

# **MINUTES OF MEETING CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY 7 DECEMBER 2021, 6.30-8.55PM**

## **PRESENT:**

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

**Also attending: Zina Etheridge (Chief Executive), Fiona Alderman (Head of Legal & Governance, Monitoring Officer), Jon Warlow (Director of Finance), David Joyce (Director for Housing, Regeneration & Planning), Rob Krzyszowski (Assistant Director for Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability), Peter O'Brien (Assistant Director for Regeneration & Economic Development), Thomas Skeen (Assistant Director of Finance), Mark Baigent (Programme Manager), Joe Baker (Head of Carbon Management) and Felicity Foley (Committees Manager)**

## **666. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

## **667. APOLOGIES**

None.

## **668. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

There was late business to be considered in relation to items 9 & 10. An addendum was been published and circulated to the Cabinet, and made available on the Council's website.

At item 9, legal comments were omitted in error from the published report and there is a statutory requirement for the Cabinet to consider these comments when taking a decision.

At item 10, there was additional information that the Cabinet Member will refer to in their introduction to the report.

## **669. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor das Neves declared an interest in respect of item 11 – Bounds Green Low Traffic Neighbourhood, as she lived on a directly affected road.

Councillors Chandwani and Davies declared an interest in respect of item 12 – St Ann's Low Traffic Neighbourhood, as they lived on a directly affected road.

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

None received.

**671. MINUTES**

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

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

None received.

**673. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

Jacob Secker addressed the Cabinet on behalf of the Broadwater Farm Residents Association. He requested that Cabinet reject the proposals for Broadwater Farm as they would lead to a large increase in rent for new homes which would negatively affect current and potential tenants. The proposals were likely to disproportionately affect people from BAME backgrounds. The report adopted a dismissive attitude to those who would not be able to afford the new, more expensive homes and instead argued that they would not have to move into the new homes if they could not afford the rent. Mr Secker stated that this would expose the Council to challenge under the equality act, as no one should be prevented from renting council housing due to low income.

Mr Secker referred to the EQIA, which set out that the rent for the new homes could be up to 50% of market rent – which for a 3 bedroom property would be beyond the social rent cap. Page 179 of the report set out clearly that people from BAME backgrounds could be disproportionately affected by the rent increase, and the mitigations set out were considered by Mr Secker to be absurd. He added that the proposals for the estate were discriminatory and asked the Council to reconsider the plans, set rents equal to current rents, and, given the inequality of proposals, appoint an independent lawyer with a strong background in equalities and civil rights to oversee the whole process, including the letting of the new homes.

In response to the deputation, Councillor Bevan stated that some of the cost to regenerate would need to be recovered by increased rents. He asked Mr Secker whether he had an alternative suggestion on how to recover the costs without

increasing the rents. Mr Secker responded that it was not known whether the people in the most housing need would be able to access the new properties due to the higher rents, and that residents were told in 2018 that funds would be available to build all of the new homes.

The Cabinet Member for House Building, Place-Making and Development responded to the deputation. The proposal was to build 300 homes at 100% Council rents. The estate currently had 10% family homes, which would increase to 30%. The EQIA report stated that overall there would be a positive impact on the BAME community. £100million would be provided by the Housing Revenue Account, and an additional £70million would be invested into refurbishing the remainder of the estate. Every borough in London used the formula set by the Government to calculate rents. The Cabinet Member appealed to the residents association to work with the Council to put the proposals in place and improve Broadwater Farm

**674. BROADWATER FARM ESTATE, DESIGNS FOR NEW HOMES AND IMPROVEMENTS, LANDLORD OFFER, BALLOT AND BALLOT PROGRAMME, RELOCATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES**

The Cabinet Member for House Building, Place-Making and Development introduced the report which provided an update on the partnership work between the Council and the Broadwater Farm Estate community to develop placemaking design proposals. The report also sought approval of the key principles of the preferred design and ground floor strategy alongside the key commitments to residents which would form part of a Landlord Offer, and approval to proceed to a resident ballot on the Broadwater Farm Estate.

The Cabinet Member responded to questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison:

- Residents would be provided with indicative rents before the ballot, however this would be with the caveat that rents would be set according to the formula at the time of letting the properties.
- There was a 'no' vote, a new scheme would have to be started from scratch. Tangmere and Northolt blocks were due to be demolished for health and safety reasons, and would leave a large space in the estate.
- There were 28 leasehold properties, with resident leaseholders entitled to the right to return. Not all were resident leaseholders however, so the maximum number of leaseholders who could return would be 28 but this number may be lower.

**RESOLVED that Cabinet**

1. Note and consider the feedback from consultations with residents and the wider community, including those required under Section 105, on the design of the new homes and associated improvements on Broadwater Farm, as described in paragraphs 6.8 to 6.26 and set out in Appendix A.
2. Approve the following:

- a) The key principles of the Urban Design Framework (UDF) as described in paragraphs 6.27 to 6.35 and the summary draft UDF document in Appendix B
  - b) The key principles of the preferred design for new homes, as described in paragraph 6.37 and the summary document in Appendix C, that will be voted on by residents in the ballot referred to in recommendation 3.2 (e)
  - c) The commitments of the Broadwater Farm Landlord Offer as set out in paragraph 6.70.
  - d) The principles of the proposed Rent Strategy for the new homes on the estate, as set out in paragraphs 6.77 to 6.85.
  - e) A ballot be undertaken of eligible current and former Broadwater Farm residents based on the approved design and the Broadwater Farm Landlord Offer, described in paragraphs 6.72 to 6.76.
  - f) The inclusion of the Enterprise Centre, Broadwater Farm Medical Centre and the former Moselle School as development sites within the design proposals, as described in paragraphs 6.41 to 6.64.
3. Delegate authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housebuilding, Placemaking and Development, to:
- a) Approve the final ballot materials, including the final Landlord Offer document and the final ballot programme.
  - b) Approve the final detailed design and subsequent submission of a full planning application, based on the design principles referred to in recommendation 2(b) and subject to the outcome of the ballot referred to in recommendation 2(e).

### **Reasons for decision**

The demolition of Tangmere and Northolt blocks was, following consultation, agreed by Cabinet in November 2018. This was deemed to be the only viable option following the discovery of serious structural defects in those blocks. A commitment to replace the council rented homes lost on the estate with new council homes was made to those residents affected at the time.

Since then, the Council has been working closely with residents and the wider community to develop designs for and deliver the most comprehensive and wide-reaching Estate Improvements programme within the estate's history. This is a unique opportunity to transform the quality of life on the estate and deliver new homes, new streets, new public realm, and new social infrastructure as part of an ambitious long-term vision for the estate. The improvements will deliver on the community's priorities and aspirations that have been identified through extensive engagement efforts.

This report sets out the commitments that will be made to residents in the Landlord Offer and how the proposed designs will deliver on these commitments. The report will authorise a ballot of Broadwater Farm residents, in accordance with GLA funding requirements, ensuring that they have the final say on whether the proposals deliver on their priorities and commitments made to them. If this is successful, then the report will authorise officers to progress with a detailed planning application and enable the delivery of this once in a generation, transformational project.

## **Alternative Options Considered**

Officers considered the following alternative options to those recommended in the report:

### **Option to not hold ballot and build new homes**

The option to not hold a ballot was rejected. While an exemption to a ballot was obtained from the GLA for the replacement homes funding, a commitment was made by the Council to residents to allow them to have a say on the proposals. Since then, the inclusion of the Stapleford North block in the preferred design means a ballot is now a condition of the GLA grant funding for the new homes.

The new homes must be delivered to replace the social rented homes. This was a key commitment to residents during the initial consultations on demolition of the Tangmere and Northolt blocks. The buildings must be demolished for safety reasons and this has already been consulted upon with residents and approved by Cabinet. Not replacing the homes would result in a net loss in council homes in the borough and the Council and residents would be left with an empty site and the costs and issues associated with that.

The recommended option is to therefore proceed with the project to deliver new homes and ballot residents on the proposals.

### **Option not to adopt rent strategy**

The rent strategy for residents opting to exercise the right to return is in line with commitments the council has made on regeneration schemes elsewhere, ensuring that where residents are moved and their homes demolished, they are able to return to the estate on similar terms to their previous tenancy. The rent strategy for all homes let to council tenants beyond those opting to exercise the right to return is in line with the Council's rent strategy on new lettings borough wide.

The recommended option is to therefore adopt the proposed rent strategy.

### **Option to not relocate the Enterprise Units and medical centre**

The proposals for Broadwater Farm provide an excellent opportunity to relocate the current Enterprise Centre units and medical centre facilities in new, high-quality, easily accessible buildings and address the issues associated with the current buildings and environment, as described in more detail in paragraphs 6.49 to 6.56 below. It also offers the opportunity to provide more housing, improved public realm alongside higher quality infrastructure from which opportunities and services can be delivered for the community.

Retaining the buildings would mean these opportunities are lost, resulting in a poorer outcome in terms of opportunities and services for residents, urban design, and delivery of council housing.

Demolishing but not re-providing the facilities is not an option. The Enterprise Centre units are subject to a court order requiring the council to re-provide them. The medical

centre provides an essential service to residents and the Council is committed to maintaining this provision on the estate.

The recommended option is to therefore demolish and re-provide the Enterprise Centre units and medical centre as part of the new development. This will provide a better outcome for residents, users of the facilities and the Council.

## **675. BRUCE GROVE / WEST GREEN LOW TRAFFIC NEIGHBOURHOOD**

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report which sought approval of the principle to implement the Bruce Grove West Green Low Traffic Neighbourhood (Bruce Grove West Green LTN) experimental scheme and a range of complementary measures including new pedestrian crossings, cycle hangars and four trial School Streets. The LTN aimed to reduce or remove non-local motor traffic from residential areas of Bruce Grove and West Green, as well as reduce the number of short trips made by vehicles which could be walked or cycled. If approved, the proposed Bruce Grove West Green LTN would be implemented on a trial basis for a maximum of 18 months under an experimental traffic management order.

The Cabinet Member referred to the information provided in the late business addendum:

“As part of the work to prepare for the implementation of the Bruce Grove and West Green Low Traffic Neighbourhood, the Council will carry out further engagement with residents on Broadwater Farm and the surrounding streets, the Emergency Services, including the local police team and the Council’s Community Safety, Highways and Transport officers. This engagement will explore concerns including those which relate to the impact of the proposals on resident safety and crime and consideration will be given to making amendments in response.”

The Cabinet Member responded to questions from the Cabinet:

- The implementation of a scheme like this was an unprecedented move in many ways. A detailed and expansive engagement process had been carried out, which included a survey for disabled users, resulting in the inclusion of an exemption scheme. This showed a good example of where officers had worked hard to make sure the scheme was as inclusive as possible.
- All issues raised by residents and organisations would be taken seriously. Officers had carried out 11 months of engagement, and would look to improve engagement where possible based on lessons learned.

Cabinet Members spoke in support of the scheme and highlighted the importance ensuring the schemes were inclusive for all.

The Cabinet Member responded to questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison:

- One key aim of the scheme was to reduce overall volume of traffic, which would improve journey times. There would be an exemption for special

dispensations and the team would work with Childrens and Adults services to identify where exemption / dispensations were required.

**RESOLVED that Cabinet**

1. Notes the responses received to the proposed Bruce Grove West Green Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) as part of Engagement Stage 1 (Early Engagement), Engagement Stage 2 (Community Design Workshops) and Engagement Stage 3 (Public Consultation) as set out in Appendices E and K;
2. Approves the making of an experimental traffic management order to implement the Bruce Grove West Green LTN experimental scheme, as set out on the plan in Appendix L, subject to funding, and provided that any changes to the plan in Appendix L are reported back to the Leader, Cabinet or an individual Cabinet member for approval before being implemented;
3. Approves the making of an experimental traffic management order to implement the School Streets, as set out on the plan in Appendix L, subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements and detailed engineering drawings to implement the traffic control measures show on the plan;
4. Approves the bike hangars, as set out on the plan in Appendix L, subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements and detailed engineering drawings;
5. Approves the pedestrian crossings, as set out on the plan in Appendix L, subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements and detailed engineering drawings;
6. In relation to the LTN only, approve the exemption of:
  - a. Blue Badge holders living within the LTN or on its immediate boundary;
  - b. Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) transport; and
  - c. Essential Haringey Council services catering for people with a disabilityto non-hard closure filters in the Bruce Grove West Green LTN experimental scheme, as per paragraph 6.80 of this report.
7. Delegates approval to the Director of Environment & Neighbourhoods to agree the engineering drawings for the experimental traffic management orders for the Bruce Grove West Green LTN and School Streets and the engineering drawings for the bike hangars and pedestrian crossings, set out in recommendations B to E, provided any changes to the Plan in Appendix L do not need to be reported back to the Leader, Cabinet or an individual Cabinet member as a key decision;

8. Authorises the Director of Environment & Neighbourhoods, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency, to modify or suspend the operation of the experimental traffic management orders for the Bruce Grove West Green LTN and/or School Streets if it appears to the Director essential in the interests of the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic or for providing suitable and adequate on-street parking facilities, or for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which any road affected by the order runs provided any decision to modify or suspend does not need to be reported back to the Leader, Cabinet or an individual Cabinet member as a key decision.

### **Reasons for decision**

The proposed Bruce Grove West Green LTN has been developed over 10 months informed by a significant amount of engagement with local residents and other key stakeholders. In early 2021, the Council began early engagement with residents and businesses on the proposed Bruce Grove LTN. The most common issues raised by respondents were 'traffic speeding', 'traffic volume' and 'rat-running traffic.' The most common suggested improvements from respondents were 'reduce traffic volume', 'reduce traffic speeds' and 'increase traffic and speeding enforcement'. Having regard to strong feedback received that the proposed Bruce Grove LTN should be extended westwards to include the area between Belmont Road/Downhills Way, West Green Road and Westbury Avenue, the Council began to work up an expanded proposal for a Bruce Grove West Green LTN. A series of Bruce Grove West Green LTN design proposals were subsequently developed to help address the concerns raised. Engagement was carried out on these in May 2021 via online Community Design Workshops.

From 16 August 2021 to Friday 17 September 2021, a public consultation was held on the preferred design options. There was an overall positive response to the Council proposing to reduce motor vehicle traffic in the Bruce Grove West Green LTN but, when people were asked how they felt about the proposed changes in each of the two areas within the proposed Bruce Grove West Green LTN, there was an overall negative response. While some people opposed the principle of the proposed scheme, many supported the principles behind the Bruce Grove West Green LTN but had concerns about the Council's specific approach. In response to specific concerns raised, the Council has made a number of post-consultation changes to the proposed Bruce Grove West Green LTN as well as proposed a number of exemptions to the traffic restrictions. Other key concerns of those opposing the Bruce Grove West Green LTN are noted, particularly increased traffic on main roads, followed by concerns around increased car journey times and increased air pollution on main roads, including near schools. However, by taking a phased implementation of delivering the School Streets, pedestrian crossing facilities and bike hangars first and monitoring the impact of these, potential traffic displacement mitigation measures can

be better identified and deployed, in conjunction with any changes within the Bruce Grove West Green LTN. It is also the case that people without access to a car were underrepresented within respondents. Such people were found to be much more positive about the Bruce Grove West Green LTN than those who own or have access to a car.

Introducing the Bruce Grove West Green LTN is expected to result in the adjustment of motor vehicle travel behaviour of both those living within the LTN and those living outside. Some drivers will adjust routes and behaviour to avoid the Bruce Grove West Green LTN area, switch to walking, cycling or public transport or even reduce the number of journeys. The proposed Bruce Grove West Green LTN will contribute to reducing through-traffic in the area; it will also help encourage residents who currently make trips by motor vehicle to switch some local journeys to more sustainable travel modes. A substantial proportion of locally-generated motor vehicle trips (i.e. by Haringey residents) are short. TfL data indicates that over 60% of such trips (accounting for those that are essential/cannot be made by other means, e.g. due to a physical or other disability) could be made by cleaner, more sustainable modes. By making some local motor vehicle trips slightly less attractive (e.g. slightly longer due to restrictions in certain places) and walking/cycling much more attractive (by reducing dominance of vehicle traffic on these streets), a switch from the former to the latter will be encouraged.

Transport is the third largest source of emissions in the borough yet less than half of Haringey households have access to a car or van and this figure is falling. Census data from 2011 shows that household access across the area to cars or vans is low. 59% of households in Bruce Grove ward and 57% of households in West Green ward do not have access to a car or van. This means that that the majority of households in the area do not benefit from the large amount of space on the public highway which currently enables rat-running.

A range of assessments have been carried out to understand the potential impacts of the proposed Bruce Grove West Green LTN. The Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) showed that the measures are likely to advance equalities for many protected groups, albeit with a small disadvantage noted for those solely reliant on motor vehicles for transport. On balance, the scheme is considered to promote equality of opportunity among protected groups.

Under the Traffic Management Act 2004, Haringey Council has a 'network management duty' under section 16 in its capacity as local traffic authority. In simple terms the duty is to secure "the expeditious movement of traffic including pedestrians on the authority's road network".

A high-level transport assessment was prepared for the Bruce Grove West Green LTN which predicted a reduction in motorised vehicular traffic within the proposed Bruce

Grove West Green LTN and a range of a range of potential negative impacts on motorised vehicular traffic on certain parts of the boundary roads and at certain times (from a 0-50% increase to a 100%+ increase). However, it should be noted this is only a prediction and was based on the worst-case assumption that all motorised vehicular traffic reassigns to the nearest available route and assumed that the boundary roads are able to accommodate additional motorised vehicular traffic. There are varying levels of spare capacity in those boundary roads. Early reviews by Sustrans of 6 trial LTNs across London have shown a general reduction in traffic over time within the LTNs with a mixed picture for the boundary roads. It is only possible to accurately understand impacts of the proposals on the highway network once the scheme is in place. The scheme is proposed to be implemented on a trial basis supported by a comprehensive monitoring programme covering traffic flows and pedestrian flows, bus journey times, emergency response times, and air quality. It should be noted that 'traffic' includes motorised and non-motorised travel modes and it is considered that the Council would not be in breach of its network management duty in implementing the Bruce Grove West LTN, provided that it is phased appropriately including having regard to other LTNs proposed to be taken forward by the Council (Bounds Green and St Ann's) and considering possible mitigation measures to counter the extent of negative impact on its boundary roads.

The Department for Transport's statutory guidance on the Traffic Management Act 2004: network management to support recovery from COVID-19 (last updated 30 July 2021) sets out that, following the pandemic, local authorities are expected to continue to reallocate road space to people walking and cycling including through measures such as modal filters which can create low-traffic or traffic-free neighbourhoods.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

The alternative options available to the Council are:

Option 1: Implement an alternate design for the Bruce Grove West Green LTN. The original design for the LTN excluded the area bounded by Belmont Road/Downhills Way, West Green Road and Westbury Avenue. Proceeding with the original option is rejected because it does not take account of strong community feedback at Engagement Stage 1 (early engagement) to include this area with the proposed Bruce Grove West Green LTN

Option 2: Implement the Bruce Grove West Green LTN in a geographically-phased way – i.e. segmenting the area into discrete parts. Although this would enable the funding currently available to be used to implement full LTN measures in one or more parts of the LTN (e.g. the West Green element, a western section of Bruce Grove – say, Belmont Road/Downhills Way to Mount Pleasant Road - and an eastern section of Bruce Grove – say, Mount Pleasant Road to Bruce Grove/High Road), the effect would merely be to temporarily displace rat-running through-traffic to slightly fewer

roads within the overall Bruce Grove West Green LTN and therefore exacerbate the problems currently experienced on those roads, particularly by their residents. However, the selection of which parts to proceed with and which ones should be deferred until sufficient funding was available would be arbitrary and, for the most part, would represent a slight variation of Option 1 in terms of timing and coverage. Furthermore, additional cost would be incurred in creating any such discrete parts, delaying the rate at which the full Bruce Grove West Green LTN could be created.

Option 3: Not to implement an LTN in Bruce Grove West Green i.e. 'Do Nothing'. This option is discounted as would not: reduce pollution; reduce motor traffic collisions; reduce carbon emissions; reclaim neighbourhood streets for pedestrians and communities; support active travel modes and therefore improved health outcomes; address inequalities with impacts felt disproportionately by those who do not own a car.

## **676. BOUNDS GREEN LOW TRAFFIC NEIGHBOURHOOD**

*Clerks note: Councillor das Neves left the meeting for the consideration of this item.*

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report which sought approval of the principle to implement the Bounds Green Low Traffic Neighbourhood (Bounds Green LTN) experimental scheme and a range of complementary measures including new pedestrian crossings, cycle hangars and four trial School Streets. The LTN aimed to reduce or remove non-local motor traffic from residential areas of Bounds Green, as well as reduce the number of short trips made by vehicles which could be walked or cycled. If approved, the proposed Bounds Green LTN would be implemented on a trial basis for a maximum of 18 months under an experimental traffic management order.

The Cabinet Member responded to questions from the Cabinet:

- If approved, the aim would be to implement the scheme as soon as possible in the new year.

The Cabinet Member and Officers responded to questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison:

- Signage for the schemes would be absolutely clear for drivers entering into the areas. It was common for fines to be high at the introduction of new schemes, but these petered out once drivers were used to the new measures.
- Officers would be monitoring traffic volumes carefully across the borough to improve the information on traffic across the borough. The report packs contained the high-level traffic assessment and would help to inform where mitigations may or may not be necessary.

Councillor Cawley-Harrison added that the Alexandra Ward Councillors strongly supported the proposals.

**RESOLVED that Cabinet**

1. Notes the responses received to the proposed Bounds Green Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) as part of Engagement Stage 1 (Early Engagement), Engagement Stage 2 (Community Design Workshops) and Engagement Stage 3 (Public Consultation) as set out in Appendices E and K including the petition submitted by residents living within the proposed area C of the Bounds Green LTN (Appendix L);
2. Approves the making of an experimental traffic management order to implement the Bounds Green LTN experimental scheme, as set out on the plan in Appendix M, subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements and detailed engineering drawings to implement the traffic control measures shown on the plan;
3. Approves the making of an experimental traffic management order to implement the School Streets, as set out on the plan in Appendix M, subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements and detailed engineering drawings to implement the traffic control measures shown on the plan;
4. Approves the implementation of bike hangars, as set out on the plan in Appendix M, subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements and detailed engineering drawings;
5. Approve the implementation of pedestrian crossings, as set out on the plan in Appendix M, subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements and detailed engineering drawings;
6. In relation to the LTN only, approve the exemption of:
  - a. Blue Badge holders living within the LTN or on its immediate boundary;
  - b. Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) transport; and
  - c. Essential Haringey Council services catering for people with a disability to non-hard closure filters in the Bounds Green LTN experimental scheme as per paragraph 6.77 of this report.
7. Delegates approval to the Director of Environment & Neighbourhoods to agree the engineering drawings for the experimental traffic management orders for the Bounds Green LTN and School Streets and the engineering drawings for the bike hangars and pedestrian crossings, set out in recommendations B to E provided any changes to the Plan in Appendix M do not need to be reported back to the Leader, Cabinet or an individual Cabinet member as a key decision;

8. Authorises the Director of Environment & Neighbourhoods, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency, to modify or suspend the operation of the experimental traffic management orders for the Bounds Green LTN and/or School Streets if it appears to the Director essential in the interests of the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic or for providing suitable and adequate on-street parking facilities, or for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which any road affected by the order runs provided any decision to modify or suspend does not need to be reported back to the Leader, Cabinet or an individual Cabinet member as a key decision.

### **Reasons for decision**

The proposed Bounds Green LTN has been developed over 10 months informed by a significant amount of engagement with local residents and other key stakeholders. In early 2021, the Council began early engagement with residents and businesses on the proposed Bounds Green LTN. The most common issue raised by respondents was 'Air Quality Concerns', followed by 'Traffic Congestion' and 'Traffic Volumes.' The most commonly suggested improvement from respondents was 'Reduce Traffic Volumes', followed by 'Measures to Improve Air Quality' and 'Reduce Traffic Speeds.' Having regard to this feedback, a series of Bounds Green LTN design proposals were developed to help address the concerns raised. Engagement was carried out on these in May 2021 via online Community Design Workshops. Based on feedback received at Engagement Stage 2 a preferred design option was developed including a greater element of camera enforced filters versus physical filters.

From 16 August 2021 to Friday 17 September 2021, a public consultation was held on the preferred design options. Although there was an overall negative response to the changes proposed, including an overall negative response from residents living within each of the three areas of the proposed Bounds Green LTN, these headlines conceal a variety of different viewpoints on the Bounds Green LTN. While some people were opposed to the Bounds Green LTN in its totality, many negative responses reflected concerns that, as currently designed, the proposed Bounds Green LTN would not produce the desired objectives of the Council. In relation to Areas B and C of the proposed Bounds Green LTN, a lot of objections related to residents' rejection of a full-time LTN and a preference for a time-based LTN. A time-based LTN is not supported by the Council as a consequential change in behaviour could simply be a shift in commuting travel times (i.e. to off-peak), it will not reduce existing levels of non-local through-traffic (i.e. off-peak rat-running) and it does not encourage the shift to walking, cycling and other sustainable modes of transport. Furthermore, there are spikes in traffic flows that occur outside of peak hours which, combined with the timed approach that applies to School Streets, would make general understanding of the hours of operation of any LTN extremely challenging. In response to specific concerns

raised, the Council has made a number of post-consultation changes to the proposed Bounds Green LTN as well as proposed a number of exemptions to the traffic restrictions. Other key concerns of those opposing the Bounds Green LTN are noted, particularly concerns around increased traffic on main roads, increasing air pollution and longer journey times. However, it is considered that these can be mitigated through monitoring and addressed through changes to the trial Bounds Green LTN if necessary. It is also the case that people without access to a car were significantly underrepresented within respondents. Such people were found to be much more positive about the Bounds Green LTN than those who own or have access to a car.

Introducing the Bounds Green LTN is expected to result in the adjustment of motor vehicle travel behaviour of both those living within the LTN and those living outside. Some drivers will adjust routes and behaviour to avoid the Bounds Green LTN area, switch to walking, cycling or public transport or even reduce the number of journeys. The proposed Bounds Green LTN scheme will contribute to reducing through-traffic in the area; it will also help encourage residents who currently make trips by motor vehicle to switch some local journeys to more sustainable travel modes. A substantial proportion of locally-generated motor vehicle trips (i.e. by Haringey residents) are short. TfL data indicates that over 60% of such trips (accounting for those that are essential/cannot be made by other means, e.g. due to a physical or other disability) could be made by cleaner, more sustainable modes. By making some local motor vehicle trips slightly less attractive (e.g. slightly longer due to restrictions in certain places) and walking/cycling much more attractive (by reducing dominance of vehicle traffic on these streets), a switch from the former to the latter will be encouraged.

Transport is third largest source of emissions in the borough yet less than half of Haringey households have access to a car or van and this figure is falling. Census data from 2011 shows that household access across the area to cars or vans is low. 52% of households in Bounds Green ward, 54% of households Woodside and 27% of households in Alexandra ward do not have access to a car or van. This means that a large proportion of households in the area do not benefit from the large amount of space on the public highway which currently enables rat-running traffic.

A range of assessments have been carried out to understand the potential impacts of the proposed Bounds Green LTN. The Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) showed that the measures are likely to advance equalities for many protected groups, albeit with a small disadvantage noted for those solely reliant on motor vehicles for transport. On balance, the scheme is considered to promote equality of opportunity among protected groups.

Under the Traffic Management Act 2004, Haringey Council has a 'network management duty' under section 16 in its capacity as local traffic authority. In simple terms, the duty is to secure "the expeditious movement of traffic including pedestrians on the authority's road network".

A high-level transport assessment was prepared for the Bounds Green LTN which predicted a reduction in motorised vehicular traffic within the proposed Bounds Green LTN area and slight to moderate potential increases in traffic on some boundary roads (0-25%). However, it should be noted this is only a prediction and was based on the worst-case assumption that all motorised vehicular traffic reassigns to the nearest available route and assuming the boundary roads are able to accommodate additional motorised vehicular traffic. Early reviews by Sustrans of 6 trial LTNs across London have shown a general reduction in traffic over time within the LTNs with a mixed picture for the boundary roads. It is only possible to accurately understand impacts of the proposals on the highway network once the scheme is in place. The scheme is proposed to be implemented on a trial basis, supported by a comprehensive monitoring programme covering traffic flows, bus journey times, emergency response times, and air quality. It should be noted that 'traffic' includes motorised and non-motorised travel modes and it is considered that the Council would not be in breach of its network management duty in implementing the Bounds Green LTN in its entirety.

The Department for Transport's statutory guidance on the Traffic Management Act 2004: network management to support recovery from COVID-19 (last updated 30 July 2021) sets out that, following the pandemic, local authorities are expected to continue to reallocate road space to people walking and cycling, including through measures such as modal filters which can create low-traffic or traffic-free neighbourhoods.

A key reason to implement areas A and B of the proposed Bounds Green LTN is to mitigate impacts of the Bowes Primary Area Quieter Neighbourhood LTN which has been implemented directly adjacent within the London Borough of Enfield. The Bounds Green LTN has been designed having regard to the Bowes Primary Area Quieter Neighbourhood LTN and is required to mitigate a range of impacts which are occurring within Haringey due to the adjacent LTN.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

The alternative options available to the Council are:

Option 1: Implement an alternate design for the Bounds Green LTN. Two options were worked up for Community Design Workshops at Engagement Stage 2 but, following community feedback, a third option was worked up and consulted on at Engagement Stage 3. The initial options are discounted because they do not fully take account of community feedback that there should be a greater focus on camera filters as opposed to physical filters.

Option 2: A petition was submitted in respect of Area C of the Bounds Green LTN which advocates an alternative LTN comprising timed cameras closing the area to all through-traffic, including residents, at school times and other peak periods only and

only on weekdays. This option is rejected because the consequential change in behaviour could simply be a shift in commuting travel times (i.e. to off-peak), it will not reduce existing levels of non-local through-traffic (i.e. off-peak rat-running) and it does not encourage the shift to walking, cycling and other sustainable modes of transport. Furthermore, there are spikes in traffic flows that occur outside of peak hours which, combined with the timed approach that applies to School Streets, would make general understanding of the hours of operation of any LTN extremely challenging. These factors would inhibit the introduction of any time-based LTN.

Option 3: Implement the Bounds Green LTN in part i.e. do not implement one or more of the three areas within the proposed Bounds Green LTN. It is considered necessary to implement areas A and B of the Bounds Green LTN in order to mitigate impacts of the Bowes Primary Area Quieter Neighbourhood LTN which has been implemented directly adjacent within the London Borough of Enfield. It is also considered necessary to implement area C of the Bounds Green LTN as the roads within this area are being used rather than remaining on Durnsford Road and Bounds Green Road. All roads within area C are accessible from these main roads but this invariably will require passing through the Durnsford Road/Bounds Green Road traffic-signal controlled junction, lengthening journey time.

Option 4: Not to implement an LTN in Bounds Green i.e. 'Do Nothing'. This option would not mitigate impacts of the Bowes Primary Area Quieter Neighbourhood LTN which has been implemented adjacent to the proposed Bounds Green LTN within the London Borough of Enfield. The Bounds Green LTN has been designed having regard to the Bowes Primary Area Quieter Neighbourhood LTN and is required to mitigate a range of impacts within Haringey. The option to do nothing is discounted as it would not: address the impacts of the adjacent LTN with Enfield and it would not reduce pollution; reduce motor traffic collisions; reduce carbon emissions; reclaim neighbourhood streets for pedestrians and communities; support active travel modes and therefore improved health outcomes; address inequalities with impacts felt disproportionately by those who do not own a car.

## **677. ST ANN'S LOW TRAFFIC NEIGHBOURHOOD**

*Clerks note: Councillors Chandwani and Davies left the meeting for the consideration of this item.*

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report which sought approval of the principle to implement the St Ann's Low Traffic Neighbourhood (St Ann's LTN) experimental scheme and a range of complementary measures including new pedestrian crossings, cycle hangars and four trial School Streets. The LTN aimed to reduce or remove non-local motor traffic from residential areas of St Ann's, as well as reduce the number of short trips made by vehicles which could be walked or cycled. If

approved, the proposed Bounds Green LTN would be implemented on a trial basis for a maximum of 18 months under an experimental traffic management order.

The Cabinet Member and Officers responded to questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison:

- Engagement had been an issue with this scheme, with majority of people responding to the consultation were car owners and therefore felt that the scheme would negatively impact them. It was important that non-car owners were engaged with to gain additional views on the scheme.
- In terms of the impact on Green Lanes, there was a separate study which would look at how the movement of public transport and active travel could be facilitated. Paragraph 6.93 of the report provided further information.
- Once the trials had been implemented, there were delegated powers for officers to make changes to the scheme to improve the flow of traffic where there were issues in particular areas.

### **RESOLVED that Cabinet**

1. Notes the responses received to the proposed St Ann's Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) as part of Engagement Stage 1 (Early Engagement), Engagement Stage 2 (Community Design Workshops) and Engagement Stage 3 (Public Consultation) as set out in Appendices E and K;
2. Approves the making of the experimental traffic management order to implement the St Ann's LTN experimental scheme, as set out on the plan in Appendix L, subject to funding, and provided that any changes to the plan in Appendix L are reported back to the Leader, Cabinet or an individual Cabinet member for approval before being implemented;
3. Approves the making of an experimental traffic management order to implement the School Streets, as set out on the plan in Appendix L, subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements and detailed engineering drawings to implement the traffic control measures show on the plan;
4. Approves the bike hangars, as set out on the plan in Appendix L, subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements and detailed engineering drawings;
5. Approves the pedestrian crossings, as set out on the plan in Appendix L, subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements and detailed engineering drawings;
6. In relation to the LTN only, approve the exemption of:
  - a. Blue Badge holders living within the LTN or on its immediate boundary;
  - b. Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) transport; and

- c. Essential Haringey Council services catering for people with a disability to non-hard closure filters in the St Ann's LTN experimental scheme as per paragraph 6.71 of this report.
7. Delegates approval to the Director of Environment & Neighbourhoods to agree the engineering drawings for the experimental traffic management orders for the St Ann's LTN and School Streets and the engineering drawings for the bike hangars and pedestrian crossings, set out recommendations B to E provided any changes to the Plan in Appendix L do not need to be reported back to the Leader, Cabinet or an individual Cabinet member as a key decision;
8. Authorises the Director of Environment & Neighbourhoods, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency, to modify or suspend the operation of the experimental traffic management orders for the St Ann's LTN and/or School Streets if it appears to the Director essential in the interests of the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic or for providing suitable and adequate on-street parking facilities, or for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which any road affected by the order runs provided any decision to modify or suspend does not need to be reported back to the Leader, Cabinet or an individual Cabinet member as a key decision.

### **Reasons for decision**

The proposed St Ann's LTN has been developed over 10 months informed by a significant amount of engagement with local residents and other key stakeholders. In early 2021, the Council began early engagement with residents and businesses on the proposed LTN. The most common issues raised by respondents were 'traffic speeding', 'poor cycling environment', 'traffic volumes' and 'rat running traffic'. The most common suggested improvements were 'reduce traffic volumes', 'reduce traffic speeds', 'more cycle infrastructure' and 'increase traffic and speeding enforcement'. Following this, a series of St Ann's LTN design proposals were developed to help address the concerns raised. Engagement was carried out on these in May 2021 via online Community Design Workshops.

From 16 August 2021 to Friday 17 September 2021, a public consultation was held on two potential design options (Option A and Option B). Based on the quantitative and qualitative data received as part of the consultation, there was strong support among participants for the introduction of a St Ann's LTN. A clear preference was expressed for Option A which removes all through-traffic from the area. Those who were in support of Option A wanted to see measures introduced that reduce through-traffic in the area to create a quieter and safer environment within the St Ann's LTN, with improvements to air quality and improvements in cycling safety.

It is noted, however, that support for Option A was not universal with some participants expressing strong objections to the introduction of any measures to cut through traffic in the area. In response to specific concerns raised, the Council has made a number of post-consultation changes to the proposed St Ann's LTN as well as proposed a number of exemptions to the traffic restrictions. Other concerns of those opposing the St Ann's LTN (Option A) are noted, particularly displacement of some motorised vehicular traffic to boundary roads, some lengthened journey times and potential increased air pollution on boundary roads. However, by taking a phased implementation of delivering the School Streets, pedestrian crossing facilities and bike hangars first and monitoring the impact of these, potential traffic displacement mitigation measures can be better identified and deployed, in conjunction with any changes within the St Ann's LTN, if necessary.

Introducing the St Ann's LTN is expected to result in the adjustment of motor vehicle travel behaviour of both those living within the LTN and those living outside. Some drivers will adjust routes and behaviour to avoid the St Ann's LTN area, switch to walking, cycling or public transport or even reduce the number of journeys. The proposed St Ann's LTN will contribute to reducing through-traffic in the area; it will also help encourage residents who currently make trips by motor vehicle to switch some local journeys to more sustainable travel modes. A substantial proportion of locally-generated motor vehicle trips (i.e. by Haringey residents) are short. TfL data indicates that over 60% of such trips (accounting for those that are essential/cannot be made by other means, e.g. due to a physical or other disability) could be made by cleaner, more sustainable modes. By making some local motor vehicle trips slightly less attractive (e.g. slightly longer due to restrictions in certain places) and walking/cycling much more attractive (by reducing dominance of vehicle traffic on these streets), a switch from the former to the latter will be encouraged.

Transport is the third largest source of emissions in the borough yet less than half of Haringey households have access to a car or van and this figure is falling. Census data from 2011 shows that household access across the area to cars or vans is low. 60% of households in St Ann's ward, 62% of households in Harringay ward and 65% of households in Tottenham Green ward do not have access to a car or van. This means that the majority of households in the area do not benefit from the large amount of space on the public highway which currently enables rat-running traffic.

A range of assessments have been carried out to understand the potential impacts of the proposed St Ann's LTN. The Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) showed that the measures are likely to advance equalities for many protected groups, albeit with a small disadvantage noted for those solely reliant on motor vehicles for transport. On balance, the scheme is considered to promote equality of opportunity among protected groups.

Under the Traffic Management Act 2004, Haringey Council has a 'network management duty' under section 16 in its capacity as local traffic authority. In simple terms the duty is to secure "the expeditious movement of traffic including pedestrians on the authority's road network".

A high-level transport assessment was prepared for the St Ann's LTN which predicted a reduction in motorised vehicular traffic within the proposed St Ann's LTN area and a range of potential impacts on motorised vehicular traffic (from negative/neutral to 100%+ increase) on certain parts of the boundary roads and at certain times. However, it should be noted this is only a prediction and was based on the worst-case assumption that all motorised vehicular traffic reassigns to the nearest available route and assumed that the boundary roads are able to accommodate additional motorised vehicular traffic. There are varying levels of spare capacity in those boundary roads. Early reviews by Sustrans of 6 trial LTNs across London have shown a general reduction in traffic over time within the LTNs with a mixed picture for the boundary roads. It is only possible to accurately understand impacts of the proposals on the highway network once the scheme is in place. The scheme is proposed to be implemented on a trial basis, supported by a comprehensive monitoring programme covering traffic flows and pedestrian flows, bus journey times, and emergency response times, and air quality. It should be noted that 'traffic' includes motorised and non-motorised travel modes and it is considered that the Council would not be in breach of its network management duty in implementing the St Ann's LTN, provided that it is phased appropriately, including having regard to other LTNs being taken forward by the Council (Bounds Green and Bruce Grove/West Green) and considering possible mitigation measures to counter the extent of negative impact on its boundary roads.

The Department for Transport's statutory guidance on the Traffic Management Act 2004: network management to support recovery from COVID-19 (last updated 30 July 2021) sets out that, following the pandemic, local authorities are expected to continue to reallocate road space to people walking and cycling including through measures such as modal filters which can create low-traffic or traffic-free neighbourhoods.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

The alternative options available to the Council are:

Option 1: Implement an alternate design for the St Ann's LTN. Engagement Stage 3 included public consultation on two LTN Options (Option A and Option B). Implementation of Option B is not recommended as it was not supported by respondents in the public consultation (compared with Option A which was strongly supported) and it also would not eliminate through traffic in the St Ann's area and consequently would not deliver the same benefits as Option A

Option 2: Implement the St Ann's LTN in a geographically-phased way – i.e. segmenting the area into discrete parts. Although this would enable the funding currently available to be used to implement full LTN measures in one or more parts of St Ann's (e.g. from Green Lanes to Black Boy Lane, from Black Boy Lane to Avenue Road and from Avenue Road to Seven Sisters Road), the effect would merely be to temporarily displace north-south through-traffic to slightly fewer roads within the overall St Ann's LTN and therefore exacerbate the problems currently experienced on those roads, particularly by their residents. However, the selection of which parts to proceed with and which ones should be deferred until sufficient funding was available would be arbitrary and, for the most part, would represent a slight variation of Option B. Furthermore, additional cost would be incurred in creating any such discrete parts, delaying the rate at which the full St Ann's LTN could be created.

Option 3: Not to implement an LTN in St Ann's i.e. 'Do Nothing'. This option is discounted as it would not: reduce pollution; reduce motor traffic collisions; reduce carbon emissions; reclaim neighbourhood streets for pedestrians and communities; support active travel modes and therefore improved health outcomes; address inequalities with impacts felt disproportionately by those who do not own a car.

#### **678. DECISION ON THE COUNCIL'S PROPOSAL TO BRING HOMES FOR HARINGEY IN-HOUSE**

The Cabinet Member for Employment, Skills and Corporate Services introduced the report which set out the proposal to insource Homes For Haringey, provided the results of an 8-week resident consultation process, and sought approval to delegate detailed implementation to Council officers.

The Cabinet Member responded to questions from the Cabinet:

- There was a cross-party working group which had met twice, with engagement from both parties. A meeting had also been held with a residents group to seek residents opinions on how the insourcing would take place and how future tenant and leaseholder involvement would look post-insourcing.
- If approved, there would be a systematic project plan with informal and formal legal processes in terms of contracts and staff transfer.

The Cabinet Member responded to questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison:

- It was not possible to confirm whether the residents' scrutiny panel or housing board would continue in the current form as discussions were taking place on what the resident's voice would look like in the future. Different models were being reviewed to look at the best way to engage with residents.
- Bringing services together should enable better service delivery and ensure that delivery is streamlined. This would achieve savings however it was not yet quantified what those savings would be. There would be costs involved with the transfer and it was hoped over time that savings would be achieved to cover those costs and provide re-investment into services in the future.
- One of the reasons for the transfer was to strengthen the Council's ability to respond to the regulations coming forward from the Government 2020 White

Paper, and the Council will need to make sure that performance and value for money information was made available to the Regulator and residents.

### **RESOLVED that the Cabinet**

1. Note and consider the results of the consultation with tenants and leaseholders on the proposal to insource services from Homes for Haringey (see Appendix A), as well as the submission from the Board of Homes for Haringey (see Appendix B).
2. Approve the insourcing of services from Homes for Haringey, based on the rationales set out in the report, with the detailed implementation process delegated to Council officers, including service of a notice to terminate the Management Agreement, finalising the organisational structure for incoming staff and services, staff consultation and transfer under TUPE regulations, transferring budgets and financial processes, and resolving legal issues such as contract novation, ongoing management of leases, support to the Haringey Community Benefit Society, etc. as set out in section 6.7 of the report.
3. Approve co-design and co-production of new resident engagement arrangements, including involvement in policy, operational oversight and scrutiny, with detailed proposals to be brought back for final approval during 2022, as set out in section 6.6 of the report.
4. Approve a virement of £565,000 for the year 2021/22 and note an additional sum of £550,000 required next year, 2022/23, to meet the one-off expenditure needed to complete the transfer processes, as set out in paragraph 6.7.2 of the report.

### **Reasons for decision**

As set out in the 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2021 Cabinet report approving the resident consultation, the proposal to bring HfH back in-house is rooted in four key rationales:

- Robust governance – accountability to the regulators 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.

The July report set out the rationales for insourcing to meet these objectives, as follows.

### **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 are anticipated by eliminating areas of duplication and bringing together Council and HfH back-office services;
- 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 will 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 Council and HfH performance improvement teams 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 Connected Communities;
- Integrated services will be more responsive to external demands, such as the new regime for keeping residents safe in their homes, 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;
- Service integration opportunities have been identified with Adults and Health; Environment and Neighbourhoods; Customers, Transformation and Resources; Housing, Regeneration and Planning.

### **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-design and co-production will lead to increased customer satisfaction.

Having completed a comprehensive resident consultation process and undertaken detailed service review work, the proposal to bring HfH services back under direct Council control and responsibility is now further supported by:

- The majority of residents who expressed an opinion were in agreement with the Council's proposal – see summary below and full report in Appendix A.
- Recognition by the HfH Board of the scope for successful transfer resulting in thriving services – see below and full submission in Appendix B.
- Service integration opportunities have been identified and explored demonstrating scope to achieve efficiencies and improved outcomes for residents – see below.

### **Alternative options considered**

There are a range of different possible approaches to organising and procuring housing management and maintenance services including: transfer ownership to a housing association; transfer management to a housing association; procure a private sector managing agent; bring services in-house; continue with management by HfH.

Transferring ownership would require a positive result in a residents ballot and a financial arrangement to support acquisition by a housing association. Given the current and future stock investment requirements and the constraints on rental income, it is highly unlikely a workable financial arrangement could be arrived at. This approach would be completely at odds with the Council's long term strategic commitment to build 3,000 new council homes in a decade. This option has not been explored in any detail.

Transferring management to a housing association would involve a major procurement process to put in place a long term contract, resulting in a transfer of staff. This approach would require retaining a "client-side" contract management resource in the Council, eliminating one of the key efficiencies achievable by insourcing the HfH services. It would also fail to increase the direct accountability of the Council, a core objective given the impending regulatory changes. This has not been explored in detail.

Procuring a private sector managing agent would also involve a major procurement process to put in place a long term contract, resulting in a transfer of staff. This approach would require retaining a "client-side" contract management resource in the Council, eliminating one of the key efficiencies achievable by insourcing the HfH services. It would also fail to increase the direct accountability of the Council, a core objective given the impending regulatory changes. This has not been explored in detail.

Continued management by HfH would be the status quo option. This would require retaining a “client-side” resource in the Council, eliminating one of the key efficiencies achievable by insourcing the HfH services. It would also fail to increase the direct accountability of the Council, a core objective given the impending regulatory changes. Whilst housing service improvement and integration with other Council services could continue to be pursued by HfH, officers are of the view that there are greater opportunities for improvement and closer integration by insourcing HfH staff and services into the Council.

## **679. 2021/22 FINANCE UPDATE QUARTER 2**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Transformation introduced the report which set out the position at Quarter 2 (Period 6) of the 2021/22 financial year including General Fund (GF) Revenue, Capital, Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budgets. The report focused 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. The Cabinet Member highlighted that the overall general fund revenue position had worsened from the first quarter of the financial year, largely due to the ongoing impacts of Covid on our demand led services. Pandemic related pressures, had stabilised, and it was anticipated that the in-year impact of the pandemic would be offset by various government funding streams. The Council would continue to monitor and report on this throughout the year.

The Cabinet Member and Officers responded to questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison:

- Officers were working to establish the drivers behind the variances – over half of variances related to the direct consequences from Covid, and majority of those would be met in form of emergency grants from the government. The net gap forecasting caused directly by Covid was around £1million. It was worth noting that none of the primary factors around the variances were particular to Haringey. Officers were looking to identify any measures which might go towards responding to the funding gap.
- Court income – the ability to pursue liabilities owed to Authority through the legal system had been impaired by court closures. It was still difficult to get a case before the courts, and this reflected on the Council’s ability to recover arrears and court cost income.

### **RESOLVED that Cabinet**

1. Note the forecast base budget revenue outturn for the General Fund of **£10.2m** 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).
2. Note that the **£12.87m** forecast Covid pressure on the GF is expected to be offset by Government funding (Section 6 and Table 1a).
3. Note the net Housing Revenue Account (HRA) forecast of £1.0m overspend (Section 6 and Appendices 1 and 2).

4. Note the net DSG forecast of £6.98m overspend. (Section 6 and Appendix 1).
5. Note the forecast budget savings position in 2021/22 which indicates that £5.8m (55%) 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.
6. Approve the proposed budget adjustments and virements to the capital programme as set out in Table 2 and Appendix 6.
7. Note the forecast expenditure of £287m in 2021/22 which equates to 62% of the revised capital budget (Section 8 and Appendix 4).
8. To approve the revenue budget virements and receipt of grants as set out in Appendix 6.
9. To note the debt write-offs approved by officers in Quarter 2 2021/22 (Appendix 7).
10. To note the C19 grants schedule (Appendix 8).

### **Reason for Decision**

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

### **Alternative Options Considered**

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

## **680. FEES & CHARGES 2022-23**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Transformation introduced the report which set out the Fees & Charges (F&Cs) that are proposed to be applied to services from the start of 2022/23. The report also sought approval to increase the fee or charge rate to those services where an increase is proposed in line with inflation, and Member's agreement where an alternative approach is being proposed.

The Cabinet Member and Officers responded to questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison:

- New River Leisure was included in the report this year due to the decision taken by Cabinet this year.
- There would be no charges to the public for the use of tennis courts in the coming years.
- This report only dealt with fees and charges increases for the forthcoming year.

Following consideration of exempt information,

**RESOLVED that the Cabinet**

1. Agree the proposed non-statutory fees and charges to be levied by the Council with effect from 1 April 2022, unless otherwise stated, and as detailed in Section 8 and Appendices I – XIII taking into account the findings of equalities assessments as set out in section 10 of the report.
2. Note the statutory fees and charges to be levied by the Council with effect from 1 April 2022.
3. Authorise Officers to proceed to statutory notification or consultation on implementation of proposed changes to parking charges
4. Note that the Council's draft 2022/23 Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2022/23-2026/27 assumes that the changes to Fees & Charges set out in this report are agreed.

**Reasons for Decision**

It is a requirement to review fees and charges as a minimum annually. The financial position of the Council supports the view that levels of fees and charges should be maximised where possible, taking into account all relevant factors including the effect on service users and any consequent demand for services.

**Alternative options considered**

This report summarises the conclusions after consideration of a range of alternative approaches dependent on particular services and relevant factors. As such a range of alternative options ranging from no increase to differentiated rates of increases or decreases have been considered and reflected in this report

**681. 2022-23 BUDGET AND 2022-2027 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY REPORT**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Transformation introduced the report which set out details of the draft General Fund (GF) Budget for 2022/23 and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2022/27, including estimated income (funding) and expenditure adjustments and new and revised capital proposals at a Priority level. The report recommended that budget proposals be released for public consultation and Scrutiny consideration.

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

- The backdrop for this budget was different to previous years – the Government have made some three-year declarations in terms of fundings. The report does point out that there is a short-term improvement in the resourcing of the Authority from the Government. The major increase year on year on resources comes from Council Tax and not from government grants. The local government

financial settlement was due soon and the position may change to the information set out in the report.

- Temporary accommodation was one of the main challenges for the council. There had been lower than normal collection rates due to the difficulties in maintaining the direct relationship with the families concerned, which could affect ensuring that benefit claims and universal credit claims were in place. Officers were working on a piece of work to catch up with current and future years position.
- There was no further information available on how the national capital allocation would be distributed for Special Needs support.

The Cabinet Member and Officers responded to questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison:

- Whenever the Council took on loans, the cost of the loan was factored into the new accounts, along with any other income and outgoings.
- This budget was very different to those of recent years as no new savings were being put forward for consultation. However, there were some level of material savings to be put in place that had been agreed in previous budgets. The medium to longer term financial situation would require some new solutions, which would take time over the next year to be thought through and developed.

#### **RESOLVED that Cabinet**

1. Note the initial General Fund revenue and capital budget proposals and financial planning assumptions set out in this report and note that they will be refined and updated after the final Local Government Finance Settlement is received in January 2022 and also to incorporate further budget changes as required;
2. Note the Draft General Fund 2022/23 Budget and MTFS (2022-27) detailed in this report and Appendix 1;
3. Note the Draft revenue and capital budget growth proposals summarised in Sections 7 and 8 and Appendices 2 and 5;
4. Note the Draft General Fund Capital Programme for 2022/23 to 2026/27 as set out in Appendix 4;
5. Note the Draft Housing Revenue Account (HRA) revenue and Capital Programme proposals and HRA Business Plan as set out in Section 9;
6. Note the 2022/23 Draft Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB) and update on the DSG reserve position set out in Section 10;
7. Note that the detailed proposals will be submitted to Overview and Scrutiny Committee / Panels in December 2021 and January 2022 for scrutiny and comments;
8. Agree to commence consultation with residents, businesses, partners, staff and other groups on the 2022/23 Budget and MTFS 2022-2027;

9. Note that an updated 2022/23 Budget and MTFS (2022-27) will be put to Cabinet on 22nd February 2022 to be recommended for approval to the Full Council meeting taking place on 1st March 2022;
10. Delegate the final decision on whether or not to participate in the proposed 8 borough business rates pool from 1 April 2022 to the Director of Finance in conjunction with the Lead Member for Finance.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Council has a statutory requirement to set a balanced budget for 2022/23 and this report forms a key part of the budget setting process by setting out the forecast funding and expenditure for that year. Additionally, in order to ensure the Council's finances for the medium term are maintained on a sound basis, this report also sets out the funding and expenditure assumptions for the following four years in the form of a Medium Term Financial Strategy.

### **Alternative options considered**

The Cabinet must consider how to deliver a balanced 2022/23 Budget and sustainable MTFS over the five-year period 2022/27, to be reviewed and ultimately adopted at the meeting of Full Council on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2022.

Clearly there are options available to achieve a balanced budget and the Council has developed the proposals contained in this report after determining levels of both income and service provision. These take account of the Council's priorities, the extent of the estimated funding shortfall, the estimated impact of wider environmental factors such as the Covid-19 pandemic and the Council's overall financial position.

These proposals are subject to consultation, both externally and through the Overview & Scrutiny process, and the outcomes of these will inform the final budget proposals.

## **682. DECENTRALISED ENERGY NETWORKS (DEN) OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE (OBC)**

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report which sought approval of the Outline Business Cases for both the Tottenham Hale and Wood Green Decentralised Energy Network (DEN) projects and to accept and release Government funding to progress enabling works and develop the Full Business Case (FBC) which would be brought back to Cabinet in late 2022.

The Cabinet Member and Officers responded to questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison:

- The general principles of the DEN were set out at paragraph 6.39, and it was important to recognise that customers would get significant benefits from this supply, which was benchmarked against the higher carbon alternative. The expectation from all of the modelling and work carried out, which included

sensitivities in terms of fluctuations in prices, was that this option would still remain affordable.

- There were issues with the Southwark DEN, but there were also lots of positive learnings from other DENs. In developing the full business case, all analysis would be taken into account to design the full implementation in Haringey.

Following consideration of exempt information,

**RESOLVED that Cabinet**

1. Notes the progress to date of the Council's DEN to deliver a significant decarbonisation of the borough's developments as outlined in section 6 of this report

**Recommendations related to Tottenham Hale DEN Project**

2. Approves the Outline Business Case at Appendix 2 in respect of the Tottenham Hale DEN, including a link to Broadwater Farm, in order to progress the proposal to FBC
3. Subject to recommendation 2, approves the acceptance of Heat Network Investment Partnership (HNIP) funding (subject to approval of the Funding Agreements at 11 below):
  - a. £1.2m for commercialisation grant funding to develop the proposal to FBC;
  - b. £3.4m of construction grant funding; and
  - c. £12.65m of construction loan to be used to construct the DEN, subject first to approval of the FBC
4. Approves entry by the Council into an Adoption Agreement with Argent LLP for the installation of heat network infrastructure at sites in Tottenham Hale as further described in paragraphs 6.24 to 6.26 of the report and gives delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to finalise the terms of the Adoption Agreement for it to be entered into

**Recommendations related to Wood Green DEN Project**

5. Subject to recommendation 2 (approval of the Tottenham Hale scheme) approves the Outline Business Case at Appendix 2 in respect of the Wood Green DEN and the extension of the link from Broadwater Farm, in order to progress the proposal to FBC
6. Subject to recommendation 5, approves the acceptance of HNIP funding (subject to approval of the Funding Agreements at 11 below):
  - a. £0.85m for commercialisation grant funding in order to develop the proposal to FBC;

b. £7.18m of construction grant funding; and

c. £2.56m construction loan to be used to construct the DEN, subject first to approval of the FBC

### **Recommendations related to both Tottenham Hale and Wood Green**

7. Agrees that officers will develop and negotiate Heat Offtake Agreements with Energetik (purchasing heat) in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders. All agreements will be subject to the approval of the FBC by Cabinet
8. Agrees that officers will develop a proposal for the set-up and governance of an appropriate corporate vehicle (working title Haringey Energy Service Company, HESCO) to deliver the DENs as the heat supplier and manager of the network with a report setting out the proposed delivery structure being brought back to Cabinet for approval once complete
9. Note that officers will negotiate connection and supply agreements (selling heat) with developments in the borough following processes set out in planning agreements and legislative frameworks. All agreements will be subject to the approval of the FBC by Cabinet
10. Note that officers begin communication and consultation with local communities and developers on the delivery of this low carbon infrastructure
11. Subject to recommendations 3 and 6, approves the Funding Agreements at Appendix 3 as described in paragraphs 6.51 to 6.56 and Appendix 4 of the report and gives delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer, to approve any amendments to the Funding Agreements as may be necessary, for reasons including but not limited to ensuring consistency and finalising any outstanding areas.

Exempt recommendations 1-2 are set out in the exempt part of this report.

### **Reasons for decision**

Approving the Outline Business Case in respect of both Tottenham Hale and Wood Green allows the Council to move forward with commitments in the CCAP to deliver the DEN projects and reduce the borough's carbon footprint.

The DEN projects will deliver affordable and secure heat for residents to a good standard of service and provide substantial local air quality and economic/ community wealth building benefits.

There is a window of opportunity created by the scale of ongoing development and availability of central government funding for the Council to act to deliver a DEN in Haringey to ensure the benefits of the borough's DENs are maximised and best aligned with the Council's priorities.

The Tottenham Hale and Wood Green schemes are in the existing energy masterplan along with the North Tottenham DEN which Cabinet approved an OBC for in January 2017.

The next stage of work (the development of the Full Business Case) is 100% Government grant funded presenting a lower risk for the authority and a key incentive for the project. The grant is subject to either 0% clawback, 50% clawback or 100% clawback as set out in section 6.54 of the exempt report.

The recommendations work towards delivering on the Borough Plan commitments to:

- Lead on the delivery of an energy network where more sustainable energy is generated for use within the borough; and
- Explore setting up an alternative local or regional energy savings company(s) that would serve our community by helping to tackle fuel poverty

The recommendation to set up DENs fed from the Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) is based on analysis in the Economic Case of the OBCs showing that this is the most advantageous option. It is also in line with previous analysis in the Council's Decentralised Energy Masterplan and in the Upper Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework which complements the London Plan (see also Section 7. Energetik (Enfield Council's Energy Company) has an exclusive deal in place with the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) to buy heat from the ERF and so the proposed DENs will need to buy energy from Energetik.

The OBCs cover two separate projects for Tottenham Hale and Wood Green. These projects have many synergies which is why a combined OBC has been produced. However it should be noted that whilst the Tottenham Hale scheme could be delivered independently of Wood Green, the Wood Green project is dependent on approval of the Tottenham Hale scheme to progress.

Approving the OBCS is a key step in the project to proceeding with a FBC for both schemes in 2022.

Further detail is set out in paragraphs 4.10 - 4.11 of the exempt part of this report.

## **Alternative options considered**

### **Do Nothing**

This would neither deliver the maximum carbon, air quality and economic benefits to the local area nor meet commitments in the CCAP and Borough Plan. If the Council did not enter this market, due to the planning requirement to deliver communal heating, developers would procure private energy companies to manage their systems. These would most likely be based on gas. As this is currently an unregulated market, any provider could be chosen. As seen already in a few private developments in the borough, this may put residents at risk from a private monopoly where the

private company is focused on increasing profits rather than user's costs. Additional information on other sources of low carbon heat can be found in Appendix R.

### **Seek a smaller DEN Network**

The option for creating a smaller DEN incorporating fewer sites in the Borough was considered and ruled out at this stage. DENs tend to become more viable with size and even the schemes proposed here require grant funding. Smaller schemes would need more grant funding to be viable and HNIP funding criteria specifically favour larger schemes. No viable smaller schemes could be found.

Additionally, the Council has declared a Climate Emergency and is seeking to accelerate decarbonisation to achieve a zero carbon borough by 2041. A smaller scheme would contribute less to this target and ignores the urgency of the need to decarbonise.

### **Seek a larger DEN Network**

There are two ways to seek to deliver a larger DEN; either by seeking to add more customers in the proposed areas or extending the network to larger additional areas.

In terms of adding customers in the areas served by the scheme, a thorough review of potential customers has been conducted. While this identified many smaller existing buildings (including e.g. medium density homes with individual heating systems), the cost of connecting such customers makes it impossible to make an attractive offer at present.

In terms of adding additional areas to the network, the opportunity has been identified to extend the DEN southwards towards St Ann's and Hackney (including Woodberry Down). This opportunity is less time critical than the Tottenham Hale and Wood Green schemes and so can be considered separately in the future. Including it within either of the schemes proposed today would improve the viability but also increase the risk and financial requirement of the scheme. On balance it was considered preferable to seek to deliver the extension opportunity as a potential subsequent project.

Keeping the OBCs focussed to two key growth areas in Tottenham Hale and Wood Green allows significant development of the DEN without it becoming unmanageable. The Wood Green project is entirely dependent on the Tottenham Hale project progressing.

### **Alternative Sources of Heat**

The Council considered several alternative heating systems for the DEN and the borough buildings. Installing individual Heat Pumps is both more expensive to install and more expensive to operate than gas boilers. Furthermore, mass roll out will require a major investment in the national electricity grid. At this time this was considered not a viable option.

Many of the solutions available to decarbonise our buildings are still under development and are not yet market ready. DENs bring opportunities at scale, for example, a DEN could tap into energy sources and ship it (a body of water or an

Energy Recovery Facility), via pipes buried in the ground to heat customers. If heat sources are large enough and cheap enough, and the energy demand is sufficiently dense, it can be a cost-effective solution. While the cost of connecting customers is similar for all heat sources, the cost of supplying them varies and so the network extent will differ depending on choice of heat source.

### **Alternatives to a Council owned energy company including potential for Private Sector led schemes**

A full spectrum of options has been considered for delivery (i.e. acting as the owner/heat supplier) ranging from 100% delivery by a third party (e.g. private sector) organisation to 100% publicly owned and delivered in-house by the Council. These options are detailed in the Commercial Case of the OBCs. Involving a third party in these roles requires the Council to confirm the customer base that will connect (which it is not currently in a position to do) and there is not sufficient time in the programme to both confirm the customer base and select a suitable partner.

The Council does not have sufficient control over the customer base at this time and by the time it can exert such control, there will be insufficient time to find a partner.

Indeed, the programme for the DEN projects is such that, even if the Council had control over the customer base today, it would be extremely challenging to select a funding partner in time to initiate the project. If the project is not initiated to the timescales set out in the OBCs, a substantial portion of the opportunity will be lost to the point that the projects are no longer viable to link into the heat network. The OBCs do identify areas where there may be scope to involve third parties later in the development of the schemes.

Therefore, the Council will need to take on the roles of owner and heat supplier in the delivery of the project and the question comes down to whether this is in-house or via a Special Purpose Vehicle. This is discussed further in 6.46 to 6.50.

As a Council scheme funded via the Heat Networks Investment Project (HNIP), the Council is required to sign up to consumer protection scheme Heat Trust or equivalent. This will ensure the maintenance of customer service standards; providing access to an Ombudsman; and promoting best practice and continuous improvement.

Further detail is set out in paragraph 5.15 of the exempt part of this report.

### **683. DISABLED BLUE BADGE FRAUD ENFORCEMENT POLICY**

The Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Welfare and the Public Realm introduced the report which sought approval for the adoption of the Blue Badge (Disabled Parking) Enforcement Policy.

#### **RESOLVED that Cabinet**

1. Adopts the Blue Badge (Disabled Parking) Enforcement Policy, attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

## **Reasons for decision**

The Department for Transport (DfT) is responsible for the legislation that sets out the framework for the National Blue Badge (Disabled Parking) Scheme including, amongst other things, the eligibility criteria, maximum fee, design of the badge and the manner in which it should be displayed. The DfT also issues non-statutory guidance in order to share good practice.

Local authorities are responsible for managing local delivery of the scheme. This involves the day-to-day administration of policies and procedures, supporting the assessment process, local provisions, and enforcement of the scheme.

The benefits of undertaking enforcement action against the fraudulent use of Blue Badges are varied and far-reaching. They include:

- More space for those legitimately accessing the scheme: kerb space is limited, so parking spaces must be made available for those with severe disabilities to support them in accessing local facilities, maintaining independence and being active members of their communities.
- Better management of the kerbside: as people are discouraged from using prime locations as long-stay parking, this means a greater turnover of visitors to high streets.
- Improved traffic management and better air quality: for many, fraudulent use of the Blue Badge makes driving and parking a car affordable. By taking this advantage away, they may be forced to switch to public transport and active travel, reducing the number of vehicles on the road.

A formal policy will provide clarity for residents and officers regarding action the Council will take in dealing with abuse of the Blue Badge (Disabled Parking) Scheme.

## **Alternative options considered**

Do nothing. The Council has undertaken ad-hoc enforcement of abuse of the Blue Badge (Disabled Parking) Scheme for several years. This informal arrangement has helped develop knowledge and understanding of the practicalities of enforcing relevant legislation. It has also helped build relationships with key partners and shape the proposed policy. A failure to adopt a formal policy will leave residents uninformed of the actions the Council will take to prevent and deal with abuse of the Scheme. It would also likely result in no prosecutions and no strong deterrent(s) to continued misuse.

## **684. THE ACQUISITION OF THE LEASEHOLD INTEREST AT 78 - 92 STAMFORD ROAD**

The Cabinet Member for House Building, Place-Making and Development introduced the report which sought approval for the acquisition of the leasehold interest in the site at 78-92 Stamford Road. The site sat within the creative enterprise zone and could be an opportunity to form part of the strategy to improve the workspace in that particular area.

The Cabinet Member and Officers responded to questions from Councillor Cawley-Harrison:

- It expected that the acquisition would be cost-neutral to the Council. A feasibility study had been undertaken and the recommendation was in part informed by that study.

Following the consideration of exempt information,

**RESOLVED that Cabinet agree**

1. To the acquisition of the leasehold interest in the site at 78 – 92 Stamford Road for General Fund purposes (as per the red line plan in Appendix A) from G. Colletta and Sons for the amount as set out in Part B of this report and as set out in the heads of terms in Appendix A of Part B.
2. To the total transaction costs of acquisition as shown in 6.8 of Part B.
3. That delegated authority is granted to agree final terms and final documentation to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Transformation and the Cabinet Member for House Building, Place-Making and Development.
4. To the site objectives for the proposed workspace development of a placemaking approach, delivering a good economy with climate change and sustainability at its heart, as described in in 6.6.
5. That £2m SIP funding and £50,000 Future High Streets funding is allocated to this project as described in 6.14 and 6.16
6. To the next steps as described in 6.20-6.22 including the development of a detailed business case and financial appraisals to be brought back to Cabinet for approval

**Reasons for decision**

78-92 Stamford Road falls within the STEA and has not been operating for some time, is now derelict and has attracted squatters and antisocial behaviour.

The site, equidistant from Tottenham Hale and Seven Sisters tube station, is within the South Tottenham Designated Employment Area (DEA 14). Stamford Road forms part of Site Allocation TH13 ‘Constable Crescent’ in the Tottenham Area Action Plan (AAP). Policy AAP4 of the AAP outlines that the Council will “facilitate the regeneration and renewal of selected DEAs through a reconfiguration of the local employment offer in order to intensify land uses and maximise the amount of business floor space”.

The acquisition of the leasehold interest will provide an opportunity to upgrade this dilapidated site, which has become a visual blight within the local neighbourhood, and enable the council to deliver a new, long term employment use that will benefit local people and businesses.

## **Alternative options considered**

The alternative option would be not to acquire the leasehold interest in the site.

By not acquiring the leasehold interest, this would mean the opportunity for the Council to deliver a new high-quality workspace-only scheme would be lost. Not acquiring the leasehold interest could mean that the leaseholder may sell their interest on the open market, the outcome of which is difficult to predict with any great certainty

The proposed option allows for the site to be redeveloped as an employment space as set out in this report.

## **685. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

### **RESOLVED**

To note the minutes of the following:

Cabinet Member Signing:

9 November 2021

11 November 2021

15 November 2021

Urgent Decisions:

17 November 2021

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

None

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

### **RESOLVED**

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the consideration of agenda items 23-27 as they contain exempt information as defined in Section 100a 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; Paragraph 5 – information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

## **688. EXEMPT - FEES & CHARGES 2022-23**

The Cabinet noted the exempt information and resolutions were agreed as per minutes 680.

## **689. EXEMPT - DECENTRALISED ENERGY NETWORKS (DEN) OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE (OBC)**

The Cabinet noted the exempt information and resolutions were agreed as per minutes 682.

**690. EXEMPT - THE ACQUISITION OF THE LEASEHOLD INTEREST AT 78 - 92 STAMFORD ROAD**

The Cabinet noted the exempt information and resolutions were agreed as per minutes 684.

**691. EXEMPT - MINUTES**

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

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

None.

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....