

# **MINUTES OF MEETING CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY, 14TH JULY, 2020, 6.30PM**

## **PRESENT:**

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

**ALSO ATTENDING: Councillors: Cawley- Harrison, das Neves**

## **251. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Leader referred to the notice of filming at meetings as set out in item 1 and advised that the meeting was being streamed live on the Council's website.

## **252. APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence.

## **253. URGENT BUSINESS**

The Leader advised that there was a short addendum to consider with item 13, Housing Delivery Test Action Plan. This confirmed that the Regulatory Committee had considered the report after publication of the Cabinet agenda and resolved to recommend the report for approval.

The terms of reference for Regulatory Committee set out in Part three section B of the Council Constitution required the Cabinet to consider informal recommendations on local development documents, development plan documents, the local development framework and any other planning policy matter.

## **254. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

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

None

## **256. MINUTES**

## **RESOLVED**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> of June 2020.

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

There were no matters referred by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

### **258. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

#### Deputation in relation to item 9

Jacob Secker, Secretary of the Broadwater Farm Resident's Association and Chris Hutton as Chair of the Broadwater Farm Resident's Association addressed the Committee in relation to item 9 – Broadwater Farm rehousing.

Mr Secker raised a number of issues in relation to the purchasing of leaseholder properties and the limited options available for those residents in Tangmere and Northolt blocks. Mr Secker highlighted that the leaseholders were not willing sellers but being forced to sell their homes due to defects in the blocks and the deputation's core objection was to the terms of the leaseholder offer that had been made.

The deputation contended that a more equitable solution for the leaseholders was to at least have been offered a sum of money that would have enabled them to buy a comparable alternative accommodation, locally at a market price in Tottenham, rather than just at market price in Broadwater Farm. These property values had been depressed by the lack of maintenance or lack of investment over the years and in the deputation's view, it seemed unfair to punish leaseholders by awarding such low values.

The proposal to extend the equity loan was welcomed by the deputation and this would include enabling leaseholders to buy properties outside of the borough. This would certainly ease the burden on some but it did not help those leaseholders that wanted to stay in the locality of Tottenham.

The deputation contended that the finance offers to leaseholders in Northolt, Tangmere blocks of between £150,000 to £160,000 was too low, and there was not the choice of housing to enable them to move. The lengthy time period that the moves were taking demonstrated this.

With regards to offering social tenancies to leaseholders in Tangmere and Northolt, the deputation noted that leaseholders in financial need can be offered: a new social tenancy or housing association tenancy and 25% value of their flat or awarded the money they paid under right to buy. The deputation welcomed the offer to those in need and recognised that this must happen as the leaseholders needed to move out

from the blocks .The issue was that 25% offer was too low and offering leaseholders the amount they paid originally was also not adequate. The leaseholders had not been consulted on this proposal and this was not enough funding to move. The leaseholders felt that their finances were not being considered or the capital amount and interest rate payments made by them over the years. The leaseholders had also over, the past few years, paid for major works such as carpark resurfacing and door entry systems in defective blocks and this also needed to be taken account of.

The deputation wanted the Council to follow the Southwark model of offering 100% the value of their flats to leaseholders, or home loss payment and social tenancy. Leaseholders were aware of this offer and wanted the same. The Council were offering 25% of a property value of £160,000, which would be around £40k payment. In Camden the 25% payment would equate to a higher payment of around £100k.The deputation felt that the leaseholders in Broadwater Farm were getting a worse offer in comparison to leaseholders in Aylesbury estate in Southwark and leaseholders in Camden.

The deputation concluded by asking the Council to reconsider the offer to leaseholders and revise this to be in line with the Southwark offer. Mr Hutton emphasised considering the depressed values of the homes and the extraordinary situation the leaseholders at Broadwater Farm were facing.

In response to questions from Cabinet members, the deputation advised the following:

- The number of leaseholders in Northolt and Tangmere affected by the policy were 14 and this was set out in the attached report.
- The disrepair of the buildings was historical and dated over 20 or 30 years, before the large panel system was an issue, the payment for the homes under Right to Buy obtained by leaseholders generally was dependent on the period i.e. 1980's and values at the time and were not felt to be applicable to this situation. The situation did not take into account the unsafe conditions and lack of repair and state of the buildings that leaseholders had been living in.
- In relation to the potential for leaseholders being able to exercise their RTB opportunity a second time by being offered a social tenancy, in the deputation's view this was an unlikely to occur. This policy only applied to those in social need and the deputation were not asking for blanket policy but consideration to those in financial need. It was very unlikely that the leaseholders would be able to be able to exercise a second RTB and were on low incomes and financial need.
- The deputation sought consideration of the financial situation of leaseholders on a case-by-case basis and supporting leaseholders to obtain the best offer possible.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal gave assurance that social tenancies would be offered on a case-by-case basis, and this would be decided by a Discretion Panel, and there would be a package according to the circumstances of the individual.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration responded to the deputation. He informed the deputes that the current offer to leaseholders in Northolt was generous and aligned with the policies of other London boroughs. The offer included payment of full market value, an independent valuation, 10% home loss payment, disturbance payments, and the covering of additional costs such as legal fees. Further to this, the Acquisition Strategy under consideration also expanded equity loans to be available for out of borough purchases and adds an option for resident leaseholders to request a 'social tenancy', with a (discounted) payment for the loss of property in addition to full home loss and disturbance payments. This demonstrated the Council's willingness to work with leaseholders in finding a solution that is right for their needs.

The Cabinet Member referred to the offer for leaseholders on the Aylesbury estate, and advised that this did not reflect the whole picture. Southwark's offer of full market value and home loss payment, as well as a Council tenancy was only available for those who could demonstrate that they were unable to afford a Council property through shared ownership or shared equity and who purchased their home before 2005. This was likely a small group of people, and it was not clear exactly how many people were eligible for this in practice.

The Cabinet Member outlined that Southwark only makes shared equity available for the purchase of a Notting Hill Genesis (its development partner) property or Council property.

The Cabinet Member continued to outline that it was also crucial to understand the context in which Southwark were able to make their offer. They had c. 38,000 tenanted properties – over double the amount Haringey had – and were the largest local authority landlord in London with the highest proportion of social housing of any local authority area in England. The different context allowed Southwark to make an offer that is appropriate for the circumstances in their borough but did not reflect what is appropriate or feasible in Haringey. Southwark's general offer to leaseholders who seek grant of a new social tenancy was very much less generous than its offer to those on the Aylesbury Estate.

The Cabinet Member advised that Haringey Council's equity loan offer, by contrast, allowed leaseholders to purchase on the private market, giving them a far greater choice of properties than Southwark's offer. If they were nevertheless unable to find an affordable property with the assistance of that offer, or if there are other exceptional circumstances, the Council was prepared to consider an offer of a social tenancy to a resident leaseholder as an alternative under the policy now proposed.

The provision of a social tenancy however carried significant cost for the Council and added to pressure on the waiting list; hence, the discounted value offered in such circumstances.

With regards to the deputation's request that leaseholders receive a fair valuation of their property. The Council agreed that they should and considered that, through paying for an independent RICS registered surveyor of the leaseholder's choice, market valuations and subsequent offers are already determined in a way that is as fair and transparent as possible. Where there was a large discrepancy between the independent valuation received by the Council and the valuation of the leaseholder's surveyor, the Council endeavoured to work with the leaseholder to come to an equitable agreement.

The Cabinet Member advised that equity loans were on the table so leaseholders can, if they wish, purchase a similar property to the one they are moving from. The Council recognised that property values in Northolt block were low compared to the borough, meaning that even with a generous offer in place it could still be difficult to find a property in the nearby area. However, having conducted some searches, the Council understood that there were many one-bedroom properties, even within the N17 postcode, which could be purchased for around or below £290,000. Indeed a number of two-bedroom properties were available within N17 for less than that price. Further to this, the Broadwater Farm discretion panel had been put in place to consider requests for additional support for leaseholders outside of the Council's current policies, demonstrating the Council's desire to work with leaseholders. The panel can consider out of borough equity loans and equity loans of more than 40% in some circumstances to enable leaseholders to remain in the local area. These gave leaseholders more options should this be something they wish to pursue. Therefore, the Council considered that the current policy allowed leaseholders options to purchase a similar property to the one they are moving from in the vast majority of cases, with added flexibility for exceptional cases.

In relation to the deputation's request that the Council offer a significantly higher price, above market value, for the property purchased, and a higher equity loan. The Council considered that the current offer was flexible to meet the needs of leaseholders in Northolt. The Council was required to balance its responsibilities to Northolt leaseholders with the broader fiduciary duties it has as a public body. Hopefully, throughout this response, the Council had demonstrated its commitment to offering leaseholders a fair and equitable offer that enabled them to purchase a similar property and remain in the local area if they wished to do so.

The Cabinet Member expressed that the proposal for changes to policies under consideration and the Council's approach to leaseholder acquisition throughout this process had demonstrated that the Council would continue to be flexible in seeking agreement with Northolt leaseholders.

The Cabinet Member concluded by emphasising that the Council and Homes for Haringey continued to welcome leaseholders coming forward and working in collaboration with officers to reach agreements that all parties considered fair and reasonable. The Council will continue working with leaseholders and the Broadwater Farm Resident's Association to reach agreement on the remaining leaseholder interests in Northolt.

## **259. BROADWATER FARM REHOUSING**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report, which set out a number of important recommendations to support the Council's vital work on the rehousing of leaseholders on the Broadwater Farm Estate.

The Cabinet Member emphasised that the Council was committed to working with leaseholders to identify rehousing solutions that met their needs and the report set out additional options to support leaseholders.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley - Harrison. The following information was provided:

- In relation to the financial compensation of leaseholders, as set out in the deputation response, this would be discussed with the leaseholders and there would need to be consideration of the Council's fiduciary duty when considering the appropriate remedy.
- With regards to the alternative housing offered to leaseholders, the personal view of the Cabinet Member was that there needed to be careful consideration of the housing options offered to ensure that this was fair and did not disadvantage other residents in priority need, awaiting housing. The Council were prepared to examine and take forward discussion with leaseholders, taking account of the compensation received, if applicable, and considering the situation of the housing waiting list.
- The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal highlighted that the Council were already considering the issue of vulnerability and if the leaseholder fell into the priority need category they would be entitled to a social tenancy were they homeless and in a situation that they could not afford to buy a home. This would also be taken into consideration by the discretion panel.

Further to considering the exempt information at item 24,

## **RESOLVED**

1. To agree to the acquisition of all leaseholders' interests in both Northolt and Tangmere for a maximum total sum of [EXEMPT] and gives delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, after consultation with

- the Director of Finance and Cabinet Member for Housing & Estate Renewal, to agree the price and terms of each acquisition;
2. To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to approve any individual equity loans to eligible resident leaseholders, as provided for in the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments policy;
  3. To authorise the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, notwithstanding the terms of the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy, to offer Equity Loans to support the purchase of properties outside the borough in exceptional circumstances taking account of the recommendation of the Discretionary Panel Discretionary Panel.
  4. To approve the policy set out at Appendix one of the report, setting out the offer that the Council will make for the leasehold interest in a property on Broadwater Farm where the owner wishes to be granted a social tenancy of the same or another property in replacement of his/her interest.
  5. To authorise the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to approve the offer of a social tenancy to leaseholders, acting on the recommendation of the discretionary panel (as set out in the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy) in line with policy set out in Appendix one of the report.

### **Reasons for decision**

Despite ongoing negotiations, there remain eight (8) leaseholders in Northolt and six (6) leaseholders in Tangmere who have not yet agreed to the sale of their homes.

Acquiring the remaining leasehold properties in Tangmere and Northolt is a high priority. Structural surveys have identified that the buildings have failed the required safety tests. While risks are currently being mitigated, it is important to acquire the remaining flats as quickly as possible so demolition can be carried out.

The Council is unable to force private owners (leaseholders) to sell their properties unless it applies for compulsory purchase powers. The Council is preparing for this eventuality, but before doing so is seeking to acquire the leasehold properties by private treaty. Following lengthy discussions with leaseholders and the Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor, officers believe that if the recommendations in this report are approved, the need to use compulsory purchase powers may be diminished.

The recommendations in this report are primarily aimed at accelerating the acquisition of leasehold properties and ensuring delegations exist to execute existing policy without having to return to Cabinet for further approvals on individual cases.

In making these recommendations it is recognised that the issues on Broadwater

Farm are pressing and unique and it is in the Council's and residents' interests to expedite the acquisition process. Market values for homes on Broadwater Farm are among the lowest in London, making it difficult for leaseholders to move to similar properties within the area. The homes are structurally unsound and while the known risks are being mitigated, it is not satisfactory to mitigate them in the long term.

These partially empty blocks are also an ongoing security and squatting risk and the cost to the Council of mitigating the risks on the estate are high as they include 24-hour security.

When acquiring properties in advance of a possible Compulsory Purchase Order, the Guidance on Compulsory Purchase 2019 sets out that Councils should consider value for money in terms of the Exchequer as a whole, as set out in paras 6.9 to 6.11 of the report. Recommendation 3.1.1 therefore aims to ensure that the Council adheres to this Guidance when undertaking leasehold acquisitions. More information on this approach is set out in Part B of this report.

### **Alternative options considered**

Not to extend the leaseholder offer.

This option was discounted as it would not help accelerate the acquisition of leasehold interests nor would it allow the Council to complete acquisitions where the leaseholder requests an equity loan. It would also arguably fail to apply flexibility in order to deliver on the aims of the BFRPP and ERRPP, as required by those policies.

*To begin Compulsory Purchase Order proceedings.*

This option was discounted as the Council wishes to seek to acquire the properties by mutual agreement before exploring this option.

*To pay full market value to a resident leaseholder who also seeks the grant of a social tenancy.*

This option was discounted, as it would be inequitable to the leaseholders who have accepted the Council's financial offer for the Council to offer to other leaseholders the same financial offer and in addition a secure Council tenancy. It would also have a much more significant impact on the Council's finances and its ability to meet housing need, than the other offers.

## **260. 2019/20 PROVISIONAL FINANCIAL OUTTURN**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report, which set out the provisional outturn for 2019/20 for the General Fund, HRA, DSG and the Capital Programme compared to budget. It provided explanations of significant under/overspends and includes proposed transfers to/from reserves, revenue and capital carry forward requests and any budget virements or adjustments.



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

- In relation to the potential up surge in mental health spend as a result of Covid 19 and lock down, the Cabinet Member highlighted the discussion at the previous evening's Council meeting where there was Councillor concern expressed about funding of local authorities. Statements were made about the expectation for government to fulfil its pledges to reimburse local authorities' Covid 19 spending. The Cabinet Member could not expressly agree, at this meeting, that the Council will spend money which it had yet to obtain but would look into this critical issue.
- The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health added that there was a lot of concern about the expected increase in mental health referrals. She advised that the Council with health and community partners were aiming to meet this need. The BEH- MET were already looking at internal reforms to manage and mitigate the demand. This was also part of recovery and renewal plans being taken forward with partners. There was already good understanding of the data to help inform the expected need and there had already been extended outreach work in the community so an awareness of issues was being compiled and preventative measures put in place to enable the Council and partners to navigate the challenges ahead.
- In response to slippage on Capital projects, there were projects that had to be put on hold for health and safety reasons as the country was still coming out of the lockdown. There would be a review on the next steps, considering those projects that could be discontinued and the impact of this going forward. It was noted that the Council were not alone in its current position on capital projects.
- Noted that there was a review taking place of the accommodation strategy and there would follow an all member presentation on way forward for Council assets, in particular those in the Wood Green area, with plans to be shared with Councillors.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the provisional revenue and capital outturn for 2019/20 as detailed in the report;
2. To approve the capital carry forwards in Appendix 3 and £1.14m for Highways works;
3. To approve the appropriations to/from reserves at Appendix 5 of the report;
4. To approve the budget virements as set out in Appendix 6 of the report.

## **Reasons for decision.**

A strong financial management framework, including oversight by Members and senior management is an essential part of delivering the Council's priorities and statutory duties.

Cabinet is responsible for the strategic management of Council resources and for taking decisions on such matters including budget management and control, budget virements above a certain value and the achievement of value for money.

### **Alternative options considered**

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

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

## **261. AFFORDABLE ENERGY STRATEGY**

The Cabinet Member Climate Change and Sustainability introduced the report which sought agreement to adopt the affordable energy strategy following public consultation and agreement to a new alignment as a result of COVID-19.

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

- The Cabinet Member had begun work on the strategy as soon as she had taken up post and would ensure that this was a rolling programme.
- The Cabinet Member would ask officers to respond in writing to Cllr Cawley-Harrison to provide information on the actions being taken to ensure that Housing Associations were providing insulation and support for treatment of damp.
- The Council would be working with community organisations that had experience of consulting with hard to reach groups and could act as a conduit to provide awareness of how to access this scheme.
- It was important to work with tenants to help them understand their rights to access this scheme and there would be use of the landlord licensing process as better insulation provided for better quality rented homes.
- The Council would use an incentive approach with landlords, highlighting the risk of Covid 19 and promoting access to the GLA warmer homes scheme which was open for access to funding. The Council would be using the landlord forum to make landlords make aware of funding opportunities and also the risks with Covid 19.

*[ Clerk's note Cllr Hearn lost connection for less than 5 minutes and the final paragraph was repeated and the Cabinet Member able to vote]*

## **RESOLVED**

1. To adopt the revised Affordable Energy Strategy 2020-2025 appearing at Appendix B of the report
2. To agree to the prioritised actions identified in the "COVID 19 AND THE AFFORDABLE ENERGY STRATEGY 2020-2025 – PRIORITIES STATEMENT" appended to the Strategy to enable the Council to respond to an increase in fuel poverty this winter.

### **Reasons for decision**

The existing Affordable Warmth Strategy (2009-2019) has now expired. It is estimated that over 15,000 households in Haringey experience fuel poverty. By adopting a new strategy Haringey will have a clear way forward to tackle fuel poverty in the borough and improve the health and wellbeing of its residents.

In November 2019, Cabinet agreed the draft Affordable Energy Strategy for public consultation. The consultation has concluded. Comments have been considered and the strategy amended as appropriate.

The impact of COVID-19 on jobs, incomes and energy use have been considered and it is anticipated that levels of fuel poverty will increase. Priority actions have been identified to enable the Council to react to this situation and support residents.

Approval is sought to adopt the strategy and a COVID-19 impact statement has been inserted into the document to allow the appropriate actions to be undertaken to support residents struggling to power their homes.

### **Alternative options considered**

#### *Do nothing*

The strategy would not be redrafted and released. The Council will have no coherent strategy to improve the circumstances of around 15,000 households living in fuel poverty in Haringey and meet the ambitions of the Borough Plan by driving up the quality of housing for everyone and exploring setting up an alternative local or regional energy savings company(s). And would be failing in its requirement under the Home Energy Conservation Act (HECA).

#### *Do not prioritise actions as set out in the inserted COVID-19 impact statement.*

An immediate and targeted response is required to mitigate the effects of COVID-19 on fuel poor households. This could divert resources and efforts from where they will be most effective.

### *Delay finalising the Strategy*

The BEIS's updated Fuel Poverty Strategy for England has been delayed and details of the Home Upgrade Grant Scheme and Social Housing Decarbonisation scheme will not be available until later this year. Again, the GLA are reviewing how their programmes (Warmer Homes and Warm Homes Advice Service) can support an increase in demand and more complex support requirements.

However, there is an urgency to act to ensure fuel poor residents are supported if there is a second wave of COVID-19 in the winter. It is therefore recommended that the strategy is adopted. Consultation documents on the proposed Fuel Poverty Strategy for England were considered when the Affordable Energy Strategy was drafted. It is therefore unlikely that the new strategy will have a major impact on Haringey's Affordable Energy strategy. Once publicised the new policies will be reviewed and mitigation measures employed where necessary. If these amendments are major they will be publically reported through the Annual Carbon Report.

## **262. OFSTED UPDATE**

The Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families, introduced the report which provided Cabinet with an update on the 2018 Ofsted inspection action plan, the actions in place to address the findings of the Ofsted focused visit of 2019 and the actions Children's Services is taking in response to Family Court Judgment on 20<sup>th</sup> May in the case of Child A and Child B.

The Cabinet Member referred to the updated 2018 Ofsted inspection action plan which spoke of the improvements the service continues to make as does the 2019 focused visit action plan. However, it was noted that the Family Court Judgment was critical of the social work practice in the DCT team, and it suggested that the practice in the team may not have improved since the 2018 Ofsted inspection.

The Cabinet Member highlighted the Council vision that every child in Haringey should have the best start in life, be happy, healthy, and safe, and grow into adulthood with a successful future. For those children, young people and families that need Council support, the Cabinet Member was committed to ensuring that this was of high quality at all times. The Cabinet Member expressed that when standards fell below expectations, the Council was determined to address these issues, no matter how uncomfortable that process might be and ensure learning from them. The Council was a learning organisation committed, every day, to continuing to drive improvement in Children's service so that the Council's vision was realised for all the children in the community.

The report set out the actions being taken to review the practices in the DCT team and there would be a full report back to Cabinet on improvements and activity in October 2020.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley – Harrison and Councillor das Neves, the following was noted:

- There would be an independent review to provide assurance that there was not a systemic issue in the Disabled Children's Team and this would be reported to Cabinet in the autumn. The review process would use similar methods to those employed in case reviews.
- With regards to working with Islington, the Council were part of a wider programme called partners in practice. This was an established programme where a number of local authorities were working together with 'good' and 'outstanding' services to get a better understanding of the best way to improve services. Although, Islington Council had been working with the Council in this programme, they were still appropriate to lead the review and were fully observant of their need to be independent. The Director for Children's Services added that the Chair was Hannah Miller, an experienced previous statutory director with a breadth of knowledge in Adults services and safeguarding partnerships.
- The Cabinet Member referred to the unique experience of every parent and the key part of co-production was about sharing experiences. The SEND service were committed to working with parents to enable this to work successfully.
- The Cabinet Member remarked that the SEND services was not as poor as it was currently commented to be but nonetheless faced challenges. It was appropriate that parents were involved in the service and represented their children's views.
- The Cabinet Member was committed to working with parents and following publication of the AMAZE report would be working with officers to put in place an action plan which would be shared with parents about how the services can move forward.
- The Cabinet Member was also expecting the service to learn from good practice in the Council where co – production has worked

*[Clerks note – At 8pm the streaming of the meeting was interrupted, prior to agreement of the resolutions, and the Chair adjourned the meeting for 5 minutes to enable streaming to be resumed. The meeting resumed at 8.05pm and the streaming continued successfully and meeting available to the public]*

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the findings of the Ofsted Focused visit in December 2019 as attached as Appendix 1 of the report and endorsed the ongoing Action plan attached as Appendix 2 of the report.

2. To note the progress of the Ofsted inspection 2018 Action plan attached as Appendix 3 of the report; and
3. To endorse the assurance measures to improve practice in the Disabled Children's Team set out in paragraphs 7.8 to 7.11 of the report.

### **Reasons for decision**

Non key decision

### **Alternative options considered**

None.

## **263. HOUSING DELIVERY TEST ACTION PLAN (HDT AP) 2020**

The Cabinet Member outlined that the Housing Delivery Test was a Government initiative to try and bolster housing supply. Housing supply referred to all housing built in the borough, not just Council housing, whether affordable or for purchase.

The Council were undertaking work on a new Local Plan to frame its housing ambitions, including a commitment to build 1,000 new Council Homes. The number of permissions agreed were what counted as the numbers of housing supplied within a given period.

The Council would continue to grant permissions in line with planning policies, manifesto commitments and in accordance with statutory timeframes, to ensure Haringey has the homes it needs. The Council would continue to work with developers to remove obstacles to delivery. The Cabinet Member expected the house building industry to also take action, as the under delivery of homes could not be solved by, or blamed, on the Council alone.

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

- The next Local Plan was due to be published in late 2022 and a Member's working group had been established to oversee this process. However, there would need to be a set process followed with prescribed consultation, and a public enquiry, before final decision by the Council. The previous Local Plan had been published in 2017 and in 2018 there had been changes made to the Housing strategy appendix C and also to the CiL policy. The Council were working in accordance with the timeframe of a 5-year plan with adoption planned in 2022.
- If the local Planning Authority's delivery of housing fell below its housing target of 75%, the Council would not be able to prove that it its meeting its five-year housing target .The Council would move to a legal situation called a 'tilted balance' which means a higher planning test to follow if refusing a planning application with housing included. The effect of this for decision making was that the Council would need to give more weight to housing, meaning less

consideration of other needs for the area that the Council were wanting to promote. This could also mean losing more planning appeals if enough consideration had not been given to housing requirements.

- It was important to note that Haringey's target for housing development had risen 4 times over the last 4 years and there had been over 4000 planning consents with implementation on site. This was not a housing delivery policy implementation issue and the Council worked with developers but ultimately could not force them to build.
- To provide some further context to the housing target, it was important to compare the Council's own house building programme which had 1000 units which the Council were in control of building with the target of 8000 units set in the London Plan. This demonstrated that the housing delivery test was imbalanced as the Council were not in full control of wider delivery of housing in the borough.
- It was noted that the Council were at 58% against the target of 75% of housing delivery. However, this was without the inclusion of the financial year end data which required site visits to take place for validation purposes and these could not take place due to Covid 19.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the comments of Regulatory Committee.
2. To adopt the Housing Delivery Test Action Plan 2020 attached at Appendix A of the report

### **Reasons for decision**

To comply with requirements in the NPPF to produce an Action Plan, given delivery in Haringey of new homes was recorded as 55% of the Council's housing target.

### **Alternative options considered**

The alternative option would be not to publish an Action Plan. However, this is not recommended as it would be contrary to Government Policy, and could jeopardise the Council's position at any future appeals where housing delivery was contested, as it could be seen that the Council is not actively trying to address the housing shortfall against the adopted target.

## **264. HARINGEY EMPTY HOMES POLICY**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which set out a refreshed version of the Council's existing empty homes policy. This had been developed to communicate the Council's approach to bringing empty homes back into use.

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

- Agreed a response would be provided to Cllr Palmer's question at the January Cabinet meeting, which was put forward when discussing the 1000 new homes to be built in the borough, and comparing this policy decision to the number of empty homes in the borough which was over 1000 and some empty for over a decade. At the meeting the figures quoted were questioned by the Cabinet and Councillor Palmer followed up with details of this information received in an FOI request which set out the following:
- FOI reference number LBH/9297319.
- It stated that:

*“As at 31 October 2019 the Council had:*

- 1136 properties classified as being empty for more than six months*
  - 94 properties classified as being empty for more than five years*
  - 21 properties classified as being empty for more than ten years”*
- The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal queried if these figures had included second homes? It would be important to establish this as there was a different process involved. These properties were applicable for Council tax collection and could therefore not be deemed empty homes.
  - Local research had yet to be completed on the reasons for the rising numbers of empty homes and this would be done following the introduction of the policy and employment of the Empty Homes officer. It was known that there were a variety of reasons why people leave their homes empty. In particular, homes that were empty from 6 months to 5 years' could be due to the increasing number of elderly residents that were going into supported living arrangements or residential care and their families were waiting to find out whether their relatives will return home. It was noted that there will also be cases of homeowners working abroad. The team were striving to ensure that they were in contact with empty home owners and were aiming to reach a higher number of homeowners to understand fully the reasons for the number of empty homes as part of implementing this policy.
  - The Cabinet Member commented that she was fully supportive of Empty Dwelling Management Orders[EDMO'S] and had no issues with the use of regulatory powers to bring homes back into use. Officers added that the Housing Improvement Team had not taken forward EDMO's before and would be working with Legal services and Homes for Haringey on how the process will work and there would be a further update on this initiative.



- The Leader concluded that the main objective of the policy should not be the number of EDMO's issued but the bringing empty homes back into use.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the Empty Homes Policy as attached in Appendix 3 of the report.
2. To note that any costs incurred in expanding the service within 2020/21 will need to be met from existing Environment & Neighbourhood revenue budgets.
3. To note that a capital bid of £5m will be made to increase the CPO budget to £6m as part of the 2021/22 budget setting process.

## **Reasons for decision**

During a housing crisis, it is unacceptable that there are within the borough a number of homes that stand needlessly empty. Currently, Haringey has 1,188 homes that have stood empty and unused for six months or more.

In the Council's t Borough Plan Priority 1- Housing, the vision is for a safe, stable and affordable home for everyone, whatever their circumstances. The Council is committed to working together to provide housing for all our residents needs and to creating environments that are safe, clean, and green (Priority 3). Empty homes are a housing resource that could be utilised when demand for housing is high. Homes which are allowed to remain empty long-term blight neighbourhoods and attract antisocial behaviour and crime.

Haringey Council has a good track record of bringing empty homes back into use. Our existing empty homes policy however is outdated and in recent years, due to reduced resources, empty homes work has been targeted only at those homes causing the most nuisance or those which have been empty for longer than 5 years or which have been abandoned. Although the number of empty homes in Haringey is at a relatively low level, in part due to the Council's work to date, there is a case to expand the scope of that work. This can be achieved through revising the empty homes policy and reallocating resources within the Environment & Neighbourhoods revenue budget

## **Alternative options considered**

Not to consider expanding any of the resources required for empty homes work. The number of empty homes in the borough has been rising for five years, and so this option was rejected.

## **265. UNIVERSITY SCHEME FOR HARINGEY YOUNG PEOPLE**

The Leader was pleased to introduce the report which sought agreement to fund a Local Authority university bursary scheme for young people from low income families (under £30k PA total income) from the academic year 2021. The scheme was

intended to support an increase in the percentage of those students from low income families who can go on to university at the end of year 13 and graduate.

The scheme would, among other things, support a monthly (Sept to June) bursary of £300 for the duration of the degree course, mentoring from year 13 (or before) through to graduation, the cost of the UCAS application and visits to two university open days during year 12/13.

It was proposed that the scheme run year on year, supporting up to 10 students through university at an eventual annual cost to the Council of £120k. The scheme would also make available a period of work experience within the Local Authority or one of its partners, aimed at the summer recess in the second year and based on two days a week for a period of eight weeks at London Living Wage.

The Leader spoke about education being unequal and opportunities at school or university skewed by where you come from. Children from the most deprived families tended to do less well at school and were less likely to go on to university, or any other form of higher education. Among those that do go to university, the most deprived students were more likely to drop-out and less likely to secure a top class degree.

The Leader described that inequality persists beyond graduation day. The most advantaged graduates were more likely to be in a high-skilled job after graduating, and BAME Russell Group university graduates are more likely to be unemployed than their white peers.

It was noted that no single injustice is responsible for the gap. Income and financial security were a major factor, but there were wider and subtler causes behind the gap too. The Leader outlined that ethnicity, class, health and household dynamics were just some of them.

The Leader expressed that a lot of the inequalities that distort educational opportunity were deep-set and would take wide-ranging interventions to overcome. The Council could not reverse the government's 2016 decision to abolish maintenance grants for low-income students for example. However, the leader felt that there was a clear role, indeed a leading role, that a local Council could play to improve opportunities and outcomes for the most deprived residents in its borough.

The scheme was central to that ambition and set out a slate of interventions to support children from some of the most deprived families in Haringey.

Following questions from Cllr Cawley- Harrison and Cllr das Neves, the following information was noted.

- The Council were aware of the university application timetable and were aiming to have the scheme ready before year 13 to allow the work experience opportunities to be accessed and also to dovetail with other schemes that will be available to students, in particular those which provide access to Russell group universities in London.

- The Leader spoke about students from low income families being able to aspire to attend the best university institutions possible and working with organisations that will support as many students as possible.
- The Leader added that the scheme was not just about providing the funding to go to university but mentoring. The Council would be dovetailing this support with the other developmental opportunities that were available. The Leader agreed considering the suggestion that the Council examine the work experience that it could provide to young people on this scheme. The Council were aiming to work with a number of partners to provide as broad and varied opportunities as possible for work experience.
- Noted that the follow up report in September/October would provide more details of the governance process. This would also include more information on the level of assistance and support that the Council can provide to all young people that apply to the scheme. The bursary grants would be provided to 30 young people at any one time. It was noted that some young people that may not get the grant will be linked to other organisations/ schemes where they will be able to access financial support.
- The later paper would also include information on the threshold for parental income and respond to other questions Councillors have put forward on the criteria for accessing the scheme. At this stage, it was important for young people that were going to be going back to school in September, and considering their further education options, to have the confidence to make the university applications and look to their future without being deterred by their financial situation.
- The Leader closed by emphasising that it was important as a Council to support young people to be the best and achieve the most that they can.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the creation of a Haringey University Scholarship Scheme with an eventual annual funding of £120,000 to assist young people from lower income families to access university with financial support.
2. To agree that the Assistant Director for Schools and Learning consult with schools and pupils over the summer on the proposals, mentoring and placement for the scholarship scheme and a second report is brought to Cabinet in autumn 2020 setting out responses to the consultation and detailed proposals for mentoring, placements, partnership work and administrative details.

## **Reasons for decision**

Haringey is committed to creating greater equality, including in education and opportunities for access to higher education. Our borough has a stark socioeconomic gap between communities and, as the Borough Plan makes clear, the Council has a pivotal role to play in narrowing it. That ambition requires interventions on several fronts – of which higher education is just one.

The interventions in the university bursary scheme are designed in the context of wider inequalities. They aim not just to support young people who are weighing up the affordability of university or another form of higher education, but also to support them as they complete their university studies and with their entry to the job market afterwards through the provision of mentoring and work experience within the Local Authority or partner organisation during the summer recess in the second year.

Using a fund of £120k per year and based on an assumed bursary of £3k grant per annum for each student, based on ten students, the following is proposed:

Year 1: 10 students = £30k

Year 2: 20 students = £60k

Year 3: 30 students = £90k

This would provide a monthly sum (Sept to June inclusive) of £300 per month for each of the ten students. Other costs relating to mentoring and application support, together with administrative costs bring the total for the scheme up an eventual £120k per annum (see Appendix 4 of the report).

This report sets out details of the current education attainment gap for low income families and how the annual fund of £120k can support our young people from lower income families to access and achieve at higher education on a level that is closer to their higher income peers.

### **Alternative options considered**

A number of alternative options were considered, including:

- A Southwark Scholarship Scheme approach
- A university grant: restricted to academic courses
- A Haringey Student Loan

Southwark Council's Scholarship Scheme covers the full cost of tuition fees for students (£9,000 per year). However, the bursary scheme as proposed by this report is favoured because it supports the young person's month to month living expenses by providing direct grant funding to give lower income students financial security that replicates some of the additional support middle income students often receive from their parents. Grants of this nature, which are smaller, can be distributed to more students – broadening the reach of the scheme.

A university grant that is restricted to academic courses was rejected on the basis that it would only support residents applying to university courses. Further, offering a cash grant for a certain type of course could create a perverse incentive, pushing individuals to choose an academic degree over another preferred form of higher education and to which they are more suited. The perceived hard line between

academic and vocational courses is somewhat misleading. Some university courses are very clearly tied to a specific job or career. Some university courses include placements or internships, while some vocational courses include on-campus tuition. Creating a fund based on an unclear distinction could needlessly exclude some residents from support.

A Haringey Student Loan has been rejected because it would not reduce debt for students – and this is already a perceived barrier. The impact of reduced debt interest on a young person's decision to pursue university is likely to be minimal.

Further, a loan scheme would create a large upfront cost for the Council and a great deal of financial uncertainty. It is very hard to project how many students will go on to earn salaries above £21,000 (the threshold at which repayments to the Student Loan Company start to be made) and how consistently they will be earning.

A loan scheme would also require enforcement and collection. Staff resources would need to be allocated to this, potentially at a significant level of cost.

The Springboard Scholarship scheme as proposed, provides a broader 'opportunity fund' to give any eligible young person a route into post-18 educations – and the opportunities that come with it.

## **266. TOTTENHAM HERITAGE ACTION ZONE (HAZ)**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which sought Cabinet approval to accept an offer of grant for £2.012 million from Historic England and to subsequently enter into a grant agreement with Historic England for restoration of both historic properties and public realm spaces within the Bruce Grove Town Conservation Area (Bruce Grove Town Centre) in Tottenham.

The Council would need to provide match funding of £2.598m but this funding allowed the Council to capitalise on the broader nature of the High Road, creating a more welcoming, safer and attractive visitor experience, promoting Tottenham High Road as a distinct destination; improving arrival at Bruce Grove Station and encouraging people to walk along Bruce Grove to Tottenham Green to enjoy the diverse local shops and handsome buildings.

In response to a question from Councillor Cawley- Harrison on altering the highways to support the improvements to heritage buildings in the area, although there were specific allocations for the improvements, the Regeneration team would be speaking with the highways team on expanding the pathways. There had already been some work completed on reducing traffic on Tottenham High road with some further initiatives to be taken forward with the London's Mayor's office.

Following considering of exempt information,

**RESOLVED**

1. Pursuant to Contract Standing Order 17.1, to approve the receipt of a grant for £2,012,000 from Historic England, subject to the Council entering into a funding agreement, to deliver the Tottenham Heritage Action Zone (HAZ) Programme;
2. To grant delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Strategic Finance and Regeneration, to approve the final terms of the funding agreement and enter into the agreement on behalf of the Council;
3. To grant delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Strategic Finance and Regeneration, and to approve the final Programme Design and any changes thereafter including private contributions to the shopfronts improvement element of the programme;
4. To agree that the properties listed in Appendix 4 of the report (which have been accepted by Historic England for grant funding) will be prioritised for inclusion into the HAZ programme, for subsequently entering into separate legal agreements with each owner for those properties listed in Appendix 4 (exempt).

### **Reasons for decision**

Overall, Bruce Grove's shopping centre has had a decline in the quality of the street frontages, correlated with low or no private investment, and compounded by signage and advertising hoardings that detract from the appearance of the High Road. Bruce Grove retains broad appeal, where footfall is high, but unit investment is lacking', reflecting a local business community that is vulnerable to broader market forces affecting high streets.

The Historic Action Zone Grant offered to the Council by Historic England presents a significant opportunity to address the physical, economic, and social issues facing Bruce Grove. It will improve Bruce Grove's historic identity and provide the catalyst for change and additional investment from private owners. This will encourage existing businesses to commit to the area and grow whilst also encouraging new businesses to locate and grow in the area; thus improving the long-term viability of the Town centre to serve its local residents and broaden its appeal to visitors.

The recommendations in this report allows the Council to receive the grant funding from Historic England and enter into a grant agreement with Historic England to deliver the programme of improvements for Bruce Grove and to commit Council match funding from the approved capital programme.

### **Alternative options considered**

#### *Option 1: 'Do Nothing'*

This option would be for the Council to not accept the grant funding from Historic England, and therefore not enter into a funding agreement. This would prevent the Council from securing £2m in funds from Historic England, which are required to

assist in repairing and restoring the historic fabric and open spaces within Bruce Grove Town Centre.

Without intervention, the economic viability of the Town Centre to compete and sustain itself would be adversely affected. This could lead to further deterioration of the historic urban fabric of Bruce Grove and in turn would not provide the catalyst for further investment by private owners nor encourage other businesses to locate into the area.

*Option 2:*

The recommended option is to accept grant funding from Historic England and enter into a grant agreement. This would enable a catalyst for positive change in Bruce Grove that will not only secure physical Improvements to its historic environment but also will encourage further private investment and broaden the appeal of Bruce Grove to new businesses to locate there. Visitors to the town centre will be encouraged to stay longer that will in-turn help to support existing businesses.

## **267. PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF THE FREEHOLD INTEREST OF MUNRO WORKS**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which put forward agreement to the purchase of the freehold interest in this property would enable the Council to exit an onerous head lease arrangement, and to support economic development in the Borough in line with the Borough Plan by letting vacant units on this estate. The purchase would also contribute to MTFs savings.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley – Harrison, the Cabinet Member was not aware of other sites in the borough where there were similar losses due to previous contractual agreements. The intention for the site was for it to be used for commercial purposes.

Further to considering exempt information,

### **RESOLVED**

1. To note the current onerous leasing arrangement of Munro Works and ongoing cost to the Council.
2. To note that the Council has exercised its option to acquire the freehold interest and gives approval to complete the purchase of Munro Works for a consideration not exceeding the value detailed in the exempt section, Part B, of this report; and
3. To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration and Director of Finance to approve the final purchase price and

the Heads of Terms and all other documentation required to give effect to the acquisition as set out in Part B of the report.

4. To note that the capital cost of the purchase and any associated costs of refurbishment, as outlined in the Exempt section of the report, can be funded from the approved capital programme.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Munro Works site is an onerous asset in its current form costing the Council £92,250 per annum (based on the head rent paid less the income from the sub-letting) in rental terms potentially until lease expiry in 62 years' time, due to the restrictive covenants on sub-letting in the head lease.

There is clear rationale to purchase the Freehold interest in Munro Works to stem the loss of rental income and business rates, and to achieve control of this investment in the future.

On 10<sup>th</sup> April 2014, a Leader decision was taken to exercise the Option to acquire the freehold interest. That Option was exercised on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2014. However, the acquisition was left in abeyance, as the parties were unable to agree the purchase price at the time. The acquisition of the freehold interest would enable the Council to actively manage this industrial estate, and maximise income potential for the future from efficient estate management and in line with the Council's Asset Management Plan and MTFS.

### **Alternative options considered.**

The alternative option is not to purchase the freehold interest in Munro Works and to manage the asset without changing the lease structure. If no action is taken to acquire the Freehold, the Council will continue to suffer a net loss of rental income, as set out below together with a loss of business rates in respect of the unlet and vacant units, currently amounting to a sum set out in Part B of this report. Further information is set out in Part B of this report.

The Council would continue to suffer an annual net loss which would worsen during the rest of the lease, and be exacerbated at the end of the lease in the likely event that a schedule of dilapidations would be served on the Council at that time. Moreover, full business rates are payable by the Council on the vacant units at Munro Works (full details are included in the Exempt report).

Another option is the restructuring of the letting arrangements at the estate to achieve a single letting of the whole, as permitted in the Headlease. This would be likely to achieve a lower overall rent than letting individual units, and would increase the Council's risk with regard to voids, rent arrears and lease default. It is therefore considered an unattractive option.

The Council could surrender the existing headlease and renegotiate terms under a new lease structure. This was previously considered, but would necessitate foregoing



the option to purchase and an adjustment to the rent review clause to reflect these changes, which would not benefit the Council.

## **268. EXTENSION OF UNITED GUARDING SERVICES (UGS) SECURITY CONTRACT**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report, which sought agreement to a further six-month extension to Haringey's existing security contract with UGS beyond 31<sup>st</sup> October in order to fully evaluate the future options for the service in line with the Council's Insourcing Policy and Community Wealth Building approach. The extension would also provide necessary continuity while the impact of COVID-19 on Council buildings was fully assessed.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the extension of the UGS security contract for a further six months until 30th April 2021 with a value up to £407k, in accordance with CSO 10.02.1 b).

### **Reasons for decision**

As part of the wider FM insource planning it was agreed in consultation with members that security would be considered in a future phase of corporate insourcing. This was necessary due to the UGS contract not being novateable from the previous FM provider.

A short-term extension to the UGS contract is required in order to provide continuity within the security service and to allow a full review of future options in line with Council policy.

In March 2020, the Assistant Director for Capital Projects & Property, following a compliant procurement exercise, approved the original award of a contract to UGS to the value of £475,000 for an initial contract period of seven months commencing 1st April 2020, with the option to extend up to a further seven months.

Because the extension for a further six months, to a value of £407k as provided for in the original contract with UGS, exceeds the key decision threshold, a Cabinet decision is required in accordance with the Council's Contract Standing Orders.

### **Alternative options considered**

Not to provide the current services supplied by the current contractor - This option would leave staff, the public and Council sites vulnerable.

To undertake a full OJEU tendering process immediately -This option is not considered viable due to current market uncertainty related to COVID-19 and the need to investigate comprehensively options to insource these services, as per Council policy.

The current contract allows for an extension, which is the preferred option enabling a review of the contract specification, insourcing opportunities and a full retendering exercise during the extension period.

## **269. CONTRACT AWARD DEN PIPE SUPPLIER**

The Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability introduced the report, which sought approval to a contract award to Logstor UK Ltd for the District Energy pipe supply. This decision did not commit the Council to any spend. However, it did create a clear delivery path to allow the developers the Council were collaborating with to deliver the project to start building the network on the Council's behalf. It clearly helps to deliver this ambition programme and the Manifesto commitment of delivering a municipal energy company to deliver affordable, low carbon energy.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley- Harrison, work was progressing for a DEN to be in place for Tottenham Hale by 2024 and Wood Green by 2025.

The Cabinet placed on record their thanks to Emma Williamson, the Assistant Director for Planning for her considerable work as the Lead Planning officer and support to councillors in her role. Emma was leaving the Council to take up a new post and the Cabinet wished her well in her new position.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To confirm the award of a call-off contract from the Stoke City Council DEPO framework for DEN Pipe Supplier to Logstor UK Ltd (Logstor) for a period of 3 years from 1/5/20 to 30/4/23. The contract value over the life of the contract (contract period + extension) is estimated to be £1.7m and so this falls under CSO 9.07.1d
2. To give delegated authority to the Director Housing, Regeneration & Planning to approve the final terms and conditions upon which the Council will enter into a call-off contract with Logstor under the Stoke City Council DEPO.

### **Reasons for decision**

This appointment allows the DEN team to manage the quality and price risks associated with the incremental installation of the network.

It will allow the team to obtain prices from the market for incremental installation of pipe to help inform the business case so that LBH can make decisions on whether or not to proceed with the DEN project.

The contracts do not commit LBH to any spend at this time. Materials will be called off from the contract as and when different phases of network installation are approved.

This approach allows developers in Tottenham Hale to work directly with

LBH's chosen suppliers and conform with LBH's quality assurance requirements.

The DEPO framework allows for direct award where either

- The chosen supplier is the cheapest on the basis of framework rates;
- There is a need for urgency; or
- For consistency where a supplier has been used on an earlier Phase 4.6 In this case, a direct award is recommended because there is a clear price advantage between the chosen supplier's standard rates and those of other suppliers on the framework and there is also a need for urgency so that we do not delay the developers we are working with.

### **Alternative options considered**

To note that the recommended route is to:

- 1) Nominate a single system provider that all developers must use.
- 2) The system provider to have design responsibility for interfaces across the network.

The costs for these aspects are estimated at c. £1.6m for the supply of pipe materials and c.£100k for the overarching design responsibility Installation of the pipe then has two aspects i) civil engineering (i.e. roadworks/excavation and associated site management) to allow installation of pipe and ii) installation of the pipe itself.

For works on private developers' land, typically a main contractor has already been selected (on the basis of the best price for constructing the scheme) and will be responsible for civil engineering associated with the pipe. However, the pipe installer is yet to be selected. The recommended route of nominating a system supplier still allows a mini-competition for these installation works using an approved list of installers to ensure competition.

Where LBH is the developer, the recommended route of appointing a preferred system supplier still allows options to either

- i) procure civil engineering and pipe installation separately; or
- ii) procure civil engineering and pipe installation together

Options around this are discussed below.

#### *Do nothing*

This will lead to developers and others generating their own technical requirements for the network which will create quality and cost issues

*Procure a single installer to install the entire network (although the installer would need to work with the main contractors on each site who would undertake civil engineering works to facilitate install).*

This would give maximum control to LBH but also requires developers to grant access to their sites – which raises significant contractual issues. The uncertainty over timing of the project means it is better to procure works as and when (as allowed via the preferred option) rather than procuring them up front to an assumed timetable and then varying the contract (which will come with a cost). It has been ruled out.

Assuming the approach of appointing a single pipe supplier with responsibility for stress calculations is chosen to give continuity, several alternative routes to market were considered Run a mini-competition to choose supplier from DEPO rather than direct award.

The DEPO framework allows for either direct award or mini-competition. A mini-competition is considered of little value given the need to avoid committing to any expenditure in the contract creates little leverage.

Run a mini-competition to choose pipe supplier via LBH Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS)

There is an option to run a mini-competition via LBH's DPS for a pipe supplier. This is considered less favourable than running a mini-competition from DEPO because it has higher overheads for LBH (it would require LBH to develop bespoke specifications, contracts and evaluation criteria) but has similar drawbacks in terms of low contract value and lack of commitment to a minimum volume meaning market interest will be low (and burden on suppliers to bid is relatively high even by DPS).

Run an OJEU compliant procurement

There is an option to run an OJEU compliant procurement from scratch but this is considered less advantageous than using either the existing DEPO f/work or the LBH DPS and has been ruled out.

## **270. ESTABLISHMENT OF CABINET SUB COMMITTEES & CABINET MEMBER APPOINTMENTS FOR 2020/21 TO THE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (CSP) AND NOTE APPOINTMENTS TO LHC**

The Leader introduced the report which sought approval to:

- Re-establish the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee, confirm its terms of reference and appoint Members to serve on this advisory Cabinet sub-committee.
- To note the membership and terms of reference of the LHC which is a Joint Committee of the Cabinet.
- To confirm the terms of reference of the Community Safety Partnership and appoint members to this statutory partnership body.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To agree to re-establish the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee, and that the terms of reference for this advisory subcommittee, attached at appendix A of the report be noted;
2. To note the Community Safety Partnership membership and terms of reference attached at Appendix B of the report;
3. To note the LHC Constitution, set out in Appendix C of the report; noting the membership of the LHC agreed at Cabinet in June 2019 .[Cllr Bull - Cabinet Member for Local Investment and Economic Growth and one non-Cabinet Member [Cllr John Bevan]. These appointments were for a term of 4 years, which started from 2018/19 in accordance with the LHC constitution]
4. To appoint the Members, indicated below, to serve on the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee and Community Safety Partnership

### Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee

Chair - Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families

Cllr Mitchell

Cllr Dogan

Cllr Culverwell

Cllr Demir

Cllr Chenot

Cllr Palmer

### Community Safety Partnership

Cabinet Member for Communities and Equalities

Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families

Councillor Ogiehor

### **Reasons for decision**

Establishing a Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee ensures that there is an overview of the Councillors statutory role as a corporate parent, assisting the Council to deliver its duties to children in care and young people leaving care.

The Council currently uses LHC frameworks as an efficient way of procuring technically complex products and services for its building refurbishment and maintenance programmes.

Continuing as a Constituent Member of LHC the Council will benefit from: influencing the future direction of LHC including the identification of new products and services, which could be beneficial to the Council; increased learning of procurement practices

and technical know-how for use by the Council's officers in carrying out its own procurement programmes, and share of the LHC annual surplus.

The LHC Committee agreed, in June 2016, to amend their constitution to allow members to nominate for a term of office of four years duration, from 2018, to coincide with the local Council elections. They agreed that the Joint Committee shall comprise two members from each of the Authorities. Each Authority's representatives on the Joint Committee shall be appointed by the Authority's executive, a member of the executive or a committee of the executive, as appropriate and be appointed to serve for a term of four years.

The LHC agreed that the Joint Committee should elect a chairperson of the Joint Committee and a Vice Chairperson of the Joint Committee from among the members of the Joint Committee to serve for a term of four years.

Appointments from Cabinet are required to the Community Safety Partnership to reflect statutory duties and enable high level, accountable, strategic, oversight of issues relating community safety.

### **Alternative options considered**

The alternative option would be for the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee to cease and this would mean that there is not a scheduled opportunity for members and officers to meet and discuss the wellbeing of children in care and to ensure that the Council is meeting its corporate parenting obligations. This Committee is different to the Children and Young

People is Scrutiny Panel as it concentrates on Looked after Children and care leavers and reports directly to the Cabinet.

Haringey has been a member of the LHC, formerly the London Housing Consortium, for forty years. In February 2012, the Haringey Cabinet approved a recommendation to remain in the LHC Joint Committee and leaving this consortium would affect accessing some shared procurement expertise and support on compliance.

The Community Safety Partnership is a statutory partnership body and Therefore, not appointing Cabinet Members to this body is not an option.

## **271. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

### **RESOLVED**

To note the minutes of the urgent signing held on the 12<sup>th</sup> of June 2020.

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

None

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

**RESOLVED**

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

**274. BROADWATER FARM REHOUSING**

As per item 259 and the exempt minutes.

**275. TOTTENHAM HERITAGE ACTION ZONE (HAZ)**

As per item 266.

**276. PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF THE FREEHOLD INTEREST OF MUNRO WORKS**

As per item 267 and the exempt minutes.

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

None

CHAIR: Councillor Joseph Ejiofor

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank