleigh Road car park	400	(400)		0	1,000	0	0	0	1,000
454	HALS Improvement Programme	125			125	0	0	0	0	125
455	Replacement Cloud based IT solutions for Planning, Building Control & Land Charges	642			642	0	0	0	0	642
457	Future High Sreet Project	0	6,302		6,302	0	0	0	0	6,302
458	SIP - Northumberland PK BB & Workspace/Biz Support	0	1,520	(1,490)	30	1,490	0	0	0	1,520
459	Wood Green Regen Sites	0	788		788	0	0	0	0	788
464	Bruce Castle	5,557		(5,000)	557	6,000	8,500	5,000	0	20,057
465	District Energy Network (DEN)	2,331		(1,771)	560	6,500	3,500	1,771	0	12,331
471	Tailoring Academy Project	15			15	0	0	0	0	15
473	Enterprising Tottenham High Road (ETHR)	1,907	(726)		1,181	451	0	0	0	1,632
474	Tottenham High Road Strategy	484	323		807	587	0	0	0	1,394
475	Heart of Tottenham (HOT)	773	(600)		173	0	0	0	0	173
478	Wood Green Good Growth Fund	50	227		277	0	0	0	0	277
479	54 Muswell Hill Health Centre	100			100	0	0	0	0	100
480	Wood Green Regen (2)	9,269	(946)	(7,627)	696	8,000	7,750	8,664	7,627	32,736
481	Strategic Investment Pot	2,831	(800)		2,031	1,950	0	0	0	3,981
482	Strategic Property	5,202			5,202	254	3	0	0	5,459
483	Production Valley Fund (SIP)	643			643	0	0	0	0	643
488	Liveable Seven Sisters (LSS)	1,704	(1,704)		0	2,250	1,019	0	0	3,269
493	Bruce Grove Yards (BGY)	1,326	(1,326)		0	1,670	218	0	0	1,888
4001	Maintenance of Tottenham Green Workshops	681			681	0	0	0	0	681
4002	Northumberland Park estate area public realm	1,000		(500)	500	500	0	0	0	1,000
4005	SME Workspace Intensification	2,116	(1,432)		684	3,500	4,000	0	0	8,184
4006	Acquisition of head leases	19,981		(13,000)	6,981	12,000	13,000	0	0	31,981
4007	Tottenham Hale Decentralised Energy Network (DEN)	1,814		(1,129)	685	3,129	5,000	7,000	7,500	23,314
4008	Wood Green Decentralised Energy Network (DEN)	1,614		(529)	1,085	2,529	2,500	7,500	7,500	21,114
4009	Additional Carbon Reduction Project	4,500		(4,000)	500	3,000	3,000	3,000	4,000	13,500
4010	Selby Urban Village Project	5,297		(4,100)	1,197	25,000	25,000	15,000	21,416	87,613
4011	Commercial Property Remediation	109			109	0	0	0	0	109
4993	Pride in the High Road (PITHR)	696	(696)		0	432	0	0	0	432
Economy - Growth & Employment		270,263	790	(47,606)	223,447	118,556	94,474	75,306	52,643	564,426

		2021/22 Revised Budget	2021/22 <u>(IN-YEAR)</u> Budget Virement	2021/22 <u>(FUTURE YEARS)</u> Budget	Revised Budget (after Virement)	2022/23 Budget	2023/24 Budget	2024/25 Budget	2025/26 Budget	2021/22 - 25/26 Total
SCHEME REF	SCHEME NAME	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
509	CPO - Empty Homes	8,050			8,050	1,000	1,000	0	0	10,050
512	Wholly Owned Company	5,000			5,000	0	0	0	0	5,000
Housing (GF) Homes & Communities		13,050	0	0	13,050	1,000	1,000	0	0	15,050
316	Asset Management of Council Buildings	9,222			9,222	4,331	1,381	4,000	4,000	22,934
330	Civic Centre Works	7,703			7,703	5,500	4,500	5,000	1,250	23,953
470	Wood Green HQ, Library & Customer Service Centre	7,788			7,788	6,400	7,000	6,000	0	27,188
601	Business Imp Programme	122			122	0	0	0	0	122
602	Corporate IT Board	2,796		(1,400)	1,396	1,400	0	0	0	2,796
604	Continuous Improvement	2,245	(1,000)		1,245	950	950	950	950	5,045
605	Customer Services (Digital Transformation)	471			471	0	0	0	0	471
607	Financial Management System Replacement	2,522			2,522	650	0	0	0	3,172
622	Customer First	2,101			2,101	0	0	0	0	2,101
639	Ways of Working	483			483	0	0	0	0	483
640	Accommodation Move	0			0	0	0	0	0	0
650	Connected Communities	1,258			1,258	0	0	0	0	1,258
653	Capital Support for IT Projects	784			784	450	450	450	450	2,584
698	Responsiveness Fund	2,000			2,000	0	0	0	0	2,000
699	P6 - Approved Capital Programme Contingency	3,800	(874)		2,926	0	1,250	1,250	0	5,426
Your Council		43,295	(1,874)	(1,400)	40,021	19,681	15,531	17,650	6,650	99,533
TOTAL GF CAPITAL PROGRAMME		460,441	(1,459)	(83,722)	375,260	200,973	190,263	134,067	84,290	984,853

APPENDIX 6

Virements for Cabinet Approval – all within the Council's Financial Framework

Transfers from Reserves & Contingencies - for noting

Period	Priority	Service/AD Area	Rev/ Cap	In year	Next year	Reason for budget changes	Description
4	People	Adults	Revenue	506,006		Budget Funding Allocation	Drawdown from Transformation Reserve to fund the ASC Transformation Programme

Virements for Approval (2021/22)

3	Place	Environment and Neighbourhood	Revenue	5,296,023	4,574,023	Budget Realignment	Realignment of the Parking & Highways Budget for 21/22 in line with Parking Restructure & Other Changes
3	Your Council	Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)	Revenue	15,057,920	15,057,920	Budget Realignment	Realignment of the 21-22 DSG budget to match the DfE allocation
4	Economy	Corporate Landlord	Revenue	300,000	300,000	Budget Allocation	Allocation of growth funding to cover staffing costs
4	People	Childrens	Revenue	815,000		Budget Allocation	Stonecroft childrens centre budget allocation for 2021-22.
4	People	Childrens	Revenue	2,437,100	2,437,100	Budget Allocation	Park Lane, Triangle and Woodside childrens centres budget allocations for 2021-22.
4	People	Adults	Revenue	525,390	525,390	Budget Realignment	Budget realignment to reflect Sec 75 funding being applied to respite care purchasing.
5	Your Council	Human Resources (HR)	Revenue	376,580	376,580	Budget Adjustment	Adjustments include moving the recruitment advertising budget to salaries; transferring job boards to consultant fees; transferring agency support costs to consultant fees

Total 2021/22

25,314,019

23,271,013

Proposed Capital Virements for Quarter One (2021/22)

Priority	Scheme Number	Scheme Description	Budget Adjustment (Virement) (£)	Scheme Description
People - Children's	101	Primary Sch - repairs & maintenance	1,754,092	Budget realignment
People - Children's	102	Primary Sch - mod & enhance (Inc SEN)	(1,754,092)	Budget realignment
People - Children's	123	Wood Green Youth Hub	248,000	Budget realignment
People - Children's	102	Primary Sch - mod & enhance (Inc SEN)	(248,000)	Budget realignment
People - Children's	114	Secondary Sch - mod & enhance (Inc SEN)	(968,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
People - Children's	121	Pendarren House	(1,418,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
People - Children's	199	P1 Other (inc Con't & Social care)	(125,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
People - Children's	102	Primary Sch - mod & enhance (Inc SEN)	(2,627,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
			(5,138,000)	
People - Adults	201	Aids, Adap's & Assistive Tech - Home Owners (DFG)	485,851	2021/22 DFG award budget reconciliation / realignment
People - Adults	208	Supported Living Schemes	(6,000,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
People - Adults	213	Canning Crescent Assisted Living	(2,809,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
People - Adults	214	Osborne Grove Nursing Home	(16,000,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
People - Adults	217	Burgoyne Road (Refuge Adaptations)	(2,000,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
			(26,323,149)	
Place	447	Alexandra Palace - Maintenance	858,000	Budget transfer from capital contingency - Alexander Palace & Park Emergency Capital Works
Place	323	Parking Strategy	200,000	Weight restriction cameras budget financed by Flexible capital receipt
Place	309	Local Implementation Plan(LIP)	(1,665,000)	2021/22 TfL funding adjustment/reduction based on limited funding information
Place	335	Streetspace Plan	(270,000)	Budget reduction/deletion
Place	606	Hornsey Library Refurbishment	15,553	Budget transfer from capital contingency
Place	314	Parkland Walk Bridges	(1,119,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Place	322	Finsbury Park	(1,000,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Place	652	Libraries - Re-imaging our Libraries offer for a better future	(650,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
			(3,630,447)	

Priority	Scheme Number	Scheme Description	Budget Adjustment (Virement) (£)	Scheme Description
Economy	481	Strategic Investment Pot	(800,000)	Budget transfer from scheme 481 to scheme 458
Economy	458	SIP - Northumberland PK BB & WorkSpace/Biz Support	800,000	Budget transfer to scheme 458 from scheme 481
Economy	458	SIP - Northumberland PK BB & WorkSpace/Biz Support	720,000	SIP2 Workspace and Business Support programme grant award
Economy	459	Wood Green Regen Sites	788,000	Budget realignment
Economy	478	Wood Green Good Growth Fund	226,739	Budget realignment
Economy	480	Wood Green Regen (2)	(945,762)	Budget realignment
Economy	480	Wood Green Regen (2)	(7,627,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Economy	401	Tottenham Hale Green Space	541,575	Budget realignment
Economy	402	Tottenham Hale Streets	(9,461,441)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Economy	4003	Tottenham Hale Housing Zone Funding	459,600	Budget reprofiled to future years
Economy	458	SIP - Northumberland PK BB & WorkSpace/Biz Support	(1,490,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Economy	464	Bruce Castle	(5,000,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Economy	4002	Northumberland Park estate area public realm	(500,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Economy	4006	Acquisition of head leases	(13,000,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Economy	4009	Additional Carbon Reduction Project	(4,000,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Economy	4010	Selby Urban Village Project	(4,100,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Economy	411	Tottenham Heritage Action Zone (HAZ)	260,000	Budget realignment
Economy	453	New workspace scheme at Stoneleigh Road car park	(400,000)	Budget realignment
Economy	457	Future High Street Project	6,302,000	Budget realignment
Economy	473	Enterprising Tottenham High Road (ETHR)	(726,000)	Budget realignment
Economy	474	Tottenham High Road Strategy	322,894	Budget realignment
Economy	475	Heart of Tottenham (HOT)	(600,000)	Budget realignment
Economy	488	Liveable Seven Sisters (LSS)	(1,704,000)	Budget realignment
Economy	493	Bruce Grove Yards (BGY)	(1,325,947)	Budget realignment
Economy	4005	SME Workspace Intensification	(1,432,000)	Budget realignment
Economy	465	District Energy Network (DEN)	(1,770,596)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Economy	4007	Tottenham Hale Decentralised Energy Network (DEN)	(1,129,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Economy	4008	Wood Green Decentralised Energy Network (DEN)	(529,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
Economy	4993	Pride in the High Road (PITHR)	(696,012)	Budget realignment
			(46,815,951)	

Priority	Scheme Number	Scheme Description	Budget Adjustment (Virement) (£)	Scheme Description
Your Council	699	P6 - Approved Capital Programme Contingency	80,000	Elections Polling Both Replacement
Your Council	699	P6 - Approved Capital Programme Contingency	(80,000)	Elections Polling Both Replacement
Your Council	699	P6 - Approved Capital Programme Contingency	(858,000)	Alexander Palace & Park Emergency Capital Works
Your Council	699	P6 - Approved Capital Programme Contingency	(15,553)	Budget transfer to Hornsey Library budget to mitigate overspend
Your Council	604	Continuous Improvement	(1,000,000)	Budget reduction/deletion
Your Council	602	Corporate IT Board	(1,400,000)	Budget reprofiled to future years
			(3,273,553)	
		OVERALL TOTAL =	(85,181,100)	

Write off Summary Report Quarter 1

All Council debt is considered recoverable; the Corporate Debt Recovery Team will make every necessary effort to collect charges due to the Council. However, there are some circumstances when it is appropriate to write off a debt once all forms of recovery action have been exhausted.

Council Debt is written off in line with the instructions set out within the Financial Regulations, following Court instruction or in accordance with the Limitations Act 1980.

This quarterly summarised report is for information purposes only and, the debts that have been written off for the Financial Period 1st April 2021 – 30th June 2021 (Qtr. 1) relate to delinquent accounts, where all forms of recovery action have now been fully exhausted. The sums approved for write off by the Director of Finance under his delegated authority have been adequately provided for in the Council's Bad Debt Provision.

Quarter 1 Summary: -

The table below summarises the write offs by service type, financial value and volume.

Quarter 1 Write Off, Financial Period 1st April 2021 - 30th June 2021									
Service	Council Tax	NNDR	HBOP	HRA Rent	Leaseholder	Commercial Rent	Sundry Debt	Parking	Total
Under £50k	£19,529.93	£34,273.51	£197,674.60				£309,444.02		£560,922.06
Volume	32	24	59				23		138
Over £50k									£0.00
Volume									0
Total Value									£560,922.06
Total Volume	32	24	59	0	0	0	23	0	138

The Council Wide write off for Quarter 1 relates to Council Tax, Business Rates, Housing Benefit Overpayments & Sundry Debt.

The Quarter 1 **Council Tax** write off for this period comprises of approximately 37% '*Absconded Charge Payers*', 34% '*Insolvency*' with the remaining 29% being made up of '*Petty Amounts*' and '*Deceased*'. This is a lower amount than previous financial years and is mainly due to the restrictions placed on Court proceedings from the onset of Covid.

Business Rate write offs for Quarter 1 comprises mainly of 54% '*Insolvency*' with the remaining 46% being made up of '*Absconded Charge Payers*' and '*Petty Amounts*'. Once again, this is a lower amount than previous financial years and is mainly due to the arrears team's continued work on the Business Grants.

Housing Benefit Overpayment write off for Qtr. 1 of **£197k**, this was split over four areas with the largest two being '*Deceased*' and '*Statute Barred*', although the cases in the second instance are all for low value debt.

The Quarter 1 **Sundry Debt** write offs are all for '*Deceased*' accounts, this is part of an ongoing review that the team are carrying out within the Adults Social Care accounts. This review will continue throughout the year.

All the accounts were reviewed to ensure that all methods of recovery had been exhausted.

APPENDIX 7A

Debt Write off Greater than £50,000.

All large businesses or organisations expect a certain level of income to become irrecoverable and therefore plan for some levels of write-offs. Occasionally, for a variety of reasons, debts do arise which become irrecoverable. Under Haringey's constitution debts of £50,000 or more require the approval of the Cabinet member for finance or Cabinet.

Details of the 3 debts over £50,000 presented for write off in this quarter are set out below. The Council's bad debt provisions are sufficient to cover the full value of these write-offs.

B Ltd - £79,901.03

The former lessee's & guarantors of commercial premises in the borough fell into rent arrears following a dispute over the rental amount. A number of court hearings were scheduled and postponed between 2008-2013 due to delays on the part of the owners, however possession was finally obtained in 2013, following which unsuccessful attempts were made to recover the debt, which has since become statute barred.

K Ltd - £124,185.73

The former lessee's of commercial premises in the borough fell into rent arrears and defaulted on a number of payment plans which were put in place between 2011-2016. The Council successfully obtained possession of the premises in 2019, and **£32,274.16** was recovered and paid towards the debt, however the company has now been dissolved and the Council is unable to recover any further amounts.

I Ltd - £282,000.00

In September 2016 Haringey Council granted an Opportunity Investment Fund (OIF) loan to I Ltd for the amount of £327,000.00 inclusive of interest. The company defaulted on their loan and Insolvency Practitioners were instructed, and the company went into liquidation. The Council has sought independent advice regarding potential further recovery steps, however there is now no prospect of further recovery.

APPENDIX 8

Covid 19 Grants Allocated 2021/22

Grant Name	Grant Type	£m
C19 Unringenced Grant (Local Authority Support Grant)	Emergency Funding	9.12
Contain Outbreak Management Fund (COMF)	Track & Trace / Outbreak Mgt	2.35
Local Council Tax Support Scheme	Welfare	3.61
ASC Infection Control Fund 21/22 (Round 3)	Track & Trace / Outbreak Mgt	0.31
ASC Rapid Testing Fund (2) 21/22	Track & Trace / Outbreak Mgt	0.25
C19 Unringenced Grant (Local Authority Support Grant)	Welfare	0.09
Welcome Back Fund (former RHSSF - Reopening High Streets Safely Fund)	Business Support	0.48
Business Restart Grant	Business Support	11.22
C-19 Winter Grant Tranche 3 (17 April to 20 June)	Welfare	0.23
C-19 Winter Grant Tranche 3 (21 June to 30 Sept)	Welfare	0.93
Self Isolation support Framework (March-June21)	Welfare	0.08
Self Isolation support Framework (July 21)	Welfare	0.09
Clinically Extremely Vulnerable Support Funding (CEV)	Welfare	0.33
Clinically Extremely Vulnerable Support Funding (CEV)	Welfare	0.20
		29.29

Report for: Cabinet

Title: Housing delivery Scheme at Templeton: revised costs approval

Report authorised by: Robbie Erbmann – Assistant Director Housing

Lead Officer: Peter Exton – Senior Project Manager

Ward(s) affected: Seven Sisters

**Report for Key/
Non Key Decision:** Key Decision

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1. In July 2019 Cabinet approved a total cost of £3,710,158 for the construction of eleven Council homes for Council rent at Templeton Road comprising the appointment of Kind Diamond Consortium Ltd to complete construction for a total sum of £3,050,163 and additional on-costs of £659,995.
- 1.2. This report provides an update on the projected outturn of the development and also seeks approval to increase contract sum to be paid to the contractor to £3,302,356 due to additional cost.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

- 2.1. Three years ago, the Council committed to start a new era of Council housebuilding. We are delivering on that ambitious promise. The eleven new Council homes for Council rent built at Templeton Road are the first in 40 years that Haringey Council has delivered directly. They are built to the highest standards and will be life-changing for eleven households.
- 2.2. Since this project was specified and tendered, the Council has significantly improved the control systems and project management processes used for its housing delivery programme. The final total scheme cost is in line with current cost assumptions in the HRA business plan and can be contained within the programme budget approved by cabinet in February 2021. In light of all that, and of the impact these new homes will have for their tenants, I recommend the 3% increase to the project budget as set out in this report.

3. Recommendations

That Cabinet:

- 3.1 Approve a gross increase of £252,193 in accordance with Contract Standing Order (CSO) 10.02.1 b) to a total contract sum of £3,302,356 to be paid to Kind

Diamond Consortium Ltd in respect of the Templeton Hall and Garage Site development contract.

3.2 Notes that the overall Project cost increased by a net amount of £118,866 due to savings that offset the gross sum of £252,193.

4. **Reasons for decision**

4.1. The Templeton site has been identified as a site for the direct delivery of new Council homes by Haringey Council. The scheme has been granted planning consent and is nearing completion. The contractor was appointed following a competitive tender process and is progressing well on site.

4.2 On 9 July 2019 Cabinet approved a total cost of £3,710,158 for the construction of eleven Council homes for Council rent at Templeton Road including the appointment of Kind Diamond Consortium Ltd to complete the construction for a total sum of £3,050,163 and additional on-costs of £659,995.

4.3 Since signing the build contract, it has been necessary to make a number of amendments for essential elements that had not been included in the contract. There are cost implications to a number of these amendments. The most significant single elements not included in the original contract are listed below.

4.4 The Council is legally bound to the contract as signed, and each of the amendments was for a necessary part of the construction process that had not been included in the initial contract as signed.

4.5 The cost of the amendments to the development contract can be offset against savings made on the additional on cost £659,995 and contingencies approved by Cabinet and built into the original appraisal, so that the net overall effect is an increase of £118,296, representing approximately 3.0%.

4.6 The principal increased cost changes have been:

- Basic Asset Protection Agreement with Network Rail
- S278 Highways Works
- UKPN – new electrical connection to the site
- NHBC Insurance
- Cadent Gas Main diversion on site
- LCP Framework Fee

4.7 The principal reductions in costs have been:

- Reduction in contingencies
- Reduction in fees

5. **Alternative options considered**

5.1 An alternate option of either stopping the scheme whilst an agreement was made with Network Rail, Cadent, UKPN and Highways or not agreeing to the increased costs and carrying out the works under a separate contract were explored, neither of these options were practical nor did they offer value for money.

6. **Background information**

6.1. The Templeton Road site, located in Seven Sisters ward, was granted full planning consent on 21 September 2017. It was formerly identified as an infill site to be developed by Sanctuary as a shared ownership block of eleven one and two bedroom flats but is now being delivered by the Council as Council rented homes, completion is expected by October 2021.

6.2. The project tender was a single stage selective tendering – JCT Design and Build form of Contract 2016. The tender was evaluated on 60% quality and 40% price. Based on a recommendation following the Tender the contract was awarded to Kind Diamond Consortium Ltd as their bid was the most economically advantageous compliant tender, scored the highest combined marks for price and quality and is within budget.

6.3. The contract was awarded on a fixed price basis. Nonetheless all JCT Contracts provide for additional sums to be paid where either additional Works are undertaken, and / or, delays are incurred that are beyond the control of the Contractor. In this case additional costs were incurred in agreeing costs for the Building Asset Protection Agreement with Network Rail for their adjoining land and, in addition to these costs, there were unavoidable delays amounting to 19 weeks for the which the Contractor is entitled, under the Contract, to be paid a sum equivalent to their weekly standing costs.

6.4 The costs should have formed part of the Pre – Start Appraisal that was considered by Cabinet in July 2019, the additional charges rendered by Network Rail, although not calculated in full at that time, would have been foreseeable and a Prime Cost Sum should have been included. The Contractor's costs of delay, again not calculable in full at that time, arose from the delay in completing the Agreement with Network Rail and could have been included as a Provisional Sum at that time. Subsequent negotiations between the Contractor and our Employer's Agent have somewhat mitigated those costs and reduced them. New Development Procedures provide for agreements with third parties to be completed in advance therefore eliminating the possibility of late charges being incurred on future Projects.

6.5 In new Contracts we expect the Contractor to take responsibility for S106 and S278 Costs and this was not the case at Templeton Road, however this would not have had any effect on the overall sum. It is always difficult to forecast utilities costs however in current and future projects greater provisional sums will be included.

6.6 The additional costs should have been anticipated. This scheme is one of the first to be brought forward in the housing delivery programme and since the project's inception the capacity, skills, project management resources and experience within the team has been substantially added to in order to ensure that the Council does not experience similar issues on other schemes. We have now comprehensively responded to the audit findings on our housing delivery programme to increase the level of assurance we have to ensure this does not happen again.

7. **Contribution to strategic outcomes**

7.1. The recommendations in this report will support the delivery of the Housing Priority in the new Borough plan, which sets out in its first outcome that "We will work together to deliver the new homes Haringey needs, especially new affordable homes".

7.2. In particular, the recommendations in this report will contribute to the aim "to deliver 1,000 new council homes at council rents by 2022". The proposals in this report contribute directly to the strategic outcomes on new housing supply that are at the core of the aims of the Council as expressed in the Borough Plan.

8. **Statutory comments (legal, finance, procurement, equalities),**

Legal

8.1. The Head of Legal and Governance (Monitoring Officer) has been consulted in the preparation of the report.

8.2. The value of the contract is below the threshold for works under the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 as amended ("Regulations") and the extension set out in the recommendations is outside the scope of Regulation 72 of the Regulations.

8.3. In accordance with Contract Standing Order 10.02.1(b) Cabinet have authority to approve the recommendations in the report.

8.4. The Head of Legal and Governance (Monitoring Officer) sees no legal reasons preventing Cabinet from approving the recommendations in the report.

Procurement

8.5 Strategic Procurement note the contents of this report and confirms the variation proposed is consistent with Contract Standing Order 10.02.2.1 b which requires cabinet to approve variations where the aggregated value of the Contract exceeds £500,000.

Finance

- 8.6 The report seeks cabinet approval for a net increase in total scheme cost of £118k. This is due to an increase in construction cost of £252k that is offset by savings in on-cost of £134k.
- 8.7 The revised total scheme cost is £3.8m which works out to a unit cost of £348k. This is in line with current unit cost assumption in the HRA business plan.
- 8.8 The revised total scheme cost (£3.8m) can be contained within the approved HRA new build capital programme budget approved by cabinet in February 2021.

Equalities

- 8.9 The Council has a Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not
 - Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

The three parts of the duty applies to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty.

- 8.10 This report is a Cost update following the appointment of a contractor to deliver new Council rented homes. The groups that the decision is most likely to directly affect are Haringey residents already living in Council housing and Haringey residents living in temporary accommodation and Haringey residents who are at risk of homelessness. Data held by the Council suggests that women, young people, and BAME communities are over-represented among those living in temporary accommodation. Women and BAME communities are over-represented among those living in Council housing. As such, it is reasonable to anticipate a positive impact on residents with these protected characteristics.

9. **Use of Appendices – N/A**

10. **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Title: Stroud Green Primary School - Phase 2 External Envelope and Building Services Improvement Works – Award of Construction Contract

Report

Authorised by: Ann Graham, Director Children's Services

Lead Officer: Katarzyna Sroka, Project Manager
Telephone 07855 070232
Email: katarzyna.sroka@haringey.gov.uk

Ward(s) Affected: Stroud Green

**Report for Key/
Non-Key Decision** Key

1. Describe the issue under consideration

1.1 To request approval for an award of contract to carry out Building Services Improvement and External Envelope Phase 2 works at Stroud Green Primary School, and to approve issuance of Letter of Intent.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

2.1. As the new Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Families I am delighted to bring this report to Cabinet. Stroud Green Primary School is in the first group of our Haringey primary schools to have these vital capital works. The works across the school include repairs to the roofs, windows, external walls and boundary walls. The funding for these works is in the council's capital programme and will ensure the physical environment for all the children and staff is greatly improved. This report asks Cabinet to approve the phase two programme for Stroud Green Primary.

2.2. The development of the schools' asset plan which has led to similar projects is a detailed and important document which will guide our schools' capital works programme. Drawing this together has involved council officers, heads and governors and I would like to take this opportunity to thank them all for this work which is now due to commence.

3. Recommendations

For Cabinet to:

3.1 Approve an award of contract to Contractor A of £1,498,628.48.

3.2 Approve a client construction contingency of 10% that equates to £149,862.85 which will be strictly managed under change control governance arrangements.

- 3.3 Approve the issuance of a letter of intent for up to 10% of the contract value, totalling £149,862.85.

4. Reasons for decision

- 4.1 A major review of the condition and suitability of the Children's Services estate has been undertaken which has informed the Children's Service's asset management plan (CSAMP). This identified condition and suitability deficiencies in the primary, secondary, and wider Children's Service estate that need addressing in the short, medium, and long-term. Stroud Green Primary School is high priority for major works due to issues relating to safeguarding and school closure risks.
- 4.2 In 2018 an initial brief was given to undertake the most immediate (short term) health and safety, compliance, and resilience work. These findings included fire compartmentation, fire doors and cold-water system replacement and were subject to a separate award under delegated powers.
- 4.3 In 2019 a further commission was given to further investigate and address urgent works relating to the condition of building services (i.e. heating), external envelope (i.e. roofs, windows) and boundary security.
- 4.4 A scheme for Stroud Green Primary School was developed into 2 phases. Phase 1 sought to meet the criteria for Public Sector Decarbonisation (Salix) grant funding (a grant contribution of £129,000), minimise disruption to the school by maximising access over the 2021 school summer holiday period, ensure resilience for heating and hot water and support a comprehensive phasing plan. A construction award to Mulalley & Co Ltd was supported by Cabinet on the 15th June 2021 and commenced on site in July 2021. Phase 1 works include heating distribution system upgrade, secondary glazing, loft insulation and new entrance and accessible toilet) works. Both phases of works will improve the condition of the building for better education delivery but will also improve the energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions during operation.
- 4.5 This construction award report requests a decision on the procurement of a Contractor A to undertake Phase 2 works:
- Windows and roof repairs
 - External walls repairs
 - Repairs to external stairs
 - Repairs and redecoration to brick boundary walls
 - Repairs to underground drainage

5. Alternative options considered

- 5.1 Do nothing option - a decision not to support this award of construction contract will result in the Councils failure to suitably maintain its education estate by undertaking essential condition improvements. This would increase the likelihood of reactive

works which will create greater disruption and cost to the council and potentially result in the loss of education days. All of which would undoubtedly impact on the quality of teaching and learning.

6. Background Information

- 6.1 London Borough of Haringey has sought to identify and address building condition and suitability issues across the Education/schools estate.
- 6.2 Initial condition and suitability surveys followed by comprehensive feasibility studies have evolved an extensive Children's Capital Programme which seeks to support essential condition improvements across the education estate.
- 6.3 From this data, Stroud Green Primary School was considered high priority and as a result was placed in wave 1 of the programme and is 1 of 8 primary school's sites in this initial wave of essential condition work.
- 6.4 As set out in section 4, the work at Stroud Green Primary School is divided into 2 phases – Phase 1, Building Services Improvements, new entrance remodelling and a new accessible toilet works. Phase 2 – all remaining external envelope and boundary works. This decision report is concerned with Phase 2 works.
- 6.5 This condition project will bring a number of benefits to the school and the council, with the primary objective of providing improved educational environments for Children in line with Haringey's borough plan. Along with improving educational outcomes, this project will significantly reduce the risk of a health and safety incident or school closure through condition failure such as mechanical failure or roof leaks. The project (both phases) will also help the school reduce its energy demands and thus reduce carbon emissions through technologies and insulation including double glazing. This work also benefits the Council in reducing the reactive maintenance requirements at the school in future by economically fixing the root cause of the condition issues within a single project whilst avoiding additional temporary repairs costs.
- 6.6 Phase 2 has been procured on a traditional basis (fully designed), with the works designed to Stage 4 of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Plan. The form of contract will be JCT Standard Building Contract with Quantities 2016. If for any reason phase 1 works are delayed it is possible that phases 1 and 2 will be working concurrently on site later this year, strict co-ordination and compliance with Construction Design and Management regulations will be adhered to.
- 6.7 Listed Building Consent for the scheme has been granted with conditions to be discharged during construction.
- 6.8 Building Control approval has been granted with conditions to be discharged during construction.

- 6.9 As part of the RIBA 2-4 design a number of visual and intrusive investigative surveys were completed.
- 6.10 A competitive tender for Phase 2 was issued to London Construction Programme Major Works 2019 Framework Education and Leisure Lot 2.1b North. Three tenders were received on the 11th July 2021. All tenders have been evaluated on a 40% quality and 60% price basis by an independent evaluation panel. No arithmetical errors were found during the clarification process with the outturn confirmed as:

Tenderer	Price	Price Score (60%)	Moderated Quality Score (40%)	Combined Cost and Quality Score	Final Ranking
Contractor A	£1,498,628.48	60%	32.8%	92.8%	1

- 6.11 Details of the evaluation of three tenderers' returns are set out in the Part B of this report. The assessment concludes with a recommendation to award a construction contract to Contractor A up to the value of £1,648,491.33 (tender value £1,498,628.48 plus construction risk of £149,862.85).
- 6.11 The Quantity Surveyor for this project is satisfied with the pricing offered by Contractor A against the pre-tender estimate (PTE). A detailed analysis of the tender returns against the PTE is provided within the tender analysis report and summarised in Part B.
- 6.12 The total projected cost for Phase 2 works is set out below:

	Total projected cost
Construction	£1,648,491.33
Other	£527,000.00
Total	£2,175,491.33

7. Contribution to Strategic Outcomes

- 7.1 This project proposal supports outcomes as outlined in the Borough Plan 2019-23. All projects commissioned by Officers of the Council are expected to align with this plan and will be reflected in key capital project documentation such as project briefs, design briefs, business cases, project initiation documents (PID) and award reports. The relevant Borough Outcome for this project is: **People** - our vision is a Haringey where strong families, strong networks and strong communities nurture all residents to live well and achieve their potential.
- 7.2 Stroud Green Primary School falls into wave 1 (priority 1) of the Children's Service's asset management plan (CSAMP) and is therefore procured in accordance with the priorities set out in the Children's Capital Programme.

7.3 As part of the works undertaken during the first phase at Stroud Green School energy efficiency improvements were made with a contribution from the Government Salix Programme. This has supported the Borough's carbon reduction and climate change ambition.

8. Statutory Officers comments (Chief Finance Officer, Procurement, Assistant Director of Corporate Governance, Equalities).

8.1 Finance

8.1.1 The recommendation of this report is to award a contract to Contractor A in the sum of £1,498,628.48 for the works and a construction contingency of £149,862.85 offering an award value up to £1,648,491.33.

8.1.2 In addition to this contract sum and based on the tender valued, there will be other costs in delivering the scheme. These are PM fees, design fees, QS fees, contingencies, statutory costs and sundry other costs of £0.527m. The estimated total cost of the scheme is round up to £2.176m which can be contained within the overall Children's Service approved 2021/22 capital programme.

8.1.3 The estimated outturn for the Phase 2 is set out in the table below:

	Prior years expenditure	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total
Projected Total	£0.114m	£0.700m	£1.317m	£0.045	£2.176m

8.2 Procurement

8.2.1 Strategic Procurement (SP) note that this report relates to the approval of award for Stroud Green Improvement Works (Construction Contract Award) to Contractor A.

8.2.2 SP support the recommendations in this report in accordance with Contract Standing Orders clause 7.0.1. (b) 10.01.01 (a), and 16.02.

8.2.3 In accordance with CSO 7.01(b) and Regulation 33 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015, SP confirms that tenderers were invited to Tender through the LCP Major Works 2019 Framework under Lot 2.1b North.

8.2.4 Compliant tenders were received from three contractors with further clarifications needed to achieve the final price.

8.2.5 SP note that tender returns were evaluated independently by the Quality Panel prior to release of the Price element of the Tender. Contractor A scored the highest in quality and in price, scoring 92.8% overall.

8.2.6 SP notes that as per section 8.1.1 of this report, funding is available for this Contract.

8.2.7 SP support the recommendations within this report and have no objections with awarding this Contract to Contractor A for value outlined in this report.

8.3 Legal

8.3.1 The Head of Legal and Governance (Monitoring Officer) has been consulted in the preparation of the report.

8.3.2 The contract which the report relates to has been procured under the London Construction Programme Framework Agreement (Education and Leisure lot 2.1b North £1m-£5m). The use of a Framework Agreement is compliant with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (Reg 33) and the Council's Contract Standing Orders (9.01.2 (f) (carrying out a mini-competition under a framework agreement).

8.3.3 In accordance with CSO 9.07.1d the Cabinet has authority to approve the recommendations in the report.

8.3.4 The Cabinet also has power to approve the issuance of a letter of intent up to £100,000 or 10% of the contract value, whichever is higher (see CSO 9.07.3).

8.3.5 The Head of Legal and Governance (Monitoring Officer) sees no legal reasons preventing the Cabinet from approving the recommendations in the report.

8.4 Equality

8.4.1 The Council has a Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not
- Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

The three parts of the duty applies to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status apply to the first part of the duty.

8.4.2 The proposed work aims to address the school's buildings deficiencies identified in the feasibility studies to prevent failure of the building fabric and building services, which could lead to the school closure and also to improve the building energy efficiencies.

8.4.3 The proposed decision is to award a contract for the Contractor A to undertake building improvement work on Stroud Green Primary School. This will affect roughly 320 students and members of staff.

- 8.4.4 The objective of the proposed decision is to carry out repairs to windows, roofs, external walls, external stairs, boundary walls and underground drainage. The proposed works will improve the building energy efficiencies, improve external areas and ensure that the building fabric failures will not disrupt the teaching time at Stroud Green Primary School. It is expected that this decision will lead to improved health and safety of all students and members of staff.
- 8.5.5 Phase 1 works started in summer holidays to minimise disruption to the school curriculum. However, due to the amount of work required Phase 2 works will be carried out over term time. To mitigate the disruption for students, the Contractor A will decant students into classrooms away from the building works. No negative implication of this decision are identified for those who share a protected characteristic, and it is concluded that the works will have a positive impact by improving the health and safety of Stroud Green Primary School.
- 8.5.6 As an organisation carrying out a public function on behalf of a public body, the Contractor A will be obliged to have due regard for the need to achieve the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty as stated above. Appropriate contract management arrangements will be established to ensure that the delivery of the major works does not result in any preventable or disproportionate inequality.

9 Use of Appendices

- 9.1 Appendix 1 – Part B

10 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1995

- 10.1 List of background documents:

This report contains exempt and non-exempt information. Exempt information is under the following categories (identified in amended Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972): Information relating to financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the statutory holding that information).

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: Cabinet 14 September 2021

Title: Selby Urban Village Design Team- Contract Variation

Report
Authorised by: David Joyce, Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning

Lead Officer: Azom Choudhury, Regeneration Manager

Ward(s) affected: White Hart Lane

Report for Key/
Non-key Decision: Key Decision

1. Describe the issue under consideration

1.1. In October 2019, following a competitive procurement process, the Council's Cabinet agreed to appoint Karakusevic Carsen Architects (KCA) to lead masterplan design proposals for the Selby Urban Village from RIBA Stage 0-3. In 2020 the Council and KCA entered into a contract for the design work, which included KCA working with the Council and the Selby Trust to develop design briefs for the development of:

- 200+ new homes on the Selby Centre site, 50% of which are planned for new council homes.
- Re-provision of the Selby Centre in a new fit for purpose building.
- New community sporting facilities on the adjacent Bull Lane Playing Fields.

1.2 KCA's commission has a total contract sum of £741,666. Officers are now seeking to vary this contract by the sum of [£225,855] to cover the costs associated with the programme delay caused by the impact of covid-19 and the need for KCA and the Selby Trust and Council partnership to undertake and commission additional work to support the design proposals. This additional work is related to the business case for the sport offer and long-term management arrangements, transport and additional reports required to meet the new London Plans' requirements.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

2.1 The Council is committed to partnership working and co-design so that our local communities are at the heart of decision making. We understand that it is our local partners and communities, who know the places we work and the needs of our residents the best. The Selby Urban Village project seeks to work with the Selby Trust to develop proposals for new homes, a new community centre and new sporting facilities for our residents. By agreeing to vary the existing KCA contract, the joint partnership arrangements between the Council and the Selby Trust can continue to oversee the development of the masterplan and detailed design proposals. These proposals, once further developed will be presented at a future Cabinet, along with a proposed delivery strategy.

3. Recommendations

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- 3.1 Agree to vary the existing contract with the KCA to reflect:
- a) An extended programme
 - b) Additional consultancy work
 - c) Cover the costs of undertaking additional reports that are required as part of the planning process now the new London Plan has been adopted
- 3.2 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.
- 3.3 In accordance with Contract Standing Order 10.02.1(b) approve the variation sum of £225,885 (excluding contingency), bringing the total contract value to £967,551.

4. Reasons for decision

- 4.1 The reasons for varying the existing contract are because the design programme has had to be extended to allow for further work to be completed, additional work has been and is required to inform decision making and because additional surveys are required to align to the new London Plan requirements.
- 4.2 The Selby Urban Village programme has been impacted by Covid -19 and the inability to undertake engagement with the community as programmed throughout the Spring 2020. The council is committed to a placemaking approach embracing c-design and co-production with the Selby Trust. The process has highlighted a number of areas which have required further optioneering to support the business case development and the design, notably the long-term management arrangements for the site, in particular the community sporting offer. Whilst officers and the Design Team have worked hard to minimise the impact on the programme, it is the case that the design programme has been delayed by 6 months. Further information on the additional work and programme can be found in paragraphs 6.7 and 6.11.
- 4.3 In addition, the new London Plan requires further detailed information to support a planning application, consequently, further surveys and reports need to be commissioned to support the planning application. This work includes additional transport advice and evidence to support the transport strategy, fire safety advice, land contamination surveys and the development of a business case to support the design proposals for the sport offer on the site.

5. Alternative options considered

- 5.1 Officers have considered not extending the programme and commissioning additional work. However, this would mean that the design would not properly consider the long-term management and maintenance of the Selby Urban Village. Officers consider that it is right that time is taken to fully develop and consider the design alongside the management, so we can be confident that we have a sustainable development into the long-term.
- 5.2 The Council also considered not commissioning the additional reports required to support the planning application through KCA. However, their technical consultants

are already embedded in the scheme and have the necessary knowledge and understanding required to develop the additional reports. Procuring this separately would cause further delay to the programme, given that we would need to undertake a procurement process and give consultants time to understand the detailed design proposals.

6 Background

- 6.1 The Selby Urban Village project arises from a shared aspiration between Haringey Council and the Selby Trust to deliver a community focused, mixed-use development on the Selby Centre and Bull Lane Playing Field sites.
- 6.2 The proposed development will comprise the re-provision of the Selby Centre's community hub in a new building, plus new housing of up to 200 residential homes, including Council homes (appx 50%), new sports and recreation facilities in Bull Lane Playing Fields along with new retail units. Both sites are in the ownership of Haringey Council, although Bull Lane Playing Fields is located within the administrative area of the London Borough of Enfield. Previous work explored disposal of the land and later the development of a Campus School on the Selby site and separately the delivery of 3G football pitches on Bull Lane playing fields.
- 6.3 Both the Selby Centre and Bull Lane Playing Fields sites are being treated as a whole for masterplanning purposes. Integration of the two sites would provide significant advantages in terms of space and costs but would also require careful planning as part of feasibility work, to ensure issues of accessibility to the site and between related parts of the scheme were co-ordinated. It is proposed that the Selby Centre is retained on a smaller footprint on the site, with new housing to be built alongside which will also improve the viability of the redevelopment.
- 6.4 The project is a flagship scheme for the Council and aims to be an exemplar of how the Local Authority and the Third Sector can work together using co-production to deliver against shared goals.
- 6.5 To date the following milestones have been achieved:
- Appointment of Karakusevic Carson Architects (**KCA**) in October 2019 to lead on the design and masterplan for the site.
 - Agreed a shared approach to delivering housing, sports and recreation facilities, social value and sustainability leading to **RIBA Stage 0** Sign off in Feb 2020.
 - Achieved **RIBA Stage 1** sign off of Masterplan scenarios in July 2020.
 - The project has continued to evolve during the covid-19 landscape, albeit, at a slower pace with community consultation deferred to RIBA Stage 2 owing to lockdown measures.
 - The Selby Trust produced a **Business Plan** in December 2020 to help inform the project and a longer term lease.
 - Masterplan scenarios were further developed in **RIBA Stage 2** with a preferred option having been identified.
 - **Cost and Viability** consultants are conducting viability reviews to help reduce the viability gap and are working on a **delivery strategy** for the scheme.
 - **RIBA Stage 3** is currently underway to develop and refine the preferred design option which is being informed by ongoing community engagement.

- 6.6 Both the council and the Selby Trust are committed to the collaborative redevelopment of the site to ensure this best serves the local community by providing housing, community provisions as well as space for businesses to thrive and local people to enjoy and prosper.

Programme delays and additional work

- 6.7 In 2020 the Selby Urban Village programme was impacted by Covid-19, as the planned engagement with the community was put on hold due to the country entering lockdown. As well as causing a delay to the programme, this also caused the need for additional work to revise the stakeholder engagement strategy and allow for Covid-19 secure engagement activity to take place, which added additional cost. In 2020 a sum of £68k was provisionally agreed as an additional fee required to meet costs. This provisional fee was not agreed as a formal variation to the contract.
- 6.8 The council is explicitly committed to employing a placemaking approach, which is centred around the principles of co-design and co-production. Through this process a number of areas have emerged which have required further design iterations to support the development of the designs, business plan and the overall business case.
- 6.9 A key piece of design work which required additional iterations linked to these discussions was the development of the long-term management options for community sports provision through the development of a joint sports business plan. At present the Selby Trust deliver a number of sporting activities from their site and the Council is proposing to deliver a new 3G football pitch, a new cricket pavilion and sports hall on the Bull Lane playing field. It is important to work with the Selby Trust to look at the location and management of all sporting facilities across the site, so that benefits for the community are maximised and efficiencies in management are made. To support this, KCA needed to develop a number of design options for the location of various sporting facilities to sit alongside the discussions on sport management. This really important work is ensuring that options are properly tested and explored so that access to, and management of sporting facilities provides the best for Haringey residents.
- 6.10 Another key area of co-design, which has resulted in further work with the Selby Trust and its licensees was the design of the new community building. It is critical that the building works for the licensees who provide a wide variety of services, ranging from health, job, skills and training support to providing a food bank and educational support and the service users, whilst at the same time being efficient to build and maintain.
- 6.11 The additional work has impacted the programme by 6 months and will result in an additional fee of £110,572. The additional time and design work required to develop and co-design the Selby Urban Village with the Selby Trust is critical to ensuring that this scheme, which has many benefits to the local community, is sustainable into the future.

Additional reports linked to new London Plan requirements

- 6.13 To meet the requirements of the new London Plan, a number of additional reports will need to be commissioned to support the planning application for the site, these

include further reports on tall buildings, Lifecycle Assessment/Whole Life Carbon, Fire safety and Biodiversity Net Gain assessments. Alongside this further work needs to be commissioned relating to the transport assessment and the bus gate, which Enfield wish to install on Bull Lane. The costs of these additional reports and surveys are £46,644.

Programme

6.14 The revised programme up to submitting a planning application is set out below:

Milestone	Target Date
Cabinet decision to vary KCA contract	September 2021
Extend RIBA Stage 3	October 2021
Project cost review	September – October 2021
Final Selby Business Plan	October 2021
Cabinet decision on Masterplan	Dec/Jan 2021
Submit full planning application	February/Mar 2021

7. Contribution to strategic outcomes

- 7.1 The recommendations in this report will support the delivery of the **Housing Priority** in the new Borough plan, which sets out in its first outcome that “We will work together to deliver the new homes Haringey needs, especially new affordable homes”. In particular, the recommendations in this report will contribute to the aim to deliver new council homes. The proposals in this report contribute directly to the strategic outcomes on new housing supply, that are at the core of the aims of the Council as expressed in the Borough Plan.
- 7.2 Social value principles are embedded throughout the design brief and in the aspirations of the development. Good quality community engagement is crucial to achieving good design that is inclusive and participatory. To that end, mapping out exercises to plug gaps to ‘hard to reach’ groups including BAME and religious demographics will be undertaken to ensure there is broad engagement. The masterplanning design team will lead this process aided by the Selby Trust and the Council. These fundamental aims and the re-provision of the Selby Centre in a new dedicated community hub will contribute to the **People Priority** “where strong families, strong networks and strong communities nurture all residents to live well and achieve their potential”.
- 7.3 The project seeks to support the **Place Priority** where Haringey is “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”. To that end, the delivery of high quality, accessible and affordable sports and recreational facilities on Bull Lane playing fields that achieve a range of social, health and educational benefits for Haringey’s residents will contribute to this aim. Allied to this, a key masterplan objective is to deliver new spaces which are lean, green and clean, embodying sustainable materials, reuse and recycling and principles of the circular requirement. The sites present the opportunity to be part of a decentralised energy network.
- 7.4 The proposed new Selby Centre aims to continue on the valuable work it currently does to offer workspaces and opportunities to local people and businesses which are

in turn committed to providing a social input. A key requirement of appointing the masterplanners is the commitment to working with local schools and young people to promote equality, diversity and inclusion in the built environment sector (lectures, talks, bursaries, apprenticeships, structured outreach). These are all linked to the **Economy Priority** - "A growing economy which provides opportunities for all our residents and supports our businesses to thrive".

8. Statutory Officers comments

Finance

- 8.1 On 8th October 2019, Cabinet approved the award of the contract with KCA at a total value of £741,666. The value of the variation to the KCA contract is £225,885 bringing the total contract value to £967,551. The cost of the variation can be contained within the overall budget for the scheme.

Legal

- 8.2 The Head of Legal and Governance (Monitoring Officer) has been consulted in the preparation of the report.
- 8.3 The variation of the contract is in accordance with Regulation 72(1)(c) of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.
- 8.4 In accordance with Contract Standing Order 10.02.1(b) Cabinet have authority to approve the recommendations in the report.
- 8.5 The Head of Legal and Governance (Monitoring Officer) sees no legal reasons preventing Cabinet from approving the recommendations in the report.

Procurement

- 8.6 Strategic Procurement agree this variation in accordance with Contract Standing Order 10.02.1(b) following a compliant procurement process carried out as permitted by CSO 3.0.1. (b).
- 8.7 The modification is in line with the Public contract regulations, as it does not exceed the 50% increase threshold.

Equalities

- 8.8 The Council has a Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not
 - Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

- 8.9 The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status apply to the first part of the duty.
- 8.10 Criterion 6 of the Evaluation Criteria used to appoint KCA in October 2019 as part of their original commission was on Social Value (Equality, Diversity and Inclusion). Bidders were scored against this criterion to assess their consideration and application in respect of social value and equalities matters.

9 Use of Appendices

- a. **Appendix 1 Exempt** - The exempt information is not for publication as it contains information classified as exempt under the following categories (identified in the amended Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972):

Paragraph (3) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: Cabinet – 14th September 2021

Title: Options for the future of Stapleford North Wing, Broadwater Farm Estate

Report authorised by : David Joyce, Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning

Lead Officer: David Sherrington/Sarah Lovell

Ward(s) affected: West Green Ward

Report for Key/

Non Key Decision: Key Decision

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 Between July 26th and August 26th 2021 the Council undertook a consultation with the 21 eligible households (out of 24) of the Stapleford North block on Broadwater Farm Estate to seek their views on the future of their block in the light of the Council's plans for Northolt tower and Tangmere block (see 6.1-2 below). 2 of the households contain unauthorised occupants and 1 is vacant. For secure Council tenants this consultation was a statutory s105 consultation under the 1985 Housing Act.
- 1.2 This report asks Cabinet to consider the feedback received from residents during this consultation (summarised in section six and set out in full in appendix one) and agree to include the demolition and re-provision of homes in the Stapleford North Wing block in the 'preferred design scenario' that will be presented to Broadwater Farm residents in a resident ballot in the coming months.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

- 2.1 Since the discovery of significant structural issues in a number of blocks on the Broadwater Farm estate in 2018, the Council has been working closely with the residents and the community to develop design proposals for new Council homes on the estate to replace those which will be demolished. We've made strong progress in developing these designs and extensive engagement has been undertaken with residents on the estate to feed into proposals for over 200 new council homes at council rents.
- 2.2 Through the design work it became clear that a number of residents living in the Stapleford North block (flats 25-36 and 61-72 only) would face heightened levels of disruption for an extensive period through demolition, new build works, and refurbishment works. As a Council we're committed to seeking resident's views on proposals that significantly impact their lives so through July and August we undertook a consultation with affected residents about the possible options we could progress.

- 2.3 Of the 24 homes in the block, 21 were eligible to participate in this consultation. I'm pleased to see that we received responses from all 21 of the eligible households following extensive engagement and out-reach by officers. 13 residents indicated a preference for the council to include the demolition and re-provision of homes in the up and coming ballot while 8 residents indicated a preference for existing homes to be retained and refurbished.
- 2.4 Following the conclusion of this consultation, this paper recommends that the demolition and replacement of this block is included in the proposals for new homes on the estate. As noted previously this programme is subject to a resident ballot, where all residents on the estate will get the final say on the proposals.
- 2.5 We recognise that not all residents agreed with this proposal and I am committed to ensuring the council and partners work with them to ensure they are properly supported throughout the next steps of the process. The Council's Rehousing team and the independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor will work one to one with residents to ensure they have access to the support and information necessary in the coming months, dealing with specific concerns throughout the next steps of the project.

3. Recommendations

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- 3.1 Note the feedback of the consultation from secure tenants in Stapleford North pursuant of Section 105 of the Housing Act 1985, and the non-statutory consultation with Council leaseholders of the same block, as described in paragraphs 6.3-6.16 and as set out in Appendix 1;
- 3.2 Authorise the inclusion of the demolition and re-provision of Stapleford North wing (flats 25-36 and 61-72) on Broadwater Farm in the 'preferred design scenario' and subsequent resident ballot.

4. Reasons for decision

- 4.1 The recommendations within this Cabinet report are being proposed following a consultation with residents on the future of the Stapleford North block.
- 4.2 The consultation presented residents with two main options but also gave residents the opportunity to raise further options for the Council to consider, if they felt that this was appropriate:
- 1) **Option one:** To refurbish the homes in Stapleford North and work with residents throughout the works to minimise disruption.
 - 2) **Option two:** To demolish the Stapleford North block and rehouse current residents, with a Right to Return to the estate once the new homes are built.
- 4.3 Residents were also encouraged to indicate if they felt there were any options we hadn't considered and were presented with a third potential option, for

permanent rehousing for the duration of the Northolt works. Responses to this are expanded on at 5.2 of this report and in Appendix 1 to this report.

- 4.4 The consultation has now been concluded and resident feedback has been received. Of the 21 eligible households, 21 responses were received (100%). 13 were in favour of the demolition and re-provision of Stapleford North being included in the forthcoming resident ballot and 8 were in favour of retention and refurbishment.
- 4.5 This paper recommends that proposals to demolish and re-provide new homes are included within the forthcoming ballot. The paper also considers the reasons why residents were not in favour of the approach and sets out proposals to work with residents in the coming months to address these reasons.
- 4.6 With the intended ballot on proposals for Broadwater Farm in Autumn 2021, this is a period of considerable uncertainty for residents about their future housing. Through the rehousing team and the independent advisor, officers will work with residents to ensure they understand the next steps of the process and are supported at each stage.

5. Alternative options considered

- 5.1 As mentioned above, the consultation document sent to residents presented two main options for consideration, these were: Option 1 – refurbishing homes within the Stapleford North block and working with residents throughout the period of works to minimise disruption and Option 2 – Demolishing the Stapleford North block and rehousing residents.
- 5.2 The document also explained that a further option would be for all residents of Stapleford North to be rehoused for the duration of the works and then have the option to move back into a refurbished Stapleford North block once the works were complete. This was not presented as a main option because it would require residents to move for a period of up to three and a half years, which would be disruptive and inconvenient for residents. However, the consultation document made clear that residents could ask that this, or any other option be considered by the council if they wished. Only 1 resident referred to this option, as such it is not being taken forward.

6. Background information

- 6.1 Since taking the decision to demolish the Tangmere and Northolt blocks on Broadwater Farm Estate in 2018 due to structural faults, the Council has been working in partnership with residents and wider stakeholders on designs for new homes. This design work is progressing well and public exhibitions were held in June and August to show the latest design proposals for resident feedback. This feedback is being used to further refine the designs as we work toward a resident ballot in the Autumn and construction starting on the first new homes in 2022.
- 6.2 Through the design work, it became clear that one small block on the estate, the Stapleford North block, was likely to experience very significant levels of disruption over a prolonged period due to its location. Disruption would be

caused by the demolition of Northolt (which is connected to the block via a link bridge), the subsequent new build work which will take place on land adjacent to the block as well as the structural and refurbishment works required to bring the homes up to current standards. The disruption will include noise, dust, changes to access and substantial hoarding around the block for long periods of time.

Consultation with Stapleford North residents

- 6.3 On 13th July 2021, the Council's Cabinet agreed to consult the 21 eligible households who live in the Stapleford North wing block on their preference on the future of their block (a further two properties in the block contain unauthorised occupants and one is vacant). As set out in the Cabinet report, the reasons for undertaking the consultation were to seek residents' views given the levels of disruption that they will experience if they remain in their homes due to the demolition of the Northolt tower, construction of the new homes, and refurbishment works required to the block.
- 6.4 The consultation took place between the 26th July and 26th August 2021 and for the secure council tenants living in the block the consultation was a s105 consultation under the 1985 Housing Act. The consultation was originally due to conclude on 24th August but due to a delay in posting the information online the consultation deadline was extended to August 26th. Residents were notified of this extension during the consultation.
- 6.5 In order to ensure that all residents were able to access the consultation, the following methods were used:
- A letter and information pack were sent to all households in the block. Residents were able to request this in other languages where necessary and large print and braille versions were available upon request.
 - The information was set out on the Broadwater Farm section of the Council's website and the Section 105 webpage. They were also able to complete the consultation online.
 - Residents received phone-calls and in-person visits from the Council's engagement team on three separate occasions to discuss the options and go through the questionnaire.
 - Details of the Independent Tenant and Leasehold Advisor were provided should tenants or leaseholders wish to obtain advice outside the council.
 - A reminder flyer was sent to the 21 eligible households two weeks prior to the consultation closing date, to remind them of how to respond, advertise the ITLA details and remind them of the details of the BWF engagement officer.
- 6.6 To ensure that it was easy for residents to voice their opinions in the consultation, they were able to:
- Return the questionnaire and booklet with their views using a freepost envelope that was provided to all households.
 - Voice their opinion to a dedicated email address.
 - Voice their opinion via a dedicated phone number.

- Give their feedback directly to one of our rehousing or engagement officers.

Summary of the results of the consultation and key issues raised

- 6.7 21 households (100% of eligible residents) responded to the consultation. A detailed consultation feedback report is appended in Appendix one and provides redacted detailed feedback received from residents in response to the consultation. An unredacted report (including verbatim resident comments) is provided to Cabinet as part of the exempt materials.
- 6.8 A summary of the headline responses is as follows:
- 21 residents (100%) who gave a preference
 - 8 residents (38% of responders) who preferred option one
 - 13 residents (62% of responders) who preferred option two
- 6.9 Residents were asked in the consultation whether there were any other options that the council could consider outside of the two presented. This included the option of residents moving out of the block throughout the period of demolition and construction of new build homes and given the opportunity to move back in once works were completed. One resident indicated that they may have preferred this option (however, this resident also indicated that they preferred option 2 in the consultation). This is expanded on at 6.12, below. One resident proposed the installation of a new lift for Stapleford residents.

Key themes in consultation responses

Theme	Response
The size of homes that people may move to – some residents expressed concerns about the size of the home they would move to if demolition took place.	Three secure tenants are currently living in over-crowded accommodation and welcomed the opportunity to move to a home that is more suited to their household size. The rehousing team will work with secure tenants to undertake an assessment of the housing need to ensure that homes they are eligible to bid for reflect their housing need as assessed through the Council's allocations policy.
The cost of moving home – some residents expressed a concern around the cost of moving and whether the payments offered by the council would be sufficient to cover all associated costs.	The Broadwater Farm rehousing and payments policy sets out the payments residents will be eligible for through the rehousing process. The disturbance payment will cover the costs of moving and can either be paid a flat rate or can be based on the actual costs incurred by the residents. The principle of the policy is that no

	<p>resident will be financially worse off as a result of costs associated with moving and the rehousing team will work with residents to ensure all necessary costs are covered. These costs include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of removals • Cost of mail redirection • Cost of reconnection of appliances • Cost of address changes
<p>The process of moving home – some residents expressed a concern around the process of moving home and moving away from established community links and support networks.</p>	<p>As part of the rehousing process, the rehousing team will undertake a detailed needs assessment and will work with residents to identify a new home that meets these needs. In addition, the rehousing team can support residents with the process of moving. For example, the council can support residents to make arrangements with removal firms.</p>
<p>The rent charged in homes that people may move to – some residents requested that the homes they move have the same rent as their current home.</p>	<p>Rents are based on the individual property so it is not possible to ensure that rents in a future home are the same as the existing. The rehousing team will work closely with residents to ensure that the proposed rent on a home they move to is affordable and is set out clearly before any decision to move is made.</p>
<p>Condition of current homes – some residents said that they liked their current home and did not want to move as their current home met their needs.</p>	<p>The rehousing team can work with residents to ensure that any temporary home is in a good standard of repair.</p> <p>Conversely, some residents felt their current homes were in poor condition and welcomed the opportunity to move to a new home that would be in better condition.</p>

Other responses

6.10 The Council received a response to the consultation from Defend Council Housing, arguing that residents should have been offered the opportunity to be

permanently rehoused (with a Right to Return) whilst the works took place to Stapleford North and on the Northolt site (i.e., for a number of years whilst demolition and re-building took place).

- 6.11 In the consultation materials sent to every household in Stapleford North, this option was offered as an alternative to the two main options and residents were encouraged to notify us if they wished us to consider this option more seriously. It was explained that this option was not included as one of the main two options due to the fact that:
- No resident had proposed this option during pre-consultation conversations with the residents of Stapleford North.
 - Officers and the design team felt that moving residents out for this period of time (likely three and a half years) would have been disruptive without delivering the many positive improvements that would be possible under the demolition option (i.e., residents would still be moving back to refurbished Stapleford North properties, which would not meet many of their needs due to over-crowding and other issues).
- 6.12 During the consultation, only one respondent indicated that they may have preferred this third option. This respondent also indicated that they preferred option 2 (demolition). Therefore, although this option was considered, it was discounted as there is no evidence residents wish the council to deliver it and it would not deliver many of the benefits for all residents deliverable from option 2 (demolition).
- 6.13 A full response to concerns raised by Defend Council Housing was provided by the Director for Housing, Planning and Regeneration. This can be found in full, along with the original letter from Defend Council Housing, in appendix 1 to this report.
- 6.14 Residents were also given space to make any other comments or propose any other alternative options they felt hadn't been considered by the council. Only three responses were received to this question – the responses to which are fully expanded on in Appendix 1 to this report.
- 6.15 Feedback was also received, via email, from the Residents' Association on 21st July 2021 in response to draft versions of the consultation materials. The response noted a number of concerns about the consultation, such as a belief that the council had not considered or offered all options to residents. In addition to this, the response argued that the consultation should be paused until residents could be promised more information about rent levels of new homes. As these concerns were raised before the consultation opened, officers sought to address these concerns – for example, by including a question encouraging residents to propose any alternative options and highlighting that an alternative option was available should they wish (this is explained in more detail at 5.2 of this report). The email is provided in appendix one to this report with a full council response that addresses the concerns raised.
- 6.16 Parts of appendix 1 are exempted due to the fact that some responses to the consultation made it possible to identify individuals. The full unredacted version
-

of this appendix has been provided to Cabinet members to inform their decision making.

Next steps

6.17 This report makes recommendations to Cabinet about including the demolition of Stapleford in the forthcoming resident ballot on new homes. Should Cabinet agree the recommendations in this report, the following next steps will be taken:

- A letter will be sent to each resident explaining the outcome of the Cabinet report and seeking to arrange a meeting with each household.
- The rehousing team will meet each individual household within Stapleford North to address any specific issues raised during the consultation, answer any questions they may have and explain what will happen next.
- The rehousing team will work closely with the seven residents that preferred the retention of the block, to work through and address any concerns they may have and advise them of their options.
- The demolition and re-provision of Stapleford North will be included within the preferred design scenario which will be discussed by Cabinet at its meeting in October ahead of the ballot.
- Engagement across the wider estate will be undertaken to set out the preferred design scenario ahead of the ballot.

The Ballot

6.18 Cabinet will receive a further report in October setting out the design proposals for new homes on Broadwater Farm and asking Cabinet to authorise issue of the Landlord Offer to all households on the estate. The Landlord Offer will form the basis of the ballot and residents will be asked if they support the council's proposals.

6.19 The ballot will give all eligible Broadwater Farm residents a vote on the preferred design scenario, as presented in the Landlord Offer. Stapleford North residents will be included in the ballot.

6.20 Eligible residents are those who meet the criteria set out by the Greater London Authority (GLA) and include those aged 16+ and who meet the following additional criteria:

- Social tenants (including those with secure, assured, flexible or introductory tenancies) named as a tenant on a tenancy agreement dated on or before the date the landlord offer is published.
- Resident leaseholders or freeholders who have been living in their properties as their only principle home for at least one year prior to the date the landlord offer is published and are named on the lease or freehold title for their property.
- Any resident whose principal home is on the estate and who has been on the council housing register for at least one year.

- 6.21 The ballot will be carried out under the GLA resident ballot requirement and will be administered by an independent organisation who will oversee the process for registering voters, counting votes and validating the outcome.
- 6.22 The indicative date for the ballot is November 2021.

Rehousing and Repayments Policy

- 6.23 In 2018 the Council agreed the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Repayments policy. This sets out the offer to tenants and leaseholders in affected blocks and was based on the Council's Estate Renewal and Rehousing Policy.
- 6.24 The consultation materials and July Cabinet report noted that any rehousing as a result of demolition – in the event of a 'yes' vote in the resident ballot – would be undertaken using the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy.
- 6.25 The policy was developed following an extensive consultation process with Tangmere and Northolt tenants and leaseholders. It is proposed that the terms of the offer set out in this policy would be extended to Stapleford residents if the block is to be demolished.
- 6.26 Residents would be supported by rehousing officers, who would undertake full needs assessments to determine how they can be best supported into suitable new homes. The process also makes access to the Choice Based Lettings system available for secure tenants and ensures they get priority for moves. Leaseholders would have affordable options to acquire new homes, including through access to equity loans.

7. Contribution to strategic outcomes

- 7.1. Haringey's Borough Plan 2019-2023, outcome 1: objective A to 'deliver as many new, good quality homes of all kinds as we can, in good quality neighbourhoods.'
- 7.2. Haringey's Borough Plan 2019-2023, outcome 3: objective A to 'improve the quality of Haringey's Council housing, including that a minimum of 95% of homes meet the Decent Homes Standard by 2022.'
- 7.3. Haringey's Borough Plan 2019-2023, outcome 3: objective D to 'ensure safety in housing of all tenures across the borough, responding to new regulations as they emerge.'
- 7.4. Haringey's Borough Plan 2019-2023, outcome 10: objective A to 'provide safe and accessible public spaces for everyone, especially children, young people, and people with disabilities.'
- 7.5. Objective 4 of the Haringey Housing Strategy 2017-2022 identifies that a key priority is to "Provide stable, safe well-managed homes in decent environments". Ensuring that all residents live in safe homes is essential to delivering this priority.

8. Statutory Officers comments (Chief Finance Officer (including procurement), Assistant Director of Corporate Governance, Equalities)

Finance

- 8.1 The report seeks approval to include the demolition and re-provision of Stapleford North wing (flats 25-36 and 61-72) on Broadwater Farm in the 'preferred design scenario' and subsequent resident ballot.
- 8.2 If approved, the demolition and re-provision of Stapleford North will be included in the ongoing work on BWF scheme in the HRA business and financial plan, which will be presented to cabinet.

Procurement

- 8.3 Strategic Procurement notes the contents of this report and confirms there are no procurement implications that need consideration as this stage of the process.

Legal

- 8.4 The Head of Legal & Governance has been consulted in the drafting of this report.
- 8.5 S105 of the Housing Act 1985 requires that secure tenants be consulted on these proposals; while there is (at this stage) no statutory requirement to consult with leaseholders, it is the council's practice to do so.
- 8.6 Compliance with the Council's published arrangements (the "Arrangements") for consultation with secure tenants is set out in the body of the report.
- 8.7 Before making a final decision, Cabinet must consider and take conscientious account of all representations made in accordance with the Arrangements.
- 8.8 Cabinet must also take into account the issues raised by the Equalities Impact Assessment and the comments under the head of "Equality" below.
- 8.9 The Head of Legal and Governance sees no legal reasons preventing Cabinet from approving the recommendations in the report.

Equality

- 8.10 The Council has a Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act.
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not.
 - Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

- 8.11 The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status apply to the first part of the duty.
- 8.12 An Equalities Impact Assessment is attached as an appendix to this report, which explains the potential impact on those with protected characteristics of the decision and the steps that will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts.
- 8.13 Due to the small number of residents involved in the consultation for Stapleford North, it has been determined that there is a risk of being able to identify them individually – and therefore some of this information held in the EqlA has been redacted in order to protect personal information.

9. Use of Appendices

Appendix one – Consultation Summary Report

Appendix two – Equality Impact Assessment

Appendix three – EXEMPT Consultation Summary Report

Appendix four – EXEMPT Equality Impact Assessment

Appendix five – EXEMPT Cabinet report

10. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

July Cabinet report authorising officers to begin Section 105 consultation with Stapleford North residents

Appendices 3, 4 and 5 contain exempt information. Exempt information is under the following categories (identified in amended Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972): 1. Information relating to any individual; 2. Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual; 3. Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information); 5. Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1: Broadwater Farm – Stapleford North consultation report summary

1. Introduction

Following the decision to consult with the residents of Stapleford North (flats 25-36 and 61-72) on the Broadwater Farm estate, the consultation commenced on 26th July 2021 and closed on 26th August 2021. For secure council tenants, this was a Section 105 consultation under the Housing Act 1985.

The consultation presented residents with two options:

- 1) To refurbish the homes in Stapleford North and work with residents throughout the works to minimise disruption.
- 2) To demolish the Stapleford North block and rehouse current residents, with a Right to Return to the estate once the new homes are built.

In addition to this, residents were notified that a third option would be for the block to be refurbished with a full decant for the duration of the works to the block and on the Northolt side. This option was not formally put forward due to the council taking the view that being rehoused for (up to) three and a half years for refurbishment was overly disruptive compared to the benefits to residents. Residents were also encouraged to notify us if there was an option we hadn't considered that they would like us to.

The block consists of 24-households and of these, 23 were occupied with 4 leaseholders, 17 secure council tenants, and 2 unauthorised occupants. One property was unoccupied.

2. Consultation and engagement approach

Initial Engagement

On 18th June 2021, officers wrote to the residents of Stapleford North informing them that, subject to Cabinet approval, a consultation would be taking place. This letter also set out:

- Why the consultation was taking place.
- What the two proposed options were.
- Details of the Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor (ITLA).
- Details of the Broadwater Farm Engagement Officer to contact with any questions.

Following the delivery of this letter, the rehousing team undertook outreach phone calls and door-knocking with residents during the week commencing 21st June 2021. This took place to ensure residents were able to express any concerns or ask any questions prior to the consultation opening, as officers were aware that residents would want more information than could be provided in the original letter. During this engagement, officers were able to speak to residents from 17 out of the 21 households that we wished to consult with. This early engagement also enabled officers to identify where residents had additional needs that needed to be reflected in the Equality Impact Assessment and to ensure that the consultation was accessible for all affected residents.

Cabinet approval was given on 13 July 2021 to proceed to formal consultation and the final consultation materials were drafted and approved ahead of the 26th July opening date.

Methods

A range of methods to encourage all eligible residents to take part in the consultation. This included:

- Sending a pack to each household that contained a covering letter from the lead member, the consultation booklet outlining the two options, the consultation questionnaire, and a free-post returns envelope.
- Making the consultation available online on the council's website.
- Giving residents the contact details of the Broadwater Farm engagement officer to call or email with feedback.
- Outreach door-knocking and phone calls to remind residents to participate and answer any questions.
- A reminder post-card two weeks before the closing date to re-iterate the above and remind people of the contact details for the ITLA.

To ensure all residents could equally access and participate in the consultation, the letter and each pack contained a 'translation panel' enabling residents to request the material in a different language. The packs were also available in large print and braille upon request.

3. Responses to the consultation

By 26th August 2021, the council had received responses from 21 of the 21 eligible households in the block. Of these responses, 13 were in favour of option 2 and 8 were in favour of option 1.

The number of responses is broken down below by household type:

	Secure tenants	Resident Leaseholders	Non-resident leaseholders
Number of responses	17 [81%]	2 [9.5%]	2 [9.5%]

All responses received from the 21 households were completed written questionnaires.

We also received general responses from a member of the Resident's Association and Defend Council Housing. These general responses did not respond to the consultation questionnaire set out and have both been responded to directly in other forums. These responses are expanded on at the end of this report.

Questions 1 and 2 referred to personal data.

Question 3: Please indicate which option is your preferred option

	Secure tenants	Resident Leaseholders	Non-resident leaseholders
Option 1 – retain and refurbish	6	2	0
Option 2 – demolish and replace	11	0	2

The above table shows that of the 21 responses received, secure tenants were more strongly in favour of option 2 (11 or 65% for option 2; 6 or 35% for option 1). Resident leaseholders exclusively chose option 1, whilst non-resident leaseholders exclusively chose option 2.

Question 4: Please state why you preferred this option.

Those in favour of option 1:

The below table sets out all of the reasons given for supporting option 1.

[Table redacted (unredacted in EXEMPT version of this document)]

Summary and response to comments

Happy with current property: A number of the responses note that they are happy with their current properties, community and/or neighbourhood and therefore have no desire to move. The council recognises that moving home can be a stressful experience and will work closely with residents to ensure that they can find a property that they like in an area that is good for them, wherever possible. Where residents wish to remain on the Broadwater Farm estate (e.g., in a similar property), effort will be made to enable this in one move. Where this isn't possible, residents would have the opportunity to move back to the estate when a suitable property becomes available.

Re-imbusement for improvements: One respondent noted that they had made improvements to their home in the form of decorations. Under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy, Disturbance Payments can cover 'Home improvements that have been notified and approved by the Council, less the cost of depreciation.' In this situation, rehousing officers would work with this resident to try to arrange re-imbusement for the costs of home improvements.

Demolition and construction: One respondent argued that the issues presented in the consultation are normal parts of the demolition and construction process and therefore the reasons for offering demolition does not make sense. The council firmly believes that the situation of Stapleford North is unique due to its very close proximity to Northolt and the fact that these buildings are directly connected to one another. Although the council acknowledges demolition and construction would be possible in such close proximity, the consultation made clear that the council believed residents should be aware of this and be able to make an informed decision. The reasons for considering demolition also related to the wider benefits to the whole estate. These benefits included improved placemaking opportunities, more family homes, safer and wider streets, and improved layout at the heart of the estate.

This response also argued that all residents can access their property via the Stapleford main entrance. Whilst this is true, step-free access to certain properties (i.e., via a lift) is currently provided through Northolt. This could be re-provided in the event of retention and refurbishment – it would not be suitable for the council to not re-provide this access.

Those in favour of option 2:

The below table sets out all of the reasons given for supporting option 2.

[Table redacted (unredacted in EXEMPT version of this document)]

Summary and response to comments

Overcrowding: A number of responses highlighted overcrowding as a reason for supporting option 2. Due to the Stapleford North block consisting only of 1-bedroom flats, these residents will be supported through the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy to move to

more suitable properties for their family's needs. Similarly, a number of respondents highlighted their desire to move home for other reasons.

Condition of blocks: Two respondents highlighted the poor condition of the existing blocks, with one response specifically highlighting that they do not believe improving the blocks would be good value for money. Whilst the council believes that refurbishing the block is possible and would improve its longevity, the design team highlight that there are significant additional benefits to demolition – including improved green and open space, better ground floor layout, more family homes, and new, high quality council homes. Therefore, the council agrees that demolition and re-provision offers better value for money on the whole.

Question 5: Do you think there is an option we haven't considered? If so, could you provide details below.

This question received fewer responses, with only 3 out of 21 respondents choosing to answer this question. Of those that did respond to this question, all were in favour of option 2 (demolition). The responses are in the table below:

[Table redacted (unredacted in EXEMPT version of this document)]

Summary and response to comments

Lift access: The first response proposes a lift for Stapleford North. This was already part of the proposals for option 1 (retain and refurbish), where a lift would have been built to re-provide step-free access for those who currently use the lift in Northolt. It is unclear if the respondent meant something different to this.

Rehousing: The second response refers to 'permanent rehousing' under option 1. Although this was not included in option 1, the consultation materials set out clearly that this could be possible under the retain and refurbish option if residents wished us to consider this. It is not clear whether this response wished for this option to be chosen or just wanted to highlight it.

Rents: The third response highlights an important issue about future rents. This is an issue that the council are aware of and are working hard to address. Under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy, residents would be supported by rehousing officers to find a property that was both suitable for their needs (e.g., family composition) and is affordable to live in. Residents would not be asked to move to properties that were not suitable for them.

Insofar as the response is referring to the future rents of the replacement council homes, the council does anticipate these rents to be more expensive due to the improved space standards and quality of the homes. However, they will still be secure council tenancies and work is ongoing to determine the likely rent levels of these homes so that residents have this information prior to the resident ballot. They will be calculated as social rents on the same basis as they are now and therefore any rent increases will be due to the improved quality and standards of the new homes. We anticipate that some increased cost will be offset by lower running costs and improved energy efficiency.

Question 6: Do you have any other comments you would like to make with reference to the two options?

This question received fewer responses, with only 10 out of 21 respondents choosing to answer this question. Of those that did wish to make further comments, the responses are provided in the table below:

[Table redacted (unredacted in EXEMPT version of this document)]

Summary and response to comments

Timing: The first response relates to when tenants need to be notified (this response was received from a non-resident leaseholder). If approved by Cabinet in September 2021, the demolition of Stapleford North would be included in the 'preferred design scenario' to be presented to residents in an estate wide ballot. The current programme sets out that the 'preferred design scenario' would be agreed by Cabinet in October 2021, with the ballot due to be held in November 2021. Under this timeline, the rehousing process for residents would begin in December 2021 following a 'yes' outcome in the ballot. If the ballot was a 'no' outcome, more work would need to be undertaken before rehousing would commence. Therefore, communication with all residents in this block will be ongoing throughout September-December 2021 to ensure they understand the next steps and when rehousing is likely to begin.

Rent: The rent issue raised in the second response has been addressed in the previous section, above.

Rehousing needs: The issue raised by the deaf resident is one that council officers were already aware of. Under the rehousing process (should it go ahead following the ballot), rehousing officers would work closely with this resident to ensure that their new property provided them with suitable light and conditions so as not to impede on their ability to communicate.

Cost of moving: One resident expressed a concern around the cost of moving and whether the payments offered by the council would be sufficient to cover all associated costs. The Broadwater Farm rehousing and payments policy sets out the payments residents will be eligible for through the rehousing process. The disturbance payment will cover the costs of moving and can either be paid a flat rate or can be based on the actual costs incurred by the residents. The principle of the policy is that no resident will be financially worse off as a result of costs associated with moving and the rehousing team will work with residents to ensure all necessary costs are covered. These costs include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Cost of removals
- Cost of mail redirection
- Cost of reconnection of appliances
- Cost of address changes

Leaseholder Charges: One respondent noted the impact that leaseholder charges may have on them in the event of refurbishment and retention – and noted that they felt this did not offer good value for money for them or for the council. Although refurbishment and retention is deliverable, the council also agrees that demolition and re-provision offers the best value for money in terms of benefits to residents and the wider estate and long-term investment.

Demographics of respondents.

A number of respondents did not complete or only partially completed the equalities form. Therefore, much of the data below is not complete.

Sex

Sex	Number of responses
Male	6
Female	7
No response / not known	8

Age

Age	Number of responses
Under 20	
21-30	1
31-40	1
41-50	2
51-60	3
61-70	2
71+	5
No response / not known	7

Disability

Disability	Number of responses
Yes	5
No	8
No response / not known	8

Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Number of responses
Arab	1
Asian	2
Black	7
Mixed	
Other	2
White	3
No response / not known	6

Religion

Religion	Number of responses
Christian	5
Muslim	9
No religion	1
Other	1
No response / not known	5

Other responses:

Defend Council Housing

Paul Burnham, part of the Defend Council Housing group, provided a detailed response to the consultation. David Joyce, Director of Housing, Planning and Regeneration responded to the concerns raised in detail. The original letter from Defend Council Housing is included at the end of this report. This response is re-provided below for reference:

Dear Paul,

Thank you for contacting us with your concerns about the consultation currently taking place at Stapleford North on the Broadwater Farm estate. Councillor Gordon has asked me to respond on her behalf.

I appreciate you setting these out so that I can ensure we are providing clarity and confidence for residents throughout the consultation.

Haringey council understand the importance of council housing and the security offered by council tenancies and council properties. We are passionate about building a new generation of council homes so that residents can continue to benefit from them for decades to come.

I hope that this response goes some way to re-assuring you that our interests lie with ensuring the best outcomes for our residents.

As your query covered a range of issues I have set out some information using the same headings.

(1) Withholding the Refurbishment with Decant Option

The consultation materials

Whilst I appreciate that the refurbishment with decant option was not included as one of the main two options, the council has included this option within the consultation materials and is willing and able to deliver upon this if residents wished us to do so. I believe that some of the confusion is due to the fact that the wording you quote is from a draft version of the consultation materials.

As you will note from your scanned copy of page 4, the final published version reads:

'A further option would be for all residents of Stapleford North (flats 25-36 and 61-72) to be rehoused for the duration of the works to Northolt and then have the option to move back into your homes (if you wished) once the works were complete. Stapleford North would be refurbished as under option one, below. The Council is not proposing this as an option because:

- 1. It would require residents to move for a period of up to three and a half years, which would be disruptive and inconvenient for residents. Residents could return to the refurbished homes if they wished.*
- 2. During engagement with residents, no resident has suggested to the Council that they would want this as an option.*

Nevertheless, if you would wish the Council to choose this as an option, you can say so in response to question 5 on the survey included in this pack (or indeed any other option we haven't considered).'

The intention was that this would make it clear that, while the Council is not proposing it for the reasons given, there is an option of a full decant with a right to return to refurbished homes.

However, given that the structure of the block, if simply refurbished, would remain that of a late 1960s/early 1970s system build, it is clear that demolition and rebuilding would produce

higher quality homes. Therefore, if residents were to move out for a significant period of time anyway, the council believes that it would be sensible to take the opportunity of producing the new, high quality council homes residents deserve. This is why option two is presented as a demolition option. I also believe that the numerous other benefits to the whole estate that are set out within the consultation materials would be a positive thing for all existing and future Broadwater Farm residents.

Design work has shown that residents in this block can remain in-situ for the duration of the demolition and rebuilding works taking place at Northolt. The council however wished to consult with residents due to the disruption this may cause them. We opted not to present a preferred option in this consultation, as it is important to us that residents are able to freely express their preference to us.

Because the demolition and rebuilding works would not mean that these residents have to move, the criteria within the Housing Allocations Policy according residents Band A priority for rehousing 'where Homes for Haringey (on behalf of the Council) needs to provide alternative accommodation for its tenant in order to carry out repairs or improvements to their property or where the tenant needs to be moved as part of a regeneration scheme' (see below) would not be met.

However, if the option taken is for the block to remain and for structural and refurbishment works to be done then, where the works do require people to move, they will be supported in line with council policy, including the Housing Allocations Policy when applicable.

The Housing Allocations Policy (15.14.8) states that 'for the tenant to be awarded decant priority, the Decants Panel will need to be satisfied that the work is so disruptive that it cannot be completed with the tenants remaining in occupation and either:

- The work is likely to take more than 3 months to complete; or
- The health of the tenant or a member of their household will be severely affected if they have to leave their home and then move back again at a later date.'

Where decants are necessary for repairs 'moves will usually be temporary but in some circumstances consideration will be given to permanent moves arising from a decant.' (15.14.2 of the Housing Allocations Policy).

At present, it is not believed that the structural and refurbishment works would require anyone in the block to move out for more than 3 months. This is why option one of the consultation (refurbish and retain) refers to these moves as temporary. In the additional option provided, the council have notified residents that if they wished to move for the duration of the demolition and rebuild (as opposed to temporary moves due to refurbishment) then we would be able to deliver this option. However, the council does not believe that this option provides the best outcomes for the residents in this block or for the Broadwater Farm estate as a whole.

Whilst developing more detailed designs to the structural improvements and refurbishment for Stapleford North – if this is the option chosen - it will become clearer which residents may be required to move to undertake this work and for how long. Should residents be required to move for a period of more than 3 months, they would be rehoused according to the Housing Allocations Policy. This means that they would have a Right to Return, or to remain, at their option.

It is correct that the Council seeks to comply with the judgment in *R (on the application of Moseley) v London Borough of Haringey [2014]*; for obvious reasons, both officers have this well in mind.

”... officers have been canvassing demolition options with residents without Cabinet approval

We wrote to and spoke to residents prior to the Cabinet decision on 13th July to let them know about the proposed upcoming consultation and the options that would be presented. These conversations were to ensure that residents were aware in advance of proposals in relation to their homes and prepared for the consultation, to increase participation, and ensure residents were properly supported e.g., with language or accessibility needs. Cabinet approval is not required for such engagement.

Due to the sensitivity of the issue and awareness that such consultations can be stressful for residents, we believed that it was important to ensure residents were engaged early so that they would be aware of what was happening and how they can have their opinions heard.

(2) Right of Return compromised

We are strongly committed to the Right to Return and I believe the council has been clear in the commitments made to residents. We are absolutely committed to ensuring that – should demolition be the preferred option – residents moved from the estate would have a Right to Return. This is in line with several council policies as we recognise the impact that such schemes can have on residents who undoubtedly have connections to their community and surrounding area.

The sentence quoted from page 10 of the consultation pack (‘You are likely to have to move away from Broadwater Farm, either for a number of years or on a permanent basis’) is contextualised by the repeated and clear references to the Right to Return that precede it. The immediately previous page (page 9) states that:

*‘The first new homes on the estate are expected to be completed in late 2024 or early 2025. **You can either stay in the home that you have moved to or you could return to a new property on the estate under the right to return policy**’.* (emphasis added)

The Right to Return is emphasised throughout the consultation materials and it is clear for residents that the wording to which you refer is about the residents’ choice to remain in their decant accommodation or to return. It is not about the council deciding whether they can return.

If the decision is taken to demolish the block, the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments policy will apply. This policy guarantees two Rights to Return to the estate for secure tenants (to an available Broadwater Farm home if they wish and to a new home once completed). This policy was consulted on extensively in 2018 and it offers strong guarantees to residents. Haringey Council are in agreement with Defend Council Housing about the importance of Right to Return commitments being honoured in the event of estate regeneration.

(3) Rents, and the policy commitment that no residents will be financially worse off

I recognise that all residents will be concerned about changes to rents at the new council homes. I understand the importance of this issue and we are working to ensure residents are provided with clarity on this issue before we ask them to vote for or against our proposals in the ballot.

However, I do not believe that the figures you are quoting are an accurate representation of the rents of the new homes. Similarly, I do not believe it is fair to characterise the new homes as anything other than council properties with secure council tenancies – just as the current properties are.

To be clear, the new homes will be secure council tenancies at council rents. As the consultation materials make clear, the rents of these new properties will not be exactly the same as current rents. Social rents are calculated using a government formula and the council uses this formula to set its rents. We are currently at an early design stage for new homes and work to establish future rent levels is ongoing. Crucially, initial estimates suggest they would be significantly lower than those you quote, which assumes the formula rent cap would be reached. Due to the relatively low land values on the estate, it is highly unlikely that the new rents would reach this cap.

The figures quoted also assume all existing service charges paid by BWF will be paid on new homes. The work to establish service charges is not yet complete and so the figures quoted are unlikely to be correct. Further to this, the new homes will be more energy efficient and hence cheaper to run. This will help to offset any change in rent.

The commitment to residents not being financially worse off, contained within the Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy (ERRPP), and re-iterated in the consultation materials, is expanded upon within both the ERRPP and the consultation materials. The ERRPP states that:

- 1) 'Haringey Council is also committed to ensuring that no resident should be financially worse off as a result of the renewal scheme. But this does not necessarily mean that every tenant, leaseholder and freeholder will pay exactly the same housing costs after the move as they did before the move' (pages 8-9).
- 2) 'This means that rents will change for some tenants, particularly if they move to larger or smaller homes, or change landlords, as a result of the renewal scheme' (page 9).
- 3) 'The commitment that no tenant will be financially worse off as a result of the renewal scheme is deemed as being met by ensuring that a home is available on the scheme at an equivalent rent, and by the payment of the Home Loss and Disturbance payments to cover tenants' costs. The commitment to ensuring that the new home is at an equivalent rent means that the rent for the new property will be calculated on the same basis as their current rent. Where a tenant is on a social rent, this means that the new rent will also be a social rent, calculated according to the rent policies of the new landlord, not for example an "Affordable Rent" at up to 80% of market rents' (page 9).

The consultation materials state that:

- 1) 'No tenant or leaseholder will be financially worse off. This means that you will be supported with Home Loss and Disturbance Payments. The rent of the new Council homes will be calculated on the same basis as your current rent. It does not mean that your rent will be exactly the same as it is now' (page 7).
- 2) 'If you are a secure tenant and you move to another council home, your rent will still be a council rent but may be different to the rent you're currently paying. Any changes to your future rent or service charges will be discussed with you in detail as part of the rehousing process' (page 10).

I believe that these quotes from both documents emphasise and clarify the fact that the rents of the new council homes will not be exactly the same as the rents on the estate currently.

I recognise that residents deserve clarity on this issue before being asked to support our proposals and we will ensure that residents get this. Full details on the proposed rents will be included in the landlord offer so that existing residents of Broadwater Farm, and those who have been moved from Northolt and Tangmere, will have clear information about the proposed rents for new homes.

If the decision is taken to demolish Stapleford North, rehousing officers will work closely with residents to ensure that the new homes they move to are affordable for them. Residents would also be supported through this move with a number of payments, including disturbance payments, as set out in the consultation materials and Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy.

(4) Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor (ITLA)

In advance of the consultation, on 18th June 2021, residents in Stapleford North received a letter which gave them more information about why the council is undertaking this consultation and letting them know how to get involved; the letter also provided details of the Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor (ITLA), who can give residents impartial information and advice about the consultation and the options.

The covering letter to the consultation materials should have repeated this information. It was an error that this was not included.

A further letter has now been sent to the residents on re-iterating that an ITLA is available and letting them know their contact details - which are as follows:

- Pam Kovachich, Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor: PPCR Associates, pkovachich@ppcr.org.uk 020 7199 0901 or 07966 595 527.

(5) S105 Consultation materials not made publicly available

On 28th July 2021, the consultation materials and information were posted on Haringey's website [here](#) and linked to the full booklet and questionnaire [here](#). I recognise that these should have gone live at the same time as the launch of the consultation, on 26th July 2021.

The information can now also be found [here](#), on the council's Section 105 area of the website.

Due to the two-day delay in this information being made public, the council will be extending the consultation until Thursday 26th August 2021. I apologise for the error and we will work hard to ensure all residents are given enough opportunity to respond to the consultation.

Delegated authority

In respect of the required delegations we believe we have worked within Council policy and the terms of the delegated authority.

Conclusion

I am grateful that you have written to me and I hope the above addresses the concerns you have raised. We believe strongly that our proposals will make the Broadwater Farm estate a better place to live for generations to come – improving safety and security, providing more council homes, delivering more family homes, creating opportunities for local people, and introducing new services and amenities that will benefit all residents. I believe these are ambitions that we can all support in the future.

The Resident's Association

On 21st July 2021, an email was sent to David Sherrington, Director of Broadwater Farm, from a member of the Broadwater Farm Resident's Association. The letter sets out a number of concerns with the consultation. It has been re-produced in full at the bottom of this report, with the council's responses to the issues raised provided here:

Response: It is important to note that the email was received in response to the Resident's Association reviewing the draft version of the consultation materials (5 days before the consultation opened). Therefore, some of the comments do not relate to the material in the final form that was provided to residents in Stapleford North.

In response to the first point, it is important to note that in the final version of the consultation materials a permanent move for the duration of the refurbishment, demolition of Northolt, and building of new homes was possible. Residents were encouraged to note if they wished this option to be considered. Only one resident did so, which has been expanded on earlier in this report. Where the consultation materials referenced a temporary move for refurbishment, this was presumed to be a move shorter than 3 months – which under the Housing Allocations Policy does not require permanent rehousing. Were households required to move for longer, this would have been done in accordance with the Housing Allocations Policy.

The reference to no tenant or leaseholder being financially worse off refers to the provisions set out in the Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy (ERRPP). This provision refers to the costs of moving home. In the final consultation materials provided to Stapleford North residents, this was made clear with some additional text: 'No tenant or leaseholder will be financially worse off. This means that you will be supported with Home Loss and Disturbance Payments. The rent of the new Council homes will be calculated on the same basis as your current rent. It does not mean that your rent will be exactly the same as it is now' (page 7 of the consultation materials). This language made it clear that we were not promising rents would be the same as they are now.

We did not agree with the request to delay or postpone the consultation and felt that it was carried out in a fair and transparent way that gave residents real choice over their future options.

Other responses to the consultation in full

Paul Burnham letter on behalf of Defend Council Housing

Haringey Council is refusing to move people facing excessive noise and disturbance at Broadwater Farm: unless they agree to the demolition of their homes in a consultation which starts on Monday 26 July 2021.

Paul Burnham of Haringey Defend Council Housing says, **“The Council is bullying residents to accept demolition if they want a peaceful life. The consultation options are not fair choices, and they need to add the third option of the block being repaired while residents are temporarily re-located during the works period.”**

In 2018, Haringey Council agreed to demolish two blocks at Broadwater Farm for safety reasons. On 13 July 2021 the Council’s Cabinet agreed to consult residents on the additional demolition of the 24 homes at Stapleford North.

The reason given by the Council for proposing demolition at Stapleford North is that residents ‘face heightened levels of disruption for an extensive period through demolition [of the neighbouring Northolt block], new build works and refurbishment works’. At the Cabinet meeting Cllr Ruth Gordon, Cabinet Member for House Building, Placemaking and Development, said that Stapleford North **“is going to be right in middle of an area that is going to be full of dust and construction works for a very long period of time”**.

The consultation will offer residents just two options:

- Remain in their homes throughout the duration of the works and while the block is refurbished.
- Agree that the block should be demolished and replaced with new council owned homes.

This is in breach of good practice, and of the council's own policy, because in cases of excessive disturbance from works, a temporary move away should be offered, often with options of a right to remain in the new property, or to return to the existing property once it has been refurbished (yes, a choice for residents!). This is known as a 'decant'; and as treating people with fairness, decency and respect.

The Council's Housing Allocations Policy says: 'Decants occur when a Decants Panel has decided that a transfer to alternative accommodation offers the best way of ensuring that essential repairs and redevelopment take place without causing huge disruption or hardship to the tenants'.

Also, the Council is not telling the tenants that rents for the new homes after demolition would have rents 87% higher than at present (rent increases of £69.32 per week), and total rent including service charges of £183.57 pw instead of £114.25 pw at present. What will happen if people cannot afford these big rent increases?

This is all part of a pattern. At Stapleford North, you must agree to demolition, otherwise we will make your life a misery for years. All Broadwater Farm residents must vote for the redevelopment plan this Autumn, otherwise the external decorations (including communal areas inside the blocks) will never be done. They are supposed to be done once every five years, but were last done 17 years ago; and much of the estate looks terrible because of landlord neglect."

Increasing rents by demolition is part of a strategy of forced gentrification and social cleansing, but tenants and residents will continue to resist.

When we knocked on doors to talk to people at Stapleford North on Saturday, there was plenty of support for 'no demolitions and no rent increases'. Meanwhile the Council must comply with its Decant policy, advise tenants on the real amounts of future rents, and abandon the flawed consultation at Stapleford North, which begins on Monday 26 July.

The Resident's Association

On 21st July 2021, an email was sent to David Sherrington, Director of Broadwater Farm, from a member of the Broadwater Farm Resident's Association. It has been re-produced in full below:

Dear David

The consultation is misleading. We are talking here about moving people because they cannot stay in their home when work is being carried out due to noise and disruption which is a decant. You state that the only options if the block is not demolished are for residents to stay while the work is being done or going for a very long term 'temporary' move and coming back when all the noise of demolition and building the new homes is finished (2 years or so until the new homes are built as far as I can tell). As you know, if a decant is going to be for a long period, i.e. a year or more, then under HfH policy the person being decanted can be given a permanent home somewhere else. When their property is ready to be occupied again it could be let to another tenant. This would avoid the need for replacing Stapleford

North with higher cost homes at 'New Homes Rent' which it may not be possible to rent to the lowest income households due to the benefit cap. Why are the existing residents not being consulted on this option?

Also, in the 'Option two Demolish Stapleford North' section you state:

'No tenant or leaseholder will be financially worse off.

All tenants and resident leaseholders will have a right to return (if they wish to do so).'

This is misleading. It implies the tenants won't be financially worse off they come back to one of the new homes. They will be worse off if it is at 'New Homes Rent' and you have no guarantee it won't be. Also, tenants may end up being signed up for one of the other homes around Haringey being built at New Homes Rent. This already happened to at least one Love Lane decantee who ended up massively worse off.

You must put the consultation on hold until it is rewritten with an honest choice of options and cast-iron guarantees over rent that have been signed off by the financial officers responsible for this. These guarantees must be put in front of the Council, agreed and included in publicly available minutes.

Yours sincerely

XXX

(Broadwater Farm Residents' Association)

This page is intentionally left blank

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The **Equality Act 2010** places a '**General Duty**' on all public bodies to have '**due regard**' to the need to:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act;
- Advancing equality of opportunity between those with a 'relevant protected characteristic' and those without one;
- Fostering good relations between those with a 'relevant protected characteristic' and those without one.

In addition the Council complies with the Marriage (same sex couples) Act 2013.

Stage 1 – Screening

Please complete the equalities screening form. If screening identifies that your proposal is likely to impact on protect characteristics, please proceed to stage 2 and complete a full Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA).

Stage 2 – Full Equality Impact Assessment

An EqIA provides evidence for meeting the Council's commitment to equality and the responsibilities under the Public Sector Equality Duty.

When an EqIA has been undertaken, it should be submitted as an attachment/appendix to the final decision making report. This is so the decision maker (e.g. Cabinet, Committee, senior leader) can use the EqIA to help inform their final decision. The EqIA once submitted will become a public document, published alongside the minutes and record of the decision.

Please read the Council's Equality Impact Assessment Guidance before beginning the EqIA process.

1. Responsibility for the Equality Impact Assessment	
Name of proposal	Stapleford North consultation
Service area	Housing, Regeneration and Planning
Officer completing assessment	Sarah Lovell
Equalities/ HR Advisor	Ed Ashcroft
Cabinet meeting date (if applicable)	14 th September 2021
Director/Assistant Director	David Joyce

2. Summary of the proposal

Please outline in no more than 3 paragraphs

- The proposal which is being assessed*
- The key stakeholders who may be affected by the policy or proposal*
- The decision-making route being taken*

This EqIA was originally used to inform a consultation with residents and has now been updated to inform a final decision recommended for Cabinet in September 2021.

Background:

In 2018, the decision was taken to demolish the Tangmere and Northolt blocks on Broadwater Farm Estate in North Tottenham due to structural faults. Since then, the Council has been working in partnership with residents and wider stakeholders on designs for new homes. It has become apparent that one small block on the estate, the Stapleford North block, is likely to experience very significant levels of disruption over a prolonged period due to its location.

Cabinet approved a consultation in July 2021 with residents in the 24 1-bedroom properties in Stapleford North wing block on Broadwater Farm about the future of their block. The residents were presented with two options:

- Option 1 – Refurbishment of the block. In this option the Stapleford North block would have the strengthening and refurbishment works completed to it. The majority of the 24 residents would be able to stay in situ, however residents were informed that it is likely to be necessary to temporarily relocate some of the households on the edge of the blocks whilst this work is completed.
- Option 2 – In this option the Stapleford North block would be demolished and new homes would be built. Residents would be rehoused under the existing Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy, which gives residents the right-to return to new homes on the estate once they have been completed.

Consultation & decision-making path:

The consultation ran from 26th July 2021 to 26th August 2021. The council put in place a series of measures to ensure that all of the affected residents were able to participate fully in the consultation. This is so that all residents, regardless of their background, first language, or individual needs, were able to understand and respond to the consultation and receive all of the information and support that they need. Measures included extensive 1-1 engagement with the residents of the affected properties. This included several attempts to knock on doors and call each resident. It also included making sure translations, accessible versions, and independent support was available.

A majority of respondents chose option 2 (13 compared to 8 for option 1). A report is being considered by Cabinet on 14th September 2021 recommending for the demolition of Stapleford North to be included in the 'preferred design scenario' which residents will be asked to vote on in an estate wide ballot. The demolition is not confirmed to happen until the ballot has taken place with a majority of residents voting 'yes' to the proposals. This ballot is scheduled to take place in November 2021. Given that Cabinet are being asked to approve option 2 being included in the 'preferred design scenario', this updated EqIA only considers the impact of option 2 (demolition and replacement homes).

Equalities Impact and Mitigations

It was originally believed that the block contained 19 secure Council tenants, 4 leaseholders, and 1 tenant in temporary accommodation. Upon beginning the consultation, officers became aware that the block actually consisted of 17 secure tenants, 4 leaseholders, 2 unauthorised occupants, and 1 vacant property. The residents in this block are disproportionately from older age groups, BAME backgrounds, and lower socio-economic households.

Should option 2 be approved by Cabinet and residents, all residents in this block would face short-term disruption but would be positively impacted in the long-term as they would be living in safer properties. Specific mitigations, set out in this EqIA, will be put in place to mitigate the potential negative impacts on those with protected characteristics.

3. What data will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on protected groups of service users and/or staff?

Identify the main sources of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, that supports your analysis. Please include any gaps and how you will address these

This could include, for example, data on the Council's workforce, equalities profile of service users, recent surveys, research, results of relevant consultations, Haringey Borough Profile, Haringey Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and any other sources of relevant information, local, regional or national. For restructures, please complete the restructure EqIA which is available on the HR pages.

Protected group	Service users	Staff
Sex	Homes for Haringey resident data	This proposal does not affect staff.
Gender Reassignment	Homes for Haringey resident data	
Age	Homes for Haringey resident data	
Disability	Homes for Haringey resident data	
Race & Ethnicity	Homes for Haringey resident data	
Sexual Orientation	Homes for Haringey resident data	
Religion or Belief (or No Belief)		

	Homes for Haringey resident data	
Pregnancy & Maternity	Homes for Haringey resident data	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	Homes for Haringey resident data	

Outline the key findings of your data analysis. Which groups are disproportionately affected by the proposal? How does this compare with the impact on wider service users and/or the borough's demographic profile? Have any inequalities been identified?

Explain how you will overcome this within the proposal.

Further information on how to do data analysis can be found in the guidance.

This decision impacts 24 households. Housing officers were familiar with and have previously engaged extensively with the residents in this block. From this, we have identified that a number of these households contain individuals with protected characteristics. Two of the households have unauthorised occupants, one is unoccupied, and a further resident was unreachable despite multiple attempts. Therefore, the data presented below does not always add up to 24.

Data analysis:

- **[Redaction (included in the EXEMPT version of the report)]**

As the above demonstrates, residents in this block are disproportionately (compared to borough averages) from older age groups, BAME backgrounds, and lower socio-economic households. These individuals will be negatively impacted in some ways by the decision to recommend the demolition of this block, as this will cause short-term disruption to their lives due to needing to be rehoused. However, the following mitigations would be put in place which would help to deliver long-term benefits:

- More suitable sized properties for those over-crowded due to the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy.
- Financial and logistical support offered by the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy.
- The two Right's to Return offered under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy – meaning all of the residents (except unauthorised occupants and non-resident leaseholders) can return to the estate and benefit from a new, high quality council home that meets their needs.
- Residents moving to safer council homes that meet their needs under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy.

4. a) How will consultation and/or engagement inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on protected groups of residents, service users and/or staff?

Please outline which groups you may target and how you will have targeted them

Further information on consultation is contained within accompanying EqlA guidance

The feedback received in this consultation has been considered fully and presented back to Cabinet with a recommended course of action to include option 2 in the 'preferred design scenario' for Broadwater Farm. The results of the consultation have informed the recommendation made to Cabinet, with the majority of respondents opting for option 2.

Several residents (who supported either option) have raised concerns which this EqlA and our future support for and work with residents will aim to address.

To enable all residents to participate in this consultation, some key actions took place:

- All materials to residents contained a translation panel for residents to inform us if they need to receive this in a different language or accessible format (e.g., braille or large print). A translator was also made available upon request.
- Door-knocking took place on three separate occasions to ensure all residents were aware of the information and had a chance to ask Council staff questions about the consultation.
- Follow up phone calls took place to check in on any residents that were unreachable at the door.
- Multiple options for responding to the consultation were given, including over the phone, online, attending a drop-in session, or completing and returning a consultation booklet.
- The information was set out on the Broadwater Farm section of the Council's website.
- A reminder leaflet was sent to all households 2 weeks before the end of the consultation, reminding them of how to get involved and giving them contact details for our engagement officer and the Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor.

4. b) Outline the key findings of your consultation / engagement activities once completed, particularly in terms of how this relates to groups that share the protected characteristics

Explain how will the consultation's findings will shape and inform your proposal and the decision making process, and any modifications made?

The consultation closed on 26th August 2021. We received 21 responses from the 24 households. Of these 21 responses, 8 chose option 1 (refurbish and retain) and 13 chose option 2 (demolish and replace). A full summary of the responses to the consultation is included as an appendix to the Cabinet report. As a majority of responses opted for option 2, the Cabinet report recommends that this option is included in the 'preferred design scenario' to be presented to residents in an estate wide ballot.

Residents gave varying reasons for opting for option 2, these included concerns around disruption whilst work is ongoing as well as a desire to move to new and more suitable accommodation. Concerns identified with current accommodation included poor condition, size, and overcrowding. The council has a number of measures in place to respond to these concerns under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy

– this includes access to the Choice Based Lettings system to enable residents to find the most suitable and appropriate housing for them and individual needs assessments to ensure residents needs are identified and prioritised.

Some residents, however, supported option 1 including citing the length of time they had been in their current property, recent moves, expenditure on their current property, and a desire to remain in place. Concerns were also raised about the disruption that would be caused by demolition. The council recognises that moving can be difficult for residents, particularly when they have long-term ties to an area or community. Under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy residents will be helped to find properties in the local area wherever possible (should they wish to). Further to this, the two Right's to Return under the policy ensures that residents will have a chance to return to the Broadwater Farm estate prior to the new homes being built (if they wish) when a suitable property on the estate becomes available. This will not compromise their ability to get one of the new homes once they have been built. The financial support offered under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy is intended to ensure residents are not financially worse off as a result of moving, through the provision of disturbance payments and home loss payments.

A concern was also raised about the potential impact on rent levels. Work is being undertaken to give all residents clarity about future rents on the estate ahead of the ballot, which will allow residents to make an informed decision on the future of their estate.

[Redaction (included in the EXEMPT version of the report)]. This response was from a resident who preferred option 1. As the Cabinet report recommends option 2, this concern can be mitigated when supporting the resident with their move to a new home – ensuring that it is a suitable property for their needs. Should residents support the proposals in the ballot, rehousing officers will work closely with this resident to ensure their concerns can be addressed appropriately.

5. What is the likely impact of the proposal on groups of service users and/or staff that share the protected characteristics?

Please explain the likely differential impact on each of the 9 equality strands, whether positive or negative. Where it is anticipated there will be no impact from the proposal, please outline the evidence that supports this conclusion.

Further information on assessing impact on different groups is contained within accompanying EqIA guidance

1. Sex (Please outline a summary of the impact the proposal will have on this protected characteristic and cross the box below on your assessment of the overall impact of this proposal on this protected characteristic)

Positive	X	Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	---	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

The data suggests that there is a fairly even split of males and females in the affected block – in line with the borough population.

There is no reason to believe that there would be specific negative impact on anyone due to this protected characteristic as a result of the preferred option.

However, it is noted that residents with children and lone parents (who are disproportionately likely to be women) may face particular disruption. The Council recognises that moving home will be more disruptive to households with children, who may have to make alternative arrangements for schooling. These changes are more likely to affect single mothers who may have support networks in place in the local area, benefit from local facilities aimed at single parent households, and benefit from proximity to work arrangements.

Under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy, those with children in a local school will be given priority to remain in the local area should they wish to do so. Further to this, they would be positively impacted by the two rights to return that are guaranteed within this policy.

[Redaction (included in the EXEMPT version of the report)].

Leaseholders would be positively impacted with the provision for equity loans and the leaseholder right to return contained within this policy.

2. Gender reassignment *(Please outline a summary of the impact the proposal will have on this protected characteristic and cross the box below on your assessment of the overall impact of this proposal on this protected characteristic)*

Positive		Negative		Neutral impact	X	Unknown Impact	X
----------	--	----------	--	----------------	---	----------------	---

The Council does not hold specific data on residents regarding this protected characteristic. Individual engagement throughout the consultation has not identified any of the residents in this block with this protected characteristic.

The Council recognises that re-housing can be a challenge for someone with this protected characteristic, due to the need to access specific healthcare and support networks. The Council will continue to work with residents of this block to ensure that specific impacts based on this protected characteristic were mitigated, in the event that this is identified at a later date.

Under the proposed option, the Council recognises that being rehoused could have negative impacts on those with this protected characteristic if they have support or healthcare needs in the local area. These residents would be supported to find a suitable property in the local area where possible.

Under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy they would be positively impacted by the two rights to return that are guaranteed within this policy.

Leaseholders would be positively impacted with the provision for equity loans and the leaseholder right to return contained within this policy.

3. Age *(Please outline a summary of the impact the proposal will have on this protected characteristic and cross the box below on your assessment of the overall impact of this proposal on this protected characteristic)*

Positive	X	Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	---	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

The age profile in the block is considerably older than the age profile across the borough. The decision taken as a result of this consultation will therefore have a disproportionate impact on older residents.

Elderly residents

Where elderly or vulnerable residents are to be rehoused under option 2, the Council recognise that this may more significantly impact them due to the higher prevalence of physical disabilities and mental health difficulties amongst the older population (compared to the general population). Dedicated support would be offered to impacted residents – such as financial and practical support throughout the rehousing process.

The Council recognises that being rehoused could have negative impacts on those with this protected characteristic if they have support or healthcare needs in the local area. These residents would be supported to find a suitable property in the local area where possible. This would include carrying out occupational therapy assessments to determine if any specialist adaptations or equipment would be required in the new property – which the Council would pay for.

Young children

Where there are young children in this block, the Council recognises that the impact of rehousing on them could be negative. All effort would be made to work closely with residents to ensure that those with children are prioritised for moves in the local area, so that they do not need to move schools wherever possible.

Where young children are present on the site, they would be negatively impacted in the short term if it was necessary for them to move schools as a result of rehousing. Under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy, those with young children would be prioritised for housing in the local area, and housing officers would work closely with these residents to help them find the most suitable housing option. This should mitigate this concern, by helping these residents remain at the same school wherever possible.

Under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy they would be positively impacted by the two rights to return that are guaranteed within this policy.

Leaseholders would be positively impacted with the provision for equity loans and the leaseholder right to return contained within this policy.

4. Disability *(Please outline a summary of the impact the proposal will have on this protected characteristic and cross the box below on your assessment of the overall impact of this proposal on this protected characteristic)*

Positive	X	Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	---	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

[Redaction (included in the EXEMPT version of the report)].

Under the proposed option, the Council recognises that being rehoused could have negative impacts on those with this protected characteristic if they have support or healthcare needs in the local area. These residents would be supported to find a suitable property in the local area where possible. This would include carrying out occupational therapy assessments to determine if any specialist adaptations or equipment would be required in the new property – which the Council would pay for.

Under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy they would be positively impacted by the two rights to return that are guaranteed within this policy. The new homes would be more accessible and be more friendly to those with disabilities, positively impacting those with this protected characteristic.

Leaseholders would be positively impacted with the provision for equity loans and the leaseholder right to return contained within this policy.

Further to this, all residents would be positively impacted by moving into safer properties and many residents would benefit from moving to properties that are more suitable for their needs.

5. Race and ethnicity *(Please outline a summary of the impact the proposal will have on this protected characteristic and cross the box below on your assessment of the overall impact of this proposal on this protected characteristic)*

Positive	X	Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	---	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

The Council is aware that those living in this block are more likely to be from BAME backgrounds than the general or borough populations. Therefore, there will be a disproportionate impact on those with this protected characteristic. The Council recognises that for BAME people there may be specific cultural ties, such as businesses locally that cater specific cultural needs of residents of a particular race or ethnicity.

As a result of their over-representation in the impacted group, residents from a BAME background would be disproportionately impacted by the disruption caused from needing to be rehoused under option 2. The residents would receive dedicated support to ensure that they were able to prepare for and be supported through these moves. The Council recognises that being rehoused could have negative impacts on those with this protected characteristic if they have support or cultural ties in the local area. These

residents would be supported to find a suitable property in the local area where possible under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy.

Under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy they would be positively impacted by the two rights to return that are guaranteed within this policy. They will also be positively impacted by the financial and logistical support they will receive under the rehousing policy, which aims to make sure no resident is financially worse off as a result of rehousing.

Leaseholders would be positively impacted with the provision for equity loans and the leaseholder right to return contained within this policy.

All residents would be positively impacted by the higher quality of the new homes and the fact that they would no longer be living in structurally unsound blocks.

6. Sexual orientation *(Please outline a summary of the impact the proposal will have on this protected characteristic and cross the box below on your assessment of the overall impact of this proposal on this protected characteristic)*

Positive		Negative		Neutral impact	X	Unknown Impact	X
----------	--	----------	--	----------------	---	----------------	---

The Council and Homes for Haringey do not collect this data on residents and where the data is collected, it is frequently under-reported. **[Redaction (included in the EXEMPT version of the report)]**.

Should option 2 be approved, it is not believed that the disruption caused by rehousing would disproportionately impact affected residents based on this protected characteristic. Secure tenants and leaseholders would be positively impacted by the rights to return guaranteed by the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy and by the improved safety and quality of their new homes.

7. Religion or belief (or no belief) *(Please outline a summary of the impact the proposal will have on this protected characteristic and cross the box below on your assessment of the overall impact of this proposal on this protected characteristic)*

Positive	Y	Negative	Y	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	---	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

The Council and Homes for Haringey do not collect this data on residents and where the data is collected, it is frequently under-reported. **[Redaction (included in the EXEMPT version of the report)]**.

There may be a greater impact on those who go to a specific place of worship or are part of a religious community. Where possible, the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy aims to give residents choice about their move to a new home and therefore should help these residents ensure they have access to places of worship or their religious community.

Secure tenants and leaseholders would be positively impacted by the rights to return guaranteed by the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy and by the

improved safety and quality of their new homes. This Right to Return will ensure that, should residents wish, they can return to the estate and therefore be close to the religious institutions or communities that they currently belong to.

The effects of being required to move will, in part, be offset by support being given to each household, including financial help with the costs of moving. They would also receive support from housing officers to find suitable properties in the local area where possible.

8. Pregnancy and maternity *(Please outline a summary of the impact the proposal will have on this protected characteristic and cross the box below on your assessment of the overall impact of this proposal on this protected characteristic)*

Positive	X	Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	---	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

The council does not hold data on pregnancy and maternity among its tenants and leaseholders. **[Redaction (included in the EXEMPT version of the report)].**

The disruption caused by option 2 will need to be mitigated through dedicated support for any resident who presents with this protected characteristic during the rehousing process (should residents vote 'yes' in the ballot).

The Council recognises that residents with this protected characteristic would be negatively impacted by the process of rehousing. Housing officers would work closely with residents in this case to ensure that they were supported to find suitable properties, such as in the local area to continue accessing healthcare and support networks. However, these residents would be positively impacted by the rehousing policy as this would allow them to move to a more suitable sized property for their household (the Stapleford North properties are all 1-bedroom). The council have already identified several residents who would benefit as a result of this.

Leaseholders would be supported through equity loans that would help them purchase a suitable property in the right area for them, under the provisions set out in the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy.

Secure tenants and leaseholders would be positively impacted by the rights to return guaranteed by the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy and by the improved safety and quality of their new homes.

9. Marriage and Civil Partnership *(Consideration is only needed to ensure there is no discrimination between people in a marriage and people in a civil partnership)*

Positive		Negative		Neutral impact	Y	Unknown Impact	
----------	--	----------	--	----------------	---	----------------	--

People who are in a civil partnership will be treated the same as people who are married in all respects.

10. Groups that cross two or more equality strands e.g. young black women

Many of the residents in this block will have protected characteristics in two or more equalities strands, [Redaction (included in the EXEMPT version of the report)].

The Council recognises that inter-connected protected characteristics require a tailored approach that recognises the specific needs of individuals and households. This is why all effort will be made to ensure that every resident has all of the information and support necessary throughout the rehousing process, such as by undertaking individual needs assessments and providing financial support under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy.

Socio-economic disadvantage

The Council recognises that social tenants, temporary accommodation residents and leaseholders in this block are disproportionately likely to be from low-income households. Therefore, those from low-income backgrounds will disproportionately be impacted by the decision to recommend option 2 for Stapleford North to be included in the 'preferred design scenario'.

Under option 2, these residents will face some level of disruption due to the need to be rehoused. The provisions set out under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy – such as disturbance payments and the Right to Return – will help to offset these negative impacts.

The Council recognises that residents with this protected characteristic would be negatively impacted by the process of rehousing. Housing officers would work closely with residents in this case to ensure that they were supported to find suitable properties, including through the financial provisions set out in the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy. This policy was developed in adherence to the Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy (ERRPP) which aims to ensure that residents are not financially worse off as a result of rehousing. This includes by providing a £6,500 Home Loss payment and disturbance payments to cover the reasonable costs of moving home.

Leaseholders would be supported through equity loans that would help them purchase a suitable property in the right area for them, under the conditions set out in the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy. This includes Home Loss payments at 10% of their property value and disturbance payments for the reasonable costs of moving home.

Secure tenants and leaseholders would be positively impacted by the rights to return guaranteed by the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy and by the improved safety and quality of their new homes.

Outline the overall impact of the policy for the Public Sector Equality Duty:

- **Could the proposal result in any direct/indirect discrimination for any group that shares the relevant protected characteristics?**

- Will the proposal help to advance equality of opportunity between groups who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not?
This includes:
 - a) Remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons protected under the Equality Act
 - b) Take steps to meet the needs of persons protected under the Equality Act that are different from the needs of other groups
 - c) Encourage persons protected under the Equality Act to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low
- Will the proposal help to foster good relations between groups who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not?

It is not believed that this proposal would result in any direct or indirect discrimination for any group that shares a protected characteristic.

6. a) What changes if any do you plan to make to your proposal as a result of the Equality Impact Assessment?

Further information on responding to identified impacts is contained within accompanying EqIA guidance

Outcome	Y/N
No major change to the proposal: the EqIA demonstrates the proposal is robust and there is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact. All opportunities to promote equality have been taken. <u>If you have found any inequalities or negative impacts that you are unable to mitigate, please provide a compelling reason below why you are unable to mitigate them.</u>	Y
Adjust the proposal: the EqIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. Adjust the proposal to remove barriers or better promote equality. Clearly <u>set out below</u> the key adjustments you plan to make to the policy. If there are any adverse impacts you cannot mitigate, please provide a compelling reason below	
Stop and remove the proposal: the proposal shows actual or potential avoidable adverse impacts on different protected characteristics. The decision maker must not make this decision.	

6 b) Summarise the specific actions you plan to take to remove or mitigate any actual or potential negative impact and to further the aims of the Equality Duty

Impact and which relevant protected characteristics are impacted?	Action	Lead officer	Timescale

<p>Age and disability – these individuals will be negatively impacted in the short term by both option 1 (disruption, noise, possible temporary rehousing) and option 2 (rehousing, children moving school).</p>	<p><i>Option 2: Inclusion of provision in the recommendations of the July 2021 Cabinet report to extend the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy to these residents. This ensures adaptations can be made for disabled residents and those with young children can be prioritised for local rehousing. It also guarantees the Right to Return and sets out clearly the payments residents will be entitled too.</i></p>	<p>Sarah Lovell</p>	<p>Complete – July 2021</p>
<p>Socio-economic – most residents will be low-income households and will be impacted by the disruption under option 1 or the rehousing or sale of their property under option 2.</p>	<p><i>Option 2: extend the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy to give residents two rights to return and leaseholders the offer of equity loans to find suitable properties. Ensure residents are aware of the financial support available to them to enable them to move home.</i></p>	<p>Sarah Lovell</p>	<p>Complete – July 2021</p>

Please outline any areas you have identified where negative impacts will happen as a result of the proposal but it is not possible to mitigate them. Please provide a complete and honest justification on why it is not possible to mitigate them.

Rehousing can be a stressful and difficult experience for any resident. Using the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy will ensure that this is done in a fair and equitable way, that will give residents the best chance of remaining in the local area if they wish, finding suitable properties, and returning to the estate when the new homes are ready. Further to this, personalised support would be offered via the council's rehousing officers and individual needs assessments would be undertaken for secure tenants to ensure that residents with specific needs can be supported fully.

However, it is recognised that the short-term impact of rehousing could still negatively affect some residents, particularly those with strong ties to the area or young children.

6 c) Summarise the measures you intend to put in place to monitor the equalities impact of the proposal as it is implemented:

This equality impact assessment has been monitored and updated following the results of the consultation. Where any resident has noted their protected characteristic in response to the consultation, this has been taken into account for the decision that is being recommended to Cabinet. Further to this, during the consultation and engagement with the affected residents, where the Council has identified those with protected characteristics, this information has been used to inform this updated EqIA and the subsequent decision to be taken.

7. Authorisation

EqIA approved by
(Assistant Director/ Director)

Date
.....

8. Publication

Please ensure the completed EqIA is published in accordance with the Council's policy.

Please contact the Policy & Strategy Team for any feedback on the EqIA process.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: Cabinet 14 September 2021

Title: Variation of contract for 1-35 Headcorn Road and 51-92 Tenterden Road Fire Safety Works

Report

Authorised by David Joyce, Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning

Lead Officer: Kurtis Lee, Director of Asset Management

Ward(s) affected: North Tottenham

Report for Key/

Non-Key Decision: Key Decision

1. Describe the issue under consideration

1.1 This report requests authorisation for additional variation of costs under an existing building contract approved by Cabinet in February 2020.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

2.1 The additional works to Headcorn and Tenterden includes installation of Automatic Fire Detection (AFD) and associated fire safety works. These works are essential to ensure the buildings are compliant with current fire safety requirements and regulations. Previous works and these proposed additional works have sometimes /will cause some disruption to residents. I wish to thank them for their continuing cooperation and patience.

3. Recommendations

That Cabinet in accordance with Contract Standing Order 10.02.1(b) approves additional costs and variations for Fire Safety Works to 1-35 Headcorn Road and 51-92 Tenterden Road as follows:-

3.1 A variation of the contract with Greyline Builders Limited to increase the value of the contract sum of £604,756 by £176,708, to an aggregate value of £781,464.

3.2 The additional consultants' fees of £14,868, resulting in a total additional cost of £191,576. This is in line with agreed terms in the contract.

3.3 Agrees that the cost of these works will not be recharged to the leaseholders of properties at 1-35 Headcorn Road and 51-92 Tenterden Road.

4. Reasons for decision

4.1 1-35 Headcorn Road and 51-92 Tenterden Road Fire Safety Works were approved by Cabinet in February 2020 and mobilised in October 2020. Additional works costs are required to carry out essential fire safety works, including:-

- Decanting costs to facilitate the removal of asbestos from the communal areas.
- Replacement of corridor doors.
- Electrical repairs to individual flats that were identified during the construction phase.
- Extension of time to deliver the works, incurred as a result of the delays in residents providing access during the Covid-19 pandemic.

5. Alternative options considered

5.1 The option of not doing the works was considered but rejected. As the Landlord, Haringey Council must comply with current Fire and Building Regulations as well as Asbestos Regulations and Health & Safety. It is more cost effective to include the works within the existing contract whilst on site as the works are integral to the fire safety works and will be less disruptive for our residents.

6. Background information

6.1 Approval was given on 11th February 2020, by Cabinet, for 1-35 Headcorn and 51-92 Tenterden Road Fire Safety works. The scope of works comprises:-

- A full grade (A) fire alarm system within all the communal areas to allow early warning for simultaneous evacuation of the building.
- Heat and smoke detectors within individual flats.
- Fire stopping works to flats and communal areas.
- Upgrading lobby corridor doors, replacement of service riser doors.
- Asbestos removal and fire upgrade works to ensure that Haringey Council meets its obligation under The Regulatory (Fire Safety) Order 2005 and current Building Regulations.

6.2 Project details:

The number of dwellings within this project	77
Total budget contract sum	£604,756
Revised total budget contract forecast	£781,464
Building contract variation	£176,708 excluding fees
Additional consultancy fees total	£14,868
Original completion date reported	18/02/2021
Completion date now reported	23/07/21 (excluding snagging)
Contractor: Greyline Builders Ltd	Site works commenced on 05/10/20
The original contract period was 18 weeks	

6.3 Summary of total costs:

Item	1 Original Financial Provision (Tender	2 Previously Authorised Additions	3 Current Financial Provision	4 Further Approval Now Sought	5 Revised Total (3+4)

	Stage)				
	£	£	£	£	£
Building contract	£604,756	0	£604,756	£176,708	£781,464
Fees	£53,158	0	£53,158	£14,868	£68,026
Total	£657,914	0	£657,914	£191,576	£849,490

6.4 Additional contract costs

The project commenced on site in October 2020. During this period further COVID-19 restrictions were again introduced and some residents were not engaging with the contractor to provide access for fire stopping and automatic fire detection works within the flats. The delay with access resulted in the contractor's submission of an extension of time claim and the contract was extended by six weeks to 7 May 2021.

6.5 Due to the COVID-19 restrictions the decant process was delayed. The total contract extension is 14 weeks.

6.6 Although the presence of asbestos was known prior to commencement of works, working around it within the cupboard areas was not possible, due to risk of damage and exposure to the contractor and residents. 77 families were decanted into hotel accommodation for up to two nights.

6.7 Following a visit, Haringey Council's Building Control Officer recommended that four communal lobby doors be replaced and that additional repairs be carried out to the remaining lobby doors with the installation of drop seals and door closers.

6.8 It was not possible to obtain access to carry out detailed surveys of the loft areas above the twenty-eight flats on the top floor of the building. Once access had been obtained, perforations were identified and fire stopping works were required between the party walls of the neighbouring flats. Additional fire stopping works were carried out to the loft areas above the communal areas of each of the fourteen entrances.

6.9 The contract allowed for an electrical test to be carried out to each of the 77 dwellings prior to the installation of the automatic fire detection works. Remedial works were identified.

6.10 Breakdown of additional cost: -

Description of works	Cost
----------------------	------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of asbestos to shelving & rear of communal cupboard doors to facilitate the replacement of electrical riser cupboard doors. 	£26,954
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decanting of residents to facilitate asbestos removal. 	£20,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional works to corridor lobby doors to comply with Building Control Officer's requirements. 	£12,557
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional fire stopping works to lofts. 	£34,787
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrical remedial works to dwellings following electrical tests. 	£14,975
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-route new door entry cables and recommission. 	£11,149
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six weeks extension of time claim awarded due to no access due to Covid-19 restrictions. 	£18,762
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anticipated claim for delay and disruption of eight weeks due to delays in arranging the decant of residents. 	£37,524
Total	£176,708

Budget

- 6.11 The additional cost of this project is estimated to be £191,576 bringing the total cost of the scheme to £849,490, as set out in paragraph 6.13 of this additional cost report.
- 6.12 This project will be funded from the Fire Protection Work budget within the 2021/22 Housing Capital programme.
- 6.13 Phasing of estimated expenditure is set out in the table below:-

Financial Year	Works	Fees	Total
Spend up to 31/03/21	£106,471	£29,930	£136,401
2021/2022	£655,457	£36,736	£692,193
2022/2023	£19,536	£1,360	£20,896
TOTAL	£781,464	£68,026	£849,490

7. Consultation

- 7.1 A residents' newsletter was sent in August 2020 to update residents about progress and to introduce the contractor.
- 7.2 A residents' handbook was issued to all residents in December 2020 to provide additional information about the works.
- 7.3 A follow up residents' newsletter was sent in March 2021 to update residents about the door replacement works and asbestos removal works.
- 7.4 Letters were issued to residents in April 2021 to remind them to complete a consent form for hotel accommodation prior to the asbestos removal works.

8. Leasehold implications

- 8.1 There are 26 leaseholders of at 1-35 Headcorn Road and 51-2 Tenterden Road within this project that are affected by the work. Under the terms of their lease, the lessee is required to contribute towards the cost of maintaining in good condition the main structure, the common parts and common services of the building subject to the completion of statutory consultation.
- 8.2 Such contributions are normally recovered by the Leaseholder through the lessees' service charge account. For the reasons set out in the report submitted to Cabinet in February 2020, it is not recommended to levy any charges to leaseholders as the buildings had a number of historic major repairs and past refurbishment works, including changes to the external cladding, which the leaseholders have previously been recharged for. Further, the blocks are timber framed and have suffered endemic compartmentation failures, which are difficult to fully rectify without complete destructive type works. Cabinet agreed that leaseholders should not be charged for the additional early warning systems and general fire safety compartmentation works that were required to make the buildings compliant.

9. Conservation areas

- 9.1 There are no properties within conservation areas within this project.

10. Contribution to strategic outcomes

- 10.1 This project will help to achieve the Borough Plan Outcome 3: 'We will work together to drive up quality of housing for everyone'. This will include contributing to delivering the following objectives:-
- Improve the quality of Haringey's Council housing, including by ensuring that a minimum of 100% of homes meet the Decent Homes Standard by 2025.
 - Improve residents' satisfaction with the service they receive from Homes for Haringey to be in the top quartile for London (78%) by 2022.
 - Ensure safety in housing of all tenures across the borough, responding to any new regulations as they emerge.
- 10.2 Outcome 3 which comes under the Borough Plan's Housing priority, for which the vision is for safe, stable and affordable homes for everyone, whatever their circumstances.

Statutory Officers comments (Chief Finance Officer (including procurement), Head of Legal and Governance, Equalities)

11 Finance

- 11.1 The original contract sum including project consultancy fees is £0.66m. This contract variation request will result in additional cost of £0.19m, including project consultancy fee of £0.01m. This brings the total contract sum to £0.85m.

This project is included in the HRA Fire Safety Capital programme budget approved by Cabinet in February 2021.

The amounts spent and projected to be spent on this project is as shown below.

Financial year	Works	Fees	Total
Spend up to 31/03/21	£0.11m	£0.03m	£0.14m
2021/2022	£0.65m	£0.04m	£0.69m
2022/2023	£0.02m	£0.001m	£0.02m
Total	£0.78m	£0.07m	£0.85m

The expenditure of £0.14m in 2020/21 was met from the Fire Safety capital works programme budget 2020/21.

The remaining projected expenditure of £0.71m will be met from the Fire Safety capital works programme budget 2021/22 and 2021/22-26 MTFS.

No contribution to the cost of the project is expected from leaseholders as highlighted in the report.

12 Procurement

- 12.1 The variation requested is in line with the Contract Standing Orders.
- 12.2 The variation is noted in the report is outside the scope of the PCR's.
- 12.3 Strategic Procurement sees no reason from a Procurement or Governance perspective that prevents Cabinet from approving the variation noted in the report.

13 Legal

- 13.1 The Head of Legal and Governance (Monitoring Officer) has been consulted in the preparation of the report.
- 13.2 The contract which this report relates to is outside the scope of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 ("Regulations"). Therefore, the variations which are referred to in the recommendations in the report are outside the scope of Regulation 72 of the Regulations (which governs rules on contract modifications).
- 13.3 In accordance with Contract Standing Order 10.02.1(b) Cabinet has authority to approve the variations referred to in the recommendations.
- 13.4 It is open to the Council in the circumstances outlined in this report not to seek to enforce leaseholders' obligations to pay charges under the terms of the lease.

13.5 The Head of Legal and Governance (Monitoring Officer) sees no legal reasons preventing Cabinet from approving the recommendations in the report.

14 Equality

14.1 The Council has a Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to: -

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not.
- Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

14.2 The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status apply to the first part of the duty.

14.2.1 The decision will primarily impact residents living in properties managed by Homes for Haringey, a significant number of whom share the protected characteristics. It is notable that BAME people and disabled people are overrepresented relative to the population of Haringey.

14.2.2 In so far as the works will improve the quality of housing in the borough, they can be expected to have a positive overall equalities impact. It is noted that Homes for Haringey is working with residents where specific challenges, such as those related to mental health, have been identified. It is also noted that there will be no charges for leaseholders for the reasons set out in section 8. There is no indication that this decision will result in any specific negative equalities implications.

14.3 As a body carrying out a public function on behalf of a public authority, the contractor will be required to have due regard for the need to achieve the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty, noted above. Arrangements will be in place to monitor the performance of the contractor and ensure that any reasonably possible measures are taken to address any issues that may occur and may have a disproportionate negative impact on any groups who share the protected characteristics.

15 Use of appendices

Exempt Appendix A

16 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

16.1 The background papers relating to this report are included within appendix A. This appendix is **not for publication** as it contains information classified as exempt under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government

Act 1972 in that it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding the information).

MINUTES OF MEETING Cabinet Member Signing HELD ON Tuesday, 27th July, 2021, 11.30 am

PRESENT:

Councillor Mike Hakata, Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency

12. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

14. BIKEHANGAR INSTALLATION: CONNAUGHT GARDENS, FLANK WALL OF 72 WOODLAND GARDENS, N10

The Cabinet Member received a report on the feedback of statutory consultation carried out from 3 February to 24 February 2021, for a proposal to introduce a Bike hanger on Connaught Gardens, on the road surface adjacent to the flank wall of 72 Woodland Gardens N10. The Cabinet Member's approval was sought to proceed to implementation, having taken any objections into consideration.

The Cabinet Member noted that one objection had been received from an adjacent resident around the loss of a parking space. Officers acknowledged that the installation would be partially on the carriageway and would result in the loss of half a parking space.

RESOLVED

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency approved the implementation of a Bike hanger on Connaught Gardens, on the road surface adjacent to the flank wall of 72 Woodland Gardens, N10.

Reasons for decision

The proposals meet local demand from residents and helps deliver the Transport Strategy through promotion of sustainable mode of transport.

Alternative options considered

None.

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair

Date.....

MINUTES OF MEETING Cabinet Member Signing HELD ON Monday, 16th August, 2021, 9.30 am

PRESENT:

Councillor John Bevan

15. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

17. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR INTERNAL MAJOR WORKS. (TULL)

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Licensing and Housing Services considered the report which sought approval for the award of a contract to contractor C (identified in the exempt part of the report) for the sum of £5,606,833.33. The project would conduct internal improvement works to bring 947 dwellings up to the Decent Homes Standard. The report also sought approval for the issue of a letter of intent to the preferred contractor up to the value of, but not exceeding, £560,683.33 which represents 10% of the contract sum. This will enable design work and specialist surveys to be completed, whilst the contract is finalised. An additional contingency sum is also requested in the exempt part of the report.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the award of a contract to the preferred contractor C, identified in the exempt appendix A. This will be for the renewal of kitchen, bathroom and internal electrics including smoke alarms where required.
2. To note the total sum of works will be £5,606,833.33 excluding fees.
3. To approve the issue of a letter of intent for an amount up to, but not exceeding £560,683.33 that represents 10% of the contract sum.
4. To approve the total project cost, including fees of £224,595 and client contingency sum as set out in the exempt report.
5. To note that £45,000 of the total sum has already been spent on consultant design fee as part of the feasibility works.

Reasons for decision

A competitive tender was undertaken in conjunction with Haringey Council's Procurement team via the London Construction Programme Major Works Framework (LCP Framework) and processes. This will enable the essential internal works such as the renewal of kitchens, bathrooms, and internal electrics to progress.

The tender process was carried out in accordance with the framework requirements that was based on 40% price and 60% quality.

Based on the tender evaluation it is recommended that the tender is awarded to contractor C. The details of the tender evaluation are outlined in appendix A, the exempt part of this report.

Properties within this project include homes that have been non decent since 2015-16. The project will enable works to commence for properties to be brought up to the Decent Homes Standard.

Alternative options considered

Alternative routes for tender were considered. This included the option to either use third party industry frameworks or undertake a standalone compliant tender process to deliver the works. Homes for Haringey sought support and advice from Haringey Council's Strategic Procurement team and determined the LCP Framework as being the optimum route to the market. This was because it enabled the tender process to be completed quickly, with assured standards and would meet the social investment requirements of the Council as set out in LCP procurements.

The option of not undertaking this work was also considered. However, it would result in Homes for Haringey not achieving the agreed objectives within the Asset Management Strategy 2020-25 of achieving 100% of homes meeting the Decent Homes Standard by 2025. It would also result in increased repairs costs and potential resident dissatisfaction, due to under investment in their homes.

18. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR INTERNAL MAJOR WORKS. (CLARKE)

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Licensing and Housing Services considered the report which sought approval for the award of a contract to contractor C (identified in the exempt part of the report) to carry out internal improvement works to 929 dwellings to bring them up to the Decent Homes Standard. The contract award value will be for the sum £5,448,076.81. The report also sought approval for the issue of a letter of intent to the preferred contractor, up to the value of, but not exceeding, £544,807.68 which represented 10% of the contract sum to enable design work and specialist surveys to be completed, whilst the contract is finalised.

RESOLVED

1. That pursuant to the Council's Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1(d), for the Cabinet Member to approve the award of a contract to the preferred contractor identified in the exempt appendix A for the renewal of kitchen, bathroom and internal electrics including smoke alarms, rewires etc.

2. To note that works programmed will be conducted in Bruce Grove, Crouch End, Haringey, Seven Sisters, St Ann's, Stroud Green, and Tottenham Green areas. The total sum of works will be £5,448,076.81.
3. To approve the issue of a letter of intent for an amount up to, but not exceeding £544,807.68, that represents 10% of the contract sum.
4. To approve the total project costs, including fees of £218,236 and client contingency sum as set out in the exempt part of the report.
5. To note that £45,000 of the total sum has already been spent on consultant design fee as part of the feasibility works.

Reasons for decision

Homes for Haringey requires Cabinet approval to award the contract for internal works to 927 dwellings in the Bruce Grove, Crouch End, Haringey, Seven Sisters, St Ann's, Stroud Green, and Tottenham Green areas. This will enable the essential internal works such as the renewal of kitchens, bathrooms, and internal electrics to progress. This is following a competitive mini competition in conjunction with Haringey Council's Procurement team via the London Construction Programme Major Works framework (LCP Framework) and processes.

The tender process was carried out in accordance with the LCP Framework requirements that was based on 40% price and 60% quality.

Based on the tender evaluation it is recommended that the tender is awarded to contractor C. The details of the tender evaluation are outlined in appendix A, the exempt part of this report.

Properties within this project include homes that have been non decent since 2015-16. The project will enable works to commence for properties to be brought up to the Decent Homes Standard.

Alternative options considered

An alternative option would be for Homes for Haringey to either use third party industry frameworks or a stand-alone OJEU compliant tender process to deliver the works. Homes for Haringey sought support and advice from Haringey Council's Strategic Procurement and determined the LCP Framework as being the optimum route to the market. This considered aspects such as the speed of access to quality-checked contractors and focus on companies that concentrate their resources in the local area.

The option of not undertaking this work was also considered. However, it would result in Homes for Haringey not achieving the agreed objectives within the Asset Management Strategy 2020-25 of achieving 100% of homes meeting the Decent

Homes Standard by 2025. It would also result in increased repairs costs and potential resident dissatisfaction, due to under investment in their homes.

19. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as items 6 and 7 contained exempt information, as defined under paragraph 3 and 5, Part 1, schedule 12A of the Local Government Act:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings

20. EXEMPT - AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR INTERNAL MAJOR WORKS. (TULL)

The Cabinet Member considered exempt information pertaining to agenda item 3.

21. EXEMPT - AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR INTERNAL MAJOR WORKS. (CLARKE)

The Cabinet Member considered exempt information pertaining to agenda item 4.

CHAIR: COUNCILLOR JOHN BEVAN

Signed by Chair

Date

MINUTES OF CABINET MEMBER SIGNING MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 16TH AUGUST, 2021, 10.30 - 10.40 AM

PRESENT: Councillor Seema Chandwani, Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Welfare, and Public Realm.

In attendance: Simi Shah, Group Engineer (Traffic and Parking); Andrew Bourke, Team Manager (Parking Schemes); and Fiona Rae, Principal Committee Co-ordinator.

22. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

23. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

24. MUSWELL HILL WEST CPZ - STATUTORY CONSULTATION, N10

The Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Welfare, and the Public Realm considered the report which provided feedback from the statutory consultation, commencing on 25 November 2020 and concluding on 16 December 2020, on the proposal to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) - Muswell Hill West (MHW) in the following roads: Athenaeum Place, Kings Avenue, Princes Avenue, Queens Avenue, Queens Lane, Princes Lane and Avenue Mews, eastern side of Fortis Green Road (between the junctions of Queens Avenue and Muswell Hill Broadway), and the north western side of Muswell Hill Broadway (from Fortis Green Road to Woodberry Crescent). The report also requested approval to proceed to implementation, having taken objections into consideration.

Following questions from the Cabinet Member, it was noted that a higher proportion of people had objected to the statutory consultation but that a higher proportion of people had responded in support to the public consultation and that, overall, there were more responses in support than in opposition. It was added that the ward councillors were all in support of the proposals.

The Cabinet Member RESOLVED

1. To approve that a new Controlled Parking Zone called Muswell Hill West is introduced into the following roads: Athenaeum Place, Kings Avenue, Princes Avenue, Queens Avenue, Queens Lane, Princes Lane and Avenue Mews, eastern side of Fortis Green Road (between the junctions of Queens Avenue and Muswell Hill Broadway) and the north western side of Muswell Hill Broadway (from Fortis Green Road to Woodberry Crescent). A plan showing the extent and parking

arrangement for the proposed Controlled Parking Zone can be seen in **Appendix (I)** to the report.

2. To approve the operational times for the (Muswell Hill West) Controlled Parking Zone to be Monday to Friday 10am to 2pm.

Reasons for decision

Following public consultation on the proposals, approval was granted by officers under Delegated Authority in November 2020 to proceed with delivery of parking controls on the following roads: Athenaeum Place, Kings Avenue, Princes Avenue, Queens Avenue, Queens Lane, Princes Lane and Avenue Mews, eastern side of Fortis Green Road (between the junctions of Queens Avenue and Muswell Hill Broadway), the north western side of Muswell Hill Broadway (from Fortis Green Road to Woodberry Crescent), subject to the outcome of a statutory consultation.

The public consultation received a total of 83 (18%) responses, 47 (57%) in favour 33 (40%) in opposition and 3 (3%) not sure.

The outcome of the public consultation was endorsed by local Ward Councillors and is supported by Haringey's CPZ Parking Policy.

A total of 21 submissions were received to the statutory consultation, 14 objections and 7 in favour. Of the objections received, none could be considered as a 'substantial objection' i.e. relating to the consultation process not following required legal process or statutory documents containing fundamental errors. A summary of objections received are detailed in Table 2, section 6 of the report.

Alternative options considered

An alternative was to not introduce parking controls in the roads listed in section 4.1. This is not recommended as the public consultation had demonstrated the introduction of parking measures was supported by the majority of residents responding in the roads listed in section 4.1 and endorsed by local Ward Councillors. In addition, no substantial objections were received during the statutory consultation.

25. FORTIS GREEN EXTENSION - STATUTORY CONSULTATION, N10

The Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Welfare, and the Public Realm considered the report which provided feedback from the statutory consultation carried out from 4 November 2020 to 24 November 2020, on the proposal to extend the current Fortis Green Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include the following roads: Ringwood Avenue, Beech Drive and Twyford Avenue. The report also requested approval to proceed to implementation, having taken objections into consideration.

In response to questions from the Cabinet Member, it was confirmed that the roads where CPZs were proposed were those where the majority of people accepted the proposals. It was added that the Fortis Green ward councillors had been involved throughout the process and were in support of the proposals.

The Cabinet Member RESOLVED

1. To note the delegated decision report following the public consultation and considers the objections raised during the statutory consultation on the proposals, as well as officer responses to the objections.
2. To approve the extension of Fortis Green Controlled Parking Zone into the following roads: Ringwood Avenue, Beech Drive, and Twyford Avenue, as detailed in **Appendix (I)** to the report.
3. To approve the operational times for the above listed roads to match those of the existing Fortis Green Controlled Parking Zone i.e. Monday to Friday 11am to 1pm.

Reasons for decision

Following public consultation on the proposals, approval was granted by officers under Delegated Authority in October 2020 to proceed to delivery of parking controls on the following roads: Ringwood Avenue, Beech Drive and Twyford Avenue as part of the existing Fortis Green (FG) CPZ, subject to the outcome of a statutory consultation.

For Ringwood Avenue, Beech Drive and Twyford Avenue, the public consultation received a total of 86 responses: 45 (52%) in favour and 41 (48%) in opposition.

The outcome of the public consultation was endorsed by local Ward Councillors and is supported by Haringey’s CPZ Parking Policy.

A total of 51 submissions were received to the statutory consultation: 32 objections and 19 in favour. Of the objections received, none could be considered as a ‘substantial objection’ i.e. relating to the consultation process not following required legal process, or statutory documents containing fundamental errors. A summary of objections received are detailed in Table 2, section 6 of this report.

Alternative options considered

An alternative is to not introduce parking controls in roads listed in section 4.1. This is not recommended as the public consultation demonstrated the introduction of parking measures were supported by the majority of residents responding in the roads listed in section 4.1 and endorsed by local Ward Councillors. In addition, no substantial objections were received during the statutory consultation.

CABINET MEMBER: Cllr Seema Chandwani

Signed by Cabinet Member

Date ...17 August 2021.....

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF CABINET MEMBER SIGNING MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 19TH AUGUST, 2021, 10.00 - 10.10 AM

PRESENT: Councillor Peray Ahmet, Leader of the Council.

In attendance: Eubert Malcolm, Assistant Director Stronger and Safer Communities; Peter Skinner, Major Works Project Manager; Beth Waltzer, Interim Head of Waste; Adrian Watson, Major Projects Delivery Manager; and Fiona Rae, Principal Committee Co-ordinator.

26. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

28. APPOINTMENT OF CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE CORE AND SHELL WORKS IN RELATION TO THE CCTV WORKS ON THE 9TH FLOOR ALEXANDRA HOUSE

The Leader considered the report which sought approval to award a contract to Ark Build PLC up to the value of £721,629.41 to undertake Core and Shell building works, including strip out, internal structures and M&E works to 9th Floor Alexandra House, Wood Green under contract standing order 9.01.2f (use of Framework Agreement) and 9.07.1.d. (contracts awarded by Cabinet). The report also sought approval for the issue of a letter of intent under CSO 9.07.3.

It was confirmed that the costs had been verified by independent consultants and that the contract was considered to be compliant by the Council's Strategic Procurement Team.

The Leader RESOLVED

1. To approve a contract award to Ark Build PLC, up to a maximum value of £721,629.41. Made up of a fixed price sum of £656,026.74 and a 10% contingency of £65,602.67, which will be strictly managed under change control governance arrangements.
2. To approve the issuance of a letter of intent for up to 10% of the contract value, in accordance with Contract Standing Order 9.07.3.

Reasons for decision

The decision for the disposal of the Ashely Road Depot was taken by Haringey Council in 2019 to make way for residential development. This means that displaced

services, such as the CCTV control room, located within the depot will need to be relocated elsewhere within the borough.

The CCTV Control Room is required to be staffed 24 hours a day. Should the CCTV control room become offline, there is a potential risk to public safety.

The CCTV surveillance is currently backed up for recording within River Park House, however the live monitoring of the CCTV is currently located within a single suite at Ashley Road depot.

The Core and Shell building works outlined in this report referred to, are the vital 1st stage of a four-stage project to relocate and expand the CCTV monitoring and capture capabilities thereby providing greater assistance to enforcement and Police Services within Haringey.

Further options considered have been discounted as discussed in section 5 of the report.

Alternative options considered

48 Station Road, Haringey – The CCTV relocation project was initially planned to be relocated to the 5th floor of 48 Station Road. The design progressed to RIBA stage 3 and was submitted for approval. However, Haringey Council took the decision that 48 Station Road would be marked for disposal in the short to medium term and therefore it would be sensible not to relocate the service to this building.

Do nothing – the option not to progress the project has been discounted due to requirement to dispose of the Ashley Road Depot, and leaving the CCTV control room in place would mean that the disposal process could not proceed.

29. REQUEST TO VARY THE CONTRACT FOR CAMERAS REFRESH, UPGRADE AND NETWORK EXTENSION

The Leader considered the report which sought approval for a contract variation of an increase from £2.1m to £2.6m within the existing contract term of 4 years which commenced on 13 January 2020 and expires 12 January 2024. The existing contract supports the Council in delivering on the refresh and upgrade of the Council's CCTV infrastructure and significantly increase the current number of cameras across the borough to improve public confidence, detect and deter criminality as well as improve the flow of traffic across the borough. The variation sought will be within the existing contract term of 4 years that expires on 12 January 2024 for the additional value of £500K. The additional cost will be funded through the School Street capital programme.

The Leader RESOLVED

1. To approve, in accordance with the provisions of the Council's Contract Standing Order 10.02.1(b), the contract variation for the supply of CCTV goods and services to the current provider named in the exempt report for remainder of the contract

period of the contract which expires on 12 January 2024 under a call-off schedule of rates framework in Appendix A for up to a maximum spend of £2.6m.

2. To note the total value of the variation is £500,000.

Reasons for decision

On 10 November 2020 Cabinet approved the School Streets Plan to deliver local air quality improvements, encourage active travel, and create a safer environment around the school gates.

As an impact of COVID pandemic, it was acknowledged that air quality and health levels played a part in the ability to fight the virus. There was also a need to create spaces, where people could socially distance safely whilst dropping off and picking up children from school.

The current contract has facilitated and supported the delivery of the School Streets programme through the purchase of specialised cameras required for traffic contraventions on schools' streets. As a result, the contract value has reduced and not able to support the CCTV capital programme roll out.

The incumbent supplier provides CCTV equipment with interface and connectivity to the council's back-office systems. A change of supplier could affect the interoperability of the council wide CCTV network hence procuring a new supplier may not be the proper route to take.

This contract variation will not only ensure that the increased value will support the CCTV cameras refresh and upgrade across the borough as previously agreed but will also ensure that there is no interoperability issue with the council wide CCTV network.

Alternative options considered

Doing nothing – This option will impact on the Council's ability to proceed with the overall cameras refresh and upgrade which has already slipped due to COVID factors.

Please note that there will be a separate procurement exercise that will be undertaken to ensure that there is a call-off contract available to support the overall full value School Streets programme over the next 5 years.

30. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as item 6 contained exempt information, as defined under paragraph 3, Part 1, schedule 12A of the Local Government Act:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

31. EXEMPT - REQUEST TO VARY THE CONTRACT FOR CAMERAS REFRESH, UPGRADE AND NETWORK EXTENSION

The Leader considered the exempt information.

LEADER: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Leader

Date ...20 August 2021

MINUTES OF URGENT DECISIONS HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 14TH JULY, 2021, 11.00 - 11.05 AM

PRESENT: Councillor Zena Brabazon, Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children, and Families.

In attendance: Charlotte Pomery, Assistant Director for Commissioning; Florence Guppy, Strategic Lead – Community Enablement; and Fiona Rae, Principal Committee Co-ordinator.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. COVID ADDITIONAL WINTER GRANT SCHEME IN HARINGEY

The Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children, and Families considered the report which sought approval for an additional government funding allocation.

The Government, through the Department of Works and Pensions (DWP), has further extended the COVID Winter Grant Scheme/ 'Covid Local Support Grant.' The objective of the Scheme(s) is to provide support to vulnerable households and families with children particularly affected by the pandemic where alternative sources of assistance may be unavailable. Local authorities are responsible for administering the Scheme and funding has been allocated to each authority. The Council was initially allocated £986,329.83. The spend for this was decided by Cabinet Member Decision in December 2020. The Council was subsequently awarded a further £342,895. This funding was referred to as the 'Additional Winter Grant.' The spend for this was decided by Cabinet Member Decision in March 2021. A third allocation of £232,078.00 referred to as the 'Covid Local Support Grant' and/or 'Winter Grant 3: April 2021' was allocated by Cabinet Member Decision in June 2021. The DWP has stated that this further tranche of £928,310.43 allocated to Haringey will be the last extension. This final tranche is referred to as 'Winter Grant 4: July 2021'.

The funding will enable the Council to provide support to families with children, other vulnerable households and individuals from 21 June 2021 and covers the period until 30 September 2021. The 'Covid Local Support Grant' will allow the Council to extend and expand its support to households in food or fuel poverty from the original three Winter Grant allocations. This report is seeking Cabinet member approval for the proposed arrangement for the delivery of additional funding as set out in the policy document (attached) and which is within the conditions stipulated by DWP.

In response to a question from the Cabinet Member, it was confirmed that there would be Free School Meals (FSM) holiday provision which consisted of voucher support to all households eligible for FSMs during the Summer holiday to the value of £15 per child. It was noted that this would be administered by schools and funding of £3 per child would be provided to each school to support with schools' localised food support offer.

The Cabinet Member RESOLVED

1. To approve the additional funding allocation from the Government.
2. To approve the Covid Local Support Grant/ Winter Grant 4: June 2021 Scheme Policy which sets out the Council's arrangement for administering the additional funding and is attached at Appendix 1 to the report.
3. To delegate authority to the Assistant Director Commissioning, in consultation with the Director of Children Services and the Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families, to amend this policy to give effect to changes in legislation, statutory or non statutory guidance, or directives or instructions of a similar character issued by Government.
4. To agree that this policy is subject to the availability of government funding and will terminate on 30 September 2021 unless terminated earlier or extended beyond this date by Cabinet or Cabinet Member decision.

Reasons for decision

The Government through the Department of Works and Pensions (DWP) has provided funding to local authorities to provide and administer the Covid Local Support Grant Scheme. It is acknowledged that local authorities have the local ties and knowledge and are best placed to allocate funding according to local need.

The Scheme provides for local authorities to determine eligibility in their area and target support to those most in need but within the scope of conditions set by DWP. The proposed decision on the Covid Local Support Grant Scheme Policy sets out how the Council will target and deliver support to residents in addition to the support agreed in the original and additional Winter Grant policies (December 2020, March 2021, April 2021). This spend is targeted to those that are most in need and in accordance with the Scheme.

The Covid Local Support Grant payments are expected to support households over the grant period and for funding to be spent between 21 June and 30 September 2021. Therefore, there is a need for an urgent decision to be taken on the recommendation in order to ensure that payments are made to support vulnerable people within the allotted time.

Alternative options considered

The alternative option considered was not to develop a Covid Local Support Grant Policy. This was discounted as it would not have made use of potential support to

Haringey residents and would have necessitated a return of the funds to central Government.

Please be advised that the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny has further agreed that the call-in procedure shall not apply to this urgent decision. This is because the decision is urgent and any delay in implementation caused by the call-in procedure would seriously prejudice the Council's or the public's interests due to the fact that any delay in decision making will impact on the ability to utilise available funding to support families with children, other vulnerable households and individuals in Haringey. Accordingly, the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee has agreed that the decision is both reasonable in all circumstances, and that it should be treated as a matter of urgency. This is in accordance with Part 4, Section H, and Paragraph 18 of the Council Constitution.

CABINET MEMBER: Cllr Zena Brabazon

Signed by Cabinet Member

Date ...15 July 2021.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Housing, Regeneration & Planning

Significant decisions - Delegated Action - For Reporting to Cabinet on 14th September 2021

◆ denotes background papers are Exempt.

No	Date approved by Director	Title	Decision
1.	02.07.2021	MHCLG extension to the Welcome Back fund and new funded activities	Funding contract extension agreed
2.	02.07.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N17 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N17 ◆
3.	02.07.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N17 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N17 ◆
4.	02.07.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N15 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N15 ◆
5.	02.07.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N15 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N15 ◆
6.	02.07.2021	The acquisition of property at Broad Water Farm, N17 ◆	Acquisition of Property at Broad Water Farm, N17 ◆
7.	02.07.2021	The acquisition of property at Broad Water Farm, N17 ◆	Acquisition of Property at Broad Water Farm, N17 ◆
8.	02.07.2021	The acquisition of property at Broad Water Farm, N17 and authority for an Equity Loan for property in EN7 ◆	Acquisition of Property at Broad Water Farm, N17 and authority agreed for an Equity Loan for property in EN7 ◆

Housing, Regeneration & Planning

Significant decisions - Delegated Action - For Reporting to Cabinet on 14th September 2021

◆ denotes background papers are Exempt.

No	Date approved by Director	Title	Decision
9.	13.07.2021	The acquisition of property at Broad Water Farm, N17 ◆	Acquisition of Property at Broad Water Farm, N17 ◆
10.	16.07.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N17 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N17 ◆
11.	16.07.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N17 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N17 ◆
12.	16.07.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N22 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N22 ◆
13.	19.07.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N15 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N15 ◆
14.	19.07.2021	Payment to Capital Letters 2021-22 in accordance with membership terms ◆	Payment to Capital Letters approved. ◆
15.	30.07.2021	Approval of ballot programme and landlord offer for High Road West Scheme	Approval of Ballot programme and Landlord offer for High Road West Scheme
16.	02.08.2021	Acquisition of property to assist with delivery of the High Road West regeneration scheme, N17 ◆	Acquisition of property in N17 ◆

Housing, Regeneration & Planning

Significant decisions - Delegated Action - For Reporting to Cabinet on 14th September 2021

◆ denotes background papers are Exempt.

No	Date approved by Director	Title	Decision
17.	02.08.2021	Award of contract for demolition services at N17 site ◆	Award of contract for demolition services at N17 site ◆
18.	02.08.2021	Additional Restrictions Grant ◆	Amendment approved and agreement to reopen the application process for Additional Restrictions Grant scheme ◆
19.	02.08.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N15 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N15 ◆
20.	02.08.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N4 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N4 ◆
21.	02.08.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N15 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N15 ◆
22.	02.08.2021	Funding agreement with the Funder's Accountable Body to undertake high-speed broadband connectivity work ◆	To enter into a funding agreement with the Funder's Accountable Body to undertake high-speed broadband connectivity work ◆
23.	16.08.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N17 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N17 ◆

Housing, Regeneration & Planning

Significant decisions - Delegated Action - For Reporting to Cabinet on 14th September 2021

◆ denotes background papers are Exempt.

No	Date approved by Director	Title	Decision
24.	16.08.2021	The acquisition of property under the Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme for lease to the Haringey CBS, N15 ◆	Acquisition of Property as part of Council's Right to Buy acquisition programme at N15 ◆
25.	16.08.2021	Disposal of property on a shared ownership basis, N17 ◆	Disposal of property on a shared ownership basis, N17 ◆
26.	18.08.2021	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Partial Review	Approval of the partial review into Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
27.	22.08.2021	Acquisition of property to assist with delivery of the High Road West regeneration scheme, N17 ◆	Acquisition of property in N17 ◆
28.	22.08.2021	Approval of consultation materials relating to Broad Water Farm	Approval of consultation materials relating to Broad Water Farm
29.	22.08.2021	CSO Waiver and Emergency Contract Award for Pest Control and Fire Risk Works at Broad Water Farm	Waiver and contract approved

Delegated Action	
Type	Number

Corporate Board Officer/Assistant Director Signature *David T. Joyce* Date.....06/09/2021.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Adults & Health

Significant decisions - Delegated Action - For Reporting to Cabinet on 14th September 2021

◆ denotes background papers are Exempt.

No	Date approved by Director	Title	Decision
1.	02.07.2021	Extension of the temporary call monitoring contract for the Community Alarm Service	Contract Extension approved
2.			
3.			
4.			

Delegated Action

Type	Number

Corporate Board Officer/Assistant Director Signature

B. F. Tarke

..... Date.....06.09.2021.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Environment & Neighbourhoods

Significant decisions - Delegated Action - For Reporting to Cabinet on 14th September 2021

◆ denotes background papers are Exempt.

No	Date approved by Director	Title	Decision
1.	9 th July 2021	Marsh Lane – Construction Award Name Correction – John Graham Construction Ltd	To acknowledge that the contractors name was incorrectly stated in the award report presented to Cabinet Member for Children’s Services on the 10th March 2020 as noted in ‘Minutes of Meeting Cabinet, item 213’ from John Graham (Dromore) Ltd t/a Graham Construction to John Graham Construction Ltd. Amendment made under delegated approval by Head of Major Projects On behalf of Environment and Neighbourhoods – Director – Stephen McDonnell
2.	23 rd July 2021	Final approval on the application by Krank Events Ltd to hire Finsbury Park for two consecutive food and music festival weekends in August 2021	That the Director of Environment & Neighbourhoods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes and takes due account of the contents of the report dated 23rd March 2021 to the then Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Equalities & Leisure as part of the decision-making process. • Notes and takes due account of the comments received from the Interim Director of Public Health as part of the decision-making process. • Grants final approval to the Applicant to hire Finsbury Park to host two consecutive food and music festival weekends on 7th & 8th August, and 14th & 15th August 2021.
3.	19 th August 2021	Award of Corporate Stationery and Paper Contract	The Director for Environment & Neighbourhoods approves the award of a call-off contract to Lyreco UK Ltd from The National Public Sector Workplace Supplies and Services Framework for a period of 3 years with an estimated contract value of £259,000, with the option to extend for up to a further twelve months for an estimated value of £86,000 (a total estimated contract value of £345,000) In accordance with CSOs 7.01.b (selecting one or more suppliers from a framework).and CSO 9.07.1.c (A Director may award a contract valued less than £500,000).
4.	10 th August 2021	Increased investment in gully cleaning and maintenance in 2021/22	To agree the additional in-year funding of £226,500 in revenue and £175,000 in capital.

Delegated Action

Type	Number

Corporate Board Officer/ Signature
Date.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is exempt

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is exempt

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is exempt

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is exempt

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is exempt

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is exempt

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is exempt

This page is intentionally left blank