

MINUTES OF MEETING Cabinet HELD ON Tuesday, 13th October, 2020, 6.30pm

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

ALSO ATTENDING: Councillors: Ahmet, Cawley- Harrison, Berryman, and Williams

310. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

311. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence in the public part of the meeting.

312. URGENT BUSINESS

The Leader advised that there was a late addendum for consideration with item 10, Local Plan, First steps of engagement. This contained the Regulatory Committee comments on this report.

313. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were personal interests declared by Cllr Bull and Cllr Chandwani as they were leaseholders in the borough.

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

None

315. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2020.

316. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

Mr Jacob Secker, Secretary of the Broadwater Farm Residents' Association, and Mr Chris Hutton, Chair of the Broadwater Farm Residents' Association, addressed the Committee in relation to item 13 – Tangmere and Northolt Compulsory Purchase Order.

Mr Jacob Secker strongly objected to the proposal to use a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) against the remaining leaseholders. He felt that, instead, the Council should make a fair offer, not involving eviction, which covered the cost of a comparable property in Tottenham because the prices were artificially depressed. Therefore, when considering the shared equity this was not enough and the leaseholder would lose their home loss payment as this was added to the financial pot to enable purchase of a property. He stated that it was unacceptable to use CPOs when such low offers had been made, explaining that £160,000 was offered for a 1-bed unit in Northolt and this would force people out of the area which was unacceptable. Mr Secker felt that this was similar to the issue on the Aylesbury estate, and the same situation should not be faced on Broadwater Farm

Although offers were made in July, these were not consulted upon. These offers met some people's needs but the deputation contended that not all the leaseholders needs were met and time had not been taken to complete a proper consultation on this situation to avoid the CPO process.

Mr Jacob Secker wanted the Council to offer leaseholders an amount comparable to other values in Tottenham rather than the depressed values in Broadwater Farm.

Mr Chris Hutton reiterated that Broadwater Farm had depressed values and that not enough consideration had been given to the fact that these leaseholders were not willing sellers. He stated that the basis of evaluation for leaseholders to receive a fair offer should be an offer comparable to the cost of replacing their home in the local area, assuming that there was a willing seller and buyer.

The Leader responded that the Council's offer was very different from the offer on the Aylesbury Estate in Southwark. The Leader advised that the Council were offering the opportunity for residents to purchase a property and for the Council to take an equity stake in that. The Leader challenged the view that the Council were forcing people out and making people homeless as this was not sustained or justified by the proposal that the Council was actually putting forward. He added that it was unfortunate that property prices were depressed in the area but that this would have also been the case when properties were purchased. It was highlighted that leaseholders had the opportunity to move in Tottenham and were not being restricted. Mr Jacob Secker contended that shared equity could be used to move elsewhere in Tottenham but this was too low and that leaseholders would end up having a limited choice and would lose their home loss payment. He felt that leaseholders were getting the lowest possible offer in the circumstances which was why people were not moving and the Council were having to resort to a CPO process Mr Secker reiterated that the Council needed to consult on another offer.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal thanked the deputation for their representations and noted that these issues had also been set out in a recent

email which was helpful and the Cabinet Member would respond to each of the points made.

The Cabinet Member explained that both blocks had failed structural tests and required demolition on health and safety grounds. The Council had been in negotiations with leaseholders for quite some time and there were those who may argue that the Council should have started the CPO process earlier. However, the approach taken was a balanced one which recognised the need to secure vacant possession of the building so the Council could start rebuilding the blocks. This was, at the same time, recognising that the leaseholders were in a situation that was unforeseen and was no fault of their own. The approach taken forward was the least antagonistic. Also, whilst taking forward the CPO process, the negotiations with the leaseholders would continue.

The Cabinet Member emphasised that the Council had been negotiating with leaseholders for a considerable length of time and the CPO was designed to set a deadline on the process.

A deadline was needed for a number of necessary reasons:

- The blocks presented a health and safety risk and the Council would continue to mitigate those risks.
- There was no gas supply to the building, but this could not be sustained.
- Security costs for keeping the blocks secure, and this was considerable to ensure the buildings were not squatted and this money could be better spent on services for residents.
- While the blocks remained standing, the Council were prevented from building much needed new homes on the estate

The Cabinet Member reiterated not ceasing negotiations with leaseholders and the Cabinet report in July underlined the Council's commitment to seek a negotiated settlement with those leaseholders and allowed for considerable amount of more flexibility to ensure this.

The Cabinet Member continued to respond to the other points made by the deputation.

In relation to the payment of £160k for a flat in Northolt example, the Cabinet Member was clear that the amounts that the Council were offering were based on market values and these valuations were carried out by an organisation that was certified by the Institute of Chartered Surveyors. These valuations were not based on the Council's perception of value. The Council also had offered to pay for the leaseholders to have their own valuations completed and these figures could also be used as a basis for negotiations, underlining the Council's commitment for a fair outcome for leaseholders.

It was accepted that values on Broadwater Farm were lower than elsewhere but the Council had balance out that with the price that the leaseholder originally purchased their property for.

In relation to offering the amount of compensation with the cost of a comparable property in Tottenham as a whole, as opposed to the Council's perceived property values, the Cabinet Member reiterated that this was a perception in values. In addition to the full market offer, the Council were offering to all the BWF leaseholders an equity loan, as acknowledged by the deputation. This would make onward purchases much easier to ensure that they can remain in the area. The Council were not aware, at the moment, of any cases where this did not at least provide for a comparable property in Tottenham. It was noted that the equity loan was limited to that in the policy. The Council allowed the leaseholders to submit a request, through the discretion panel to increase that amount so this was another avenue available to leaseholders.

In relation to the low values and Aylesbury Estate situation raised by the deputation, the Council had a rehousing and repayments policy which was reflective of best practice in London to provide a range of options so that leaseholders could remain in the area .The Cabinet Member was more than happy to be provided with examples of cases, from the Residents Association ,where the leaseholder was struggling to secure any accommodation elsewhere based on the negotiations that the Council were undertaking and would consider them and try to resolve them.

With regard to the historic decision making on the building of the blocks and the unfair situation the leaseholders were facing as a result of this, the Cabinet Member recognised the difficult circumstances, but believed that the leaseholder offer was a reasonable one , considering the unforeseen circumstances in 2018, and apologised for the upheaval this had caused residents and she would continue to work with leaseholders to find a settlement . The valuations did not take into account the problems identified in the blocks, post 2018 and were completed on the basis of being in a good condition.

With regards to the new offers for leaseholders approved in July, and contention that no consultation was taken forward with leaseholders to understand if these offers would meet their needs, the Cabinet Member highlighted that there was a team of officers as well as Independent Liaison Officers working closely with remaining residents on the Broadwater Farm. It was noted that the team's understanding of the needs of all these residents was used to inform the proposals that Cabinet approved in July. Where leaseholders felt that the range of options were not reasonable, then the Cabinet Member advised the leaseholders to contact the Council.

Given the need to move forward to the next agenda item , the Cabinet Member agreed to provide an email response to the deputation on the remaining issues and these would be added to the minutes.

In concluding her response to the deputation, the Cabinet Member appreciated the difficult circumstances that the leaseholders found themselves in, through no fault of their own, but emphasised that this was not the end of the negotiations and the

process allowed a clear roadmap and timeline to reach a final resolution and the negotiations would be ongoing.

The Leader added that he hoped the leaseholders would find in comfort in the response received.

Emailed response for the minutes

Very importantly, in the cases of leaseholders that cannot purchase new homes, the Council should offer an amount approaching the market value of the home on Broadwater Farm plus a secure tenancy. This is opposed to the current offer which is 25% of the home or its 'use value' which can be as little as £56,000 or even less.

The Council have yet to be approached by any leaseholder who has set out how the council's existing policies for rehousing means it is impossible for them to purchase a new home. The secure tenancy offer is therefore only one option offered to leaseholders and they are under no obligation to accept this where this offer has been made. The Council strongly encouraged anyone who finds themselves in this position to get in contact with us immediately.

While the Council is working hard to build and acquire new homes, they remained a scarce resource and the council has a very significant waiting list of high priority applicants for them. We believe the offer of a secure tenancy has significant value. Leaseholders who take this option are guaranteed to receive, in addition to a secure tenancy, at least what they paid for their homes. We believe this is a reasonable offer

317. TANGMERE AND NORTHOLT COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought authority for the Council to use its compulsory purchase powers to make 'The London Borough of Haringey (Tangmere and Northolt) Compulsory Purchase Order 2020' ("the Order") in respect of the Tangmere and Northolt sites and to acquire all outstanding property interests and any additional rights that may be required. It was noted that the majority of the information for this report had been covered in the deputation under item 7.

In response to a question from Cllr Chandwani, it was confirmed that there were people in both blocks who had accepted the package of relocation offers.

In response to a question from Cllr Cawley-Harrison, it was explained that the health and safety issues with the blocks had been discovered in 2018. All Council tenants had been rehoused as soon as possible and the remaining residents were leaseholders. It was noted that the Council had made significant efforts to come to agreements with the remaining leaseholders but that it was essential to vacate the blocks as they were unsafe and the current situation, including mitigation measures, was not sustainable.

Further to considering the exempt information at item 23,

RESOLVED

1. To authorise the making of the Order to acquire all land and rights within the land edged red on (Appendix 2(b)) for housing purposes pursuant to the powers contained in section 17 of the Housing Act 1985, to enable the Council demolition of the Tangmere and Northolt blocks and the erection of new housing accommodation on the site so as to achieve a future qualitative gain following confirmation of the Order.
2. To delegate authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning in consultation with the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance as follows:
 - (a) To make all necessary changes, as appropriate to the draft Statement of Reasons (and any adjustment to the Order Schedule and Order Map) and take all necessary steps to make, serve and implement the Order, to pursue its confirmation by the Inspector, Secretary of State (or the Council) and to implement the Order as may be necessary (these steps are set out in section 6.59-6.74 of this report);
 - (b) To make General Vesting Declarations (GVDs) under the Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981 and/or to serve notices to treat and notices of entry (if required) following confirmation of the Order.
 - (c) To issue and serve any warrants to obtain possession of property acquired by the Council following the execution of a GVD or service of a notice of entry relating to the Order if it is considered appropriate and necessary to do so.
 - (d) To acquire third party interests in the land within the Order either by agreement or compulsorily; and
 - (e) To finalise and confirm the Order documents prior to making the Order.

Reasons for decision

Proceeding with a CPO and making the Order is necessary due to the extensive timescale and resources expended in acquiring all of the third-party properties by private treaty spanning approximately 2 years to date, which puts at risk residents' safety. Residents approved the demolition of the blocks via consultation during 2018, and the Order is now necessary to ensure this can be delivered. The reasons for the Order are set out in the draft Statement of Reasons attached at Appendix 1.

To date and despite ongoing negotiations with affected parties, the Council has been unable to acquire all of the outstanding third party land interests in the proposed CPO site through agreement and is unlikely to be able to do so without the use of the Order. The demolition of both the Tangmere and Northolt blocks and the redevelopment of the site is at considerable risk if control of all of the land interests within the Order area is not obtained within a reasonable time. In the absence of making and using the powers afforded by the CPO, negotiations by the Council with

parties with individual land interests could be much more difficult and protracted, as has been the case to date. Delays could also make the proposals more expensive, putting the deliverability of the project at risk. This would be due to the long-term costs associated with security of the blocks, the ongoing repairs and maintenance required whilst the blocks remain in place and outstanding interests to be acquired. Further to this, resident's safety remains the Council's priority and leaseholders continuing to remain in the blocks increases the risk to them and the surrounding area in the event of progressive collapse. The Cabinet is asked to resolve to make the Order to acquire all land and rights within the CPO Site. Officers are satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest to make the Order for the reasons set out in this Cabinet Report and the draft Statement of Reasons see Appendix 1. This is the reason for the recommendations at section 3 of this Report.

Therefore, the justification for making the CPO is:

1. the blocks are unsafe and pose a risk both to inhabitants and the surrounding areas;
2. the cost of the buildings remaining represents poor value for money due to the prohibitively high cost of refurbishment and structural works;
3. the Council cannot deliver its commitments to rebuilding homes until demolition has been undertaken.

The confirmation of a CPO can be protracted if the CPO is challenged, which means the Council must therefore proceed with starting the CPO process now in order to avoid any further delays. A number of further steps will need to be taken to issue, serve and implement the Order. In order to expedite this process, Cabinet is also asked to grant delegated authority to the relevant officers identified in section 3 of this Report to undertake the actions required. This is the reason for the recommendations at 3.2 of this Report.

In order to use the powers under section 17 of the 1985 Housing Act to make the Order it is necessary for the Council to commit to delivering a *quantitative or qualitative gain* in housing stock on the CPO Site. On 13th November 2018, Cabinet reiterated that following demolition of the two blocks the Council would re-provide at least the same number of Council homes as will be demolished. As these homes will be structurally compliant, this will represent a qualitative gain in housing. Design proposals are already being developed to ensure that this is the case. The Council will also explore options to deliver a quantitative housing gain by providing more units on the Order Land and the surrounding vacant land.

The definitive case for making the CPO is in the draft Statement of Reasons, appended to the report.

Alternative options considered

A number of alternative options were considered and rejected:

- **Option 1 - do not make a CPO, continue negotiations:**

Option 1 is not recommended as it does not give the project any certainty in terms of the timeframe or budget. Negotiations have been ongoing with leaseholders in Tangmere since June 2018 and Northolt since February 2019 as referenced in section 1.1 of this Report. To date, despite ongoing negotiations and a comprehensive rehousing and payments policy being in place, agreement has not been reached to acquire the outstanding leasehold interests in the blocks by private treaty.

- **Option 2 - do not make a CPO, stop negotiations:**

Option 2 is not a realistic option as the blocks were agreed to be demolished in November 2018 and need to be demolished due to safety concerns. The Council and Homes for Haringey have obligations to ensure the safety of the buildings, residents and neighbours – obligations that would not be met if this option was chosen.

- **Option 3 - make a CPO using alternative statutory powers**

Option 3 is not recommended as, based on legal advice and full consideration of the specifics of the site, Section 17 of the Housing Act 1985 is considered the most appropriate enabling power.

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

The Leader noted that Overview and Scrutiny had referred one item, the Scrutiny Panel Review on Blue Badges and Supporting Better Access to Parking for Disabled People. It was noted that this would be covered under agenda item 9.

319. SCRUTINY PANEL REVIEW ON BLUE BADGES AND SUPPORTING BETTER ACCESS TO PARKING FOR DISABLED PEOPLE

Cllr Ahmet, Chair of Overview and Scrutiny, introduced the item, outlining that there had been Environment and Community Safety scrutiny review of the administration of the Disabled Blue Badge Scheme. It was noted that, through this review, scrutiny had been involved in policy development which was very positive and Cllr Ahmet thanked the Cabinet Member for engaging throughout the process. It was noted that the panel felt that it could have spent more time scrutinising this topic, particularly the introduction of designated disabled bays. Although it was acknowledged that the Cabinet Member had been eager to implement improvements in this case, the panel's views on ensuring suitable timelines were reflected in recommendation 1.

It was explained that there had been lots of contributions from residents during this review and that 21 recommendations had been made over five categories: dedicated disabled bays, applying for and renewing a blue badge, enforcement and blue badge related crime, correspondence and communication, and assessments for discretionary blue badge applications.

The Cabinet Member for Transformation and Public Realm Investment acknowledged the work undertaken by the panel, staff, agencies, and residents and noted that the report proposed to accept all but two of the recommendations. It was explained that recommendations 11 and 12 were not agreed. In relation to recommendation 11, there

were insufficient funds to invest in anti-theft devices for blue badges. It was also noted that a companion badge had been introduced which allowed blue badges to be kept at home; this was only valid in Haringey but discouraged theft as it was ineffective for others. In relation to recommendation 12, it was not agreed that blue badge theft should be included in the Community Safety Partnership work plan as this would not connect with its terms of reference or its role as a strategic partnership. It was added that the Council already worked with the police on the misuse of blue badges and that the quarterly strategic partnership would be a more appropriate forum.

It was also noted that recommendations 16 and 21 had been partially agreed. For recommendation 16, it was considered that the ability for next of kin to inform the Council when a disabled bay user was deceased duplicated the 'Tell Us Once' service which allowed relatives to notify various services through one point of contact and which included blue badges. For recommendation 21, it was clarified that the Council could not retender the service as it was a partnership with the NHS rather than a contract. However, it was agreed that alternatives could be explored to provide additional assessment centres.

The Cabinet Member expressed that the end of the review was not the end of the process. It was highlighted that these recommendations would be made into a Disabled Parking Action Plan and that this was specifically included in the Cabinet Member responsibilities. It was explained that the Council was investing in IT systems to improve case management for disabled parking and was coproducing solutions with residents to ensure that residents had a good, disabled parking offer.

In relation to recommendation 16, Cllr Ahmet noted that the panel had been informed that parking bays remained vacant for some time after a bereavement and that a quicker response was needed after someone used 'Tell Us Once' service. The Cabinet Member explained that she thought the Tell Us Once issues related to the blue badge rather than the parking bay and noted that she would revisit this and respond to the panel. It was explained that the Council had written to all bay users and was identifying an inventory for disabled parking bays; this would be a two- or three-year process but would result in a more efficient service. In addition, with the introduction of dedicated bays, the Council would have named contacts.

Cllr Bull welcomed the report. He noted that the companion badge was a good scheme but that it was important to publicise as some people did not realise that it existed. He added that there were issues for residents who used companion badges on TfL roads as the TfL enforcement officers did not recognise the badges.

The Cabinet Member noted that the new parking IT system and rollout of virtual permits would provide an opportunity to let people know about the companion badge. In relation to TfL roads, it was explained that the Council was aware of this issue; it was noted that TfL had been informed but that this issue tended to resurface whenever there was TfL staff turnover. It was noted that the Head of Operations would liaise with Cllr Bull in relation to this issue.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley-Harrison, it was noted that:

- People were informed that the companion badge was only valid in Haringey and this would be highlighted with the rollout of virtual permits. It was added that most

blue badge theft occurred outside people's homes, often overnight, and so the companion badge was very useful in this situation.

- The signage for dedicated bays was governed by the Department for Transport (DfT). The Cabinet Member agreed that some of the initial signage was confusing and that, following discussions with residents, the DfT had agreed for the Council to use some decommissioned signage with clearer wording.

Cllr Cawley-Harrison welcomed the Action Plan. He noted that things were changing rapidly with Covid. Following brief connection issues, the Cabinet Member provided the following written response:

- It would be made clearer that blue badge holders could park anywhere (legally) for free in the borough. This included CPZ area which was not the case in some boroughs. So, they did not have to await a bay. It was appreciated that in some places it was hard to find space on open bays too.
- The Physical Disabilities Reference Group would help identify where the disabled parking was needing an increase. The feedback received from the Cabinet Member from the last meeting of the group was that Wood Green High Rd was particularly problematic.

RESOLVED

1. To note the outcome of the Scrutiny panel review of Blue Badges and Supporting Better Access to Parking for Disabled People, as detailed in appendix 1 of the report.
2. To proceed with the recommendations regarding the Council's blue badge scheme as set out in appendix 2 of the report. And agree all recommendations except recommendation 11 and 12 which are not agreed.
3. To note that recommendations 16 and 21 are also to be agreed in part and the proposed responses to those recommendations in appendix 2 of the report.

Reasons for decision

The recommended actions set out in this report support the work being undertaken to improve the service offer to motorists with disabilities. Those actions will help streamline processes, increase self-serve options as well as protecting the dedicated spaces made available on the public highway for those users.

Alternative options considered

In addressing the recommendations set out by the Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Panel, several actions were considered. The report provided what are considered to be the most effective actions. Therefore, alternative options have not been considered at this point. These actions will be however be refined if required during implementation to ensure that the right outcomes are achieved.

320. NEW LOCAL PLAN: FIRST STEPS ENGAGEMENT

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Corporate Services introduced the report which proposed the first steps for engagement on a new Local Plan. It was outlined that, in November 2019, Cabinet had agreed an update to the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS), setting out that a New Local Plan would be prepared by 2022 to replace the existing, multiple documents adopted in 2017. It was noted that the new Local Plan would take account of the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and emerging London Plan, respond to the climate emergency, and support recovery following Covid-19.

It was explained that the first steps engagement document was included as Appendix A to the report. The engagement explained the borough, its neighbourhoods, challenges, and priorities; it asked open questions and sought views on new policy areas before the new Local Plan was drafted. The results of the engagement would feed into the drafting of the new Local Plan, a draft would be out for consultation in 2021, and the final version was due to be adopted in 2022. It was noted that an Integrated Impact Assessment Draft Scoping Report and a Communications and Engagement Plan were included as appendices to the report.

The Leader noted that the proposed consultation would be asking for views at this stage rather than comments on draft policies and this would allow the Local Plan to be built from the consultation feedback. It was noted that the Chair of the Regulatory Committee was present, and she was invited to comment. Cllr Williams thanked the Cabinet for accepting the addendum with comments from the Regulatory Committee. She welcomed the first steps engagement proposal and hoped that there would be widespread community engagement.

Cllr Williams noted that it would be important for the new Local Plan to ensure a significant proportion of family homes, defined as 3-beds or more, for those on the waiting list; this would provide stability for children in the borough which was essential. It was enquired how many family sized units were in the pipeline and whether the Council was due to meet its target for 45% of new Council homes to be 3-bed units. The Cabinet Member noted that one of the biggest challenges would be providing homes for those most in need and that this would be part of the Local Plan. The Assistant Director for Housing noted that early Council house building programme delivery had been skewed by acquisitions and that housing delivery had provided more 1-bed and 2-bed units than planned; the current forecast for 3-bed units was 25-30% but the Council was doing what it could through business planning to reach 45%. The Leader noted that this could be a target to review in 18 months' time.

Cllr Williams asked to receive confirmation by email of exactly how many 3-bed units were in the pipeline to be delivered.

Cllr Cawley-Harrison asked what changes were proposed in response to the comments made by the Regulatory Committee and how the Cabinet Member would ensure that the Local Plan included tangible goals. The Leader noted that the Regulatory Committee comments were submitted as a late addendum and that there would not have been much time to make any changes. The Interim Assistant Director for Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability outlined the proposed consultation

and engagement methods, taking on board Regulatory Committee feedback. The Cabinet Member for Planning and Corporate Services noted that the recommendations allowed for amendments to be made in relation to the comments of the Regulatory Committee and it would be ensured that there were tangible goals.

Cllr Berryman noted that the new Local Plan would need to balance the delivery of affordable housing and the description of social rent. It was noted that the Mayor of London considered that London Affordable Rent (LAR) was genuinely affordable and it was enquired how social rent would be considered in the new Local Plan. The Cabinet Member for Planning and Corporate Services noted that the Council had a clear preference for social rent but that the exact structure of this in the new Local Plan would depend on the results of consultation. The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal acknowledged that there was a spectrum of definitions and that social rent could be a generic term. She explained that she used the term 'Council rent' and that the Council was committed to Council rent; it was added that LAR was closer to Council rents than other rents.

Cllr Berryman noted that 2-bed social rent in Haringey was £106 per week, LAR was £164 per week, and the housing benefit level was £299 per week. He stated that it was sometimes necessary to sell units privately as they were not viable at social rent levels; it was enquired whether the Council would prioritise Council rent at the expense of LAR or would work out what worked best locally. The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal expressed that not everyone in Council properties received housing benefit; there were also some situations where LAR was considered in addition to Council rents but that there was a clear commitment in the manifesto to provide 1,000 Council rent homes. The Cabinet Member for Planning and Corporate Services noted that the report was proposing a first steps engagement rather than any specific Local Plan proposals. It was explained that people, including Councillors, could respond to this initial engagement with their views and comments.

Cllr Bull – briefly lost connection at 20.09 but came back in the meeting at 20.10.

Cabinet noted the comments of Regulatory Committee and,

RESOLVED

1. To approve for public consultation, in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the New Haringey Local Plan: First Steps Engagement consultation document (Appendix A).
2. To delegate authority to the Interim Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability to agree the final version of the New Haringey Local Plan: First Steps Engagement consultation document, and other supporting material to be produced for consultation purposes including the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) Scoping Report, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Corporate Services to the extent that any changes to the versions approved by Cabinet are non-material (examples of changes permitted shall

include minor text, layout and design changes as well as changes needed for clarification and for consultation purposes).

Reasons for decision

A new Local Plan is required to provide a robust planning framework for the future planning of the borough that takes account of the new National Planning Policy Framework and the emerging New London Plan, reflects the new Borough Plan (2019), responds to the Climate Emergency, supports the borough's recovery from COVID-19 and meets legal and policy requirements for the Council to have an up-to-date plan and a 5 Year Housing Land Supply. The New Local Plan – First Steps consultation document will provide the opportunity for residents, businesses and other local stakeholders to shape the New Local New Plan from the beginning, identifying key issues and challenges the borough faces and preferences for various possible options.

Alternative options considered

The alternative options considered were:

- Option 1: Do not prepare a New Local Plan at this time. The Council could continue using the existing Local Plan and the London Plan to support planning decisions. The advantage of this option is that it would not require any immediate resources. The disadvantage is that the Council would not have a fully up-to-date plan which reflects the new National Planning Policy Framework and new London Plan, responds to the corporate priorities in the Borough Plan and provides specific support for COVID-19 recovery and renewal.
- Option 2: Prepare a New Local Plan but do not carry out a First Steps Engagement consultation. The advantage of this option is that it would shorten the process of preparing a New Local Plan and reduce the resources required to do it. The disadvantage is that the Council would not be engaging the community upfront in the plan-making process and may not be able to satisfy the legal requirements for stages of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) / Sustainability Appraisal (SA).
- Option 3: Prepare a New Local Plan including a First Steps Engagement consultation. The advantage of this option is that it involves the community upfront in the plan-making process and helps to ensure that the plan is shaped by their input. The disadvantage of this option is that it would take longer to prepare the New Local Plan and would require more resources to deliver.

Option 3 was recommended as this will deliver a New Local Plan to provide a robust planning framework for the future planning of the borough, which reflects the Council's corporate priorities, is shaped by upfront and meaningful engagement with Haringey's communities and helps to meet legal requirements for SEA/SA.

321. CHILDREN'S SERVICES UPDATE

The Cabinet Member for Children, Education, and Families introduced the report which provided an overview of safeguarding and looked after children activity and performance for 2019-2020. It was noted that the annual report provided an opportunity to see improvements, challenges, and to note where attention needed to be focused to ensure improvements. It was added that the report included information on the population of children and young people in the borough which was useful in providing background for the challenges faced by the service.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley-Harrison, it was noted that:

- The payment system for travel buddies had been moved from Cavendish to the Council's internal procurement system. Although this had taken some time to establish, the relevant information had now been transferred and had been provided by travel buddies in all cases except one where amended bank details were awaited. The Cabinet Member thanked parents who had brought this issue to the Council's attention.
- 14 social workers had been recruited from South Africa following a targeted approach. As new staff, they were being inducted to ensure that they had the appropriate knowledge and that they were settled. The Cabinet Member stated that the AD/ Director could provide more detail to Cllr Cawley- Harrison after the meeting.
- It would be challenging to share information about the safeguarding reviews in November given the need to ensure the privacy of the individuals involved. However, the actions agreed from the reviews would be included in Ofsted updates, there would be a more thorough report to the Safeguarding Board, and an update would be reported to Cabinet.

RESOLVED

To note the Children Social Care Annual Report 2019/20 and in particular:

1. The increase in the rate of referral, reduction in the numbers of referrals that result in 'no further action' and the effectiveness of the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) (paragraphs 6.5 to 6.6 and 6.7 to 6.9).
2. Improvements in the numbers of, and time taken to complete assessments (paragraphs 6.13 to 6.14);
3. The increase in the rate of Section 47 enquiries (paragraph 6.17);
4. The slight reduction in the numbers of children in care which has closed the gap with our statistical neighbours (paragraph 6.26);
5. The need to reduce the numbers of children placed out of boroughs and the very good performance on long term placement stability (paragraphs 6.28 and 6.30);
6. The significant improvements in the numbers of care leavers in suitable accommodation (paragraph 6.47); and

7. The action taken to improve the recruitment and retention of social workers (section 7).

Reasons for decision

The annual report is intended to inform Cabinet of the performance of Children Social Care in 2019/20. Cabinet should be aware of the progress made against managing the financial and safeguarding demands. The report, in addition to other measures, enables Cabinet to assure itself that the necessary arrangements are in place for the Council to effectively discharge its children social care obligations. In this regard, there is a distinct leadership role for the Leader, Lead Member for Children and Young People's Services, the Chief Executive and Director of Children Services. Also, there is a wider corporate parent role for all members of the Council.

Alternative options considered

Reports which are for information or noting do not involve any actions being agreed and do not require this section to be completed.

322. EXTENSION OF ALCOHOL & DOG CONTROL PSPOS

The Cabinet Member for Communities introduced the report which proposed to extend the Council's existing Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) for Alcohol and Dog Control for a further three - year period. It was noted that a small extension was proposed to the Woodside Ward Alcohol PSPO to include Chapmans Green Park.

Cllr Cawley-Harrison enquired:

- What preventative work had been done for residents who may drink on the streets as a result of alcohol dependency.
- How the Cabinet Member would be encouraging the police to take more action against dangerous dogs. It was noted that, where people had dogs that were a potentially dangerous breed, it was unlikely that a PSPO or Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) would be an effective deterrent.
- Which scientific advice had been the basis for the decision to require dogs to be kept on leads in Haringey's parks during the Covid-19 pandemic, given that this contrasted with the Greater London Authority advice based on owner discretion.

The Cabinet Member for Communities would provide the written responses to these points.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the extension of the 11 Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) for the control of alcohol until 18 October 2023.

2. To approve varying the boundary of the Woodside alcohol PSPO to include Lordship Lane, Chapmans Green Park and the roads directly surrounding Chapmans Green Park as set out in the map on page 5 of Appendix 12 of the report.
3. To approve the extension of the borough wide dog control PSPO until 18 October 2023.
4. To approve varying the dog control PSPO to impose a new requirement that dog owners produce a device or other means for removing dog faeces when requested by an officer.

Reasons for decision

On 20 October 2017 Haringey replaced its 11 Designated Public Places Orders (also known as Alcohol Control Zones) and Dog Control Orders, with Public Space Protection Orders, with requirements and prohibitions mirroring the previous Alcohol Control Zones and Dog Control Orders. A PSPO remains in place for three years unless extended or discharged by the Local Authority. The existing PSPOs enacted on the 20 October 2017, relating to alcohol and dog control expire on 19 October 2020.

The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 states that before the time when a PSPO is due to expire, the local authority that made the order may extend the period for which it has effect, and/or vary the order, if satisfied on reasonable grounds that doing so is necessary to prevent:

- (a) occurrence or recurrence after that time of the activities identified in the order,
- or
- (b) an increase in the frequency or seriousness of those activities after that time.

On 10 March 2020, the Cabinet agreed that the proposal to extend and vary the PSPOs should be taken to public consultation. The Consultation process began on the 7 July 2020 and continued for 6 weeks ending on Monday 18 August 2020.

For the PSPOs to be extended and varied Cabinet must consider the outcome of the consultation and EQIA and make a decision before the PSPOs expire on 19 October 2020.

Alternative options considered

A discharge of the current Alcohol and Dog Control PSPOs on 19 October 2020 and/or no variation or addition.

The Alcohol Control and Dog Control PSPOs will lapse on 19 October 2020 if not extended. Not having valid PSPOs in place will have a detrimental impact on the Police and Council officers' ability to enforce drinking and dog-related nuisance across the borough. This may then lead to increased dog fouling, dogs being causing a nuisance and not being adequately controlled, dogs entering children's play areas, sports areas and marked pitches and an increase in people drinking alcohol and engaging in behaviour likely to cause nuisance and annoyance to residents and other members of the public.

This option would be contrary to the need for the PSPOs to continue and the public support for their continuation. It would also result in the re-occurrence of the activities that are detrimental to the quality of life of people who live, visit or work in the areas where the PSPOs can be enforced.

323. THE ACQUISITION OF TWO HEAD LEASES AND GRANT OF A NEW LEASE AT THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY, WOOD GREEN

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which set out the proposed acquisition of two head leases and the granting of a new lease at the Chocolate Factory and Mallard Place Wood Green which would enable the Council to fulfil its aspirations in regards to the cultural corner in Wood Green.

This decision formed part of the Council's regeneration ambitions and was part of the Wood Green Action Plan. It was noted that the proposed acquisition of the leasehold interest also offered the Council a unique opportunity to take control of the Council freehold land in this vicinity, in order, to enable the regeneration of this area.

This decision would enable the Council to develop the area acquired from Workspace in accordance with planning consent to build 137 new homes as part of the Council Housing Delivery Programme on the Chocolate Factory site. The Council were ready to build the first phase of new houses at this site by next summer and these were expected to be completed by the summer of 2023. The proposal also enabled the Council to develop a further 66 homes on the Mallard Place site at a later phase. Workspace would be provided on both sites to support employment. This proposal was in line with the Borough Plan and met Disposals and Acquisitions Policy which was agreed by the Council earlier this year.

It was noted that Area 51, which was based at Mallard Place, and currently provided education for young Adults who had severe or profound learning disabilities and would continue as part of the Cultural quarter.

This decision was a positive step to support good economic recovery and the Council's housing programme.

The following information was provided in response to Councillor Cawley- Harrison's questions:

- Workspace were able to take forward their own refurbishment on their own part of the site and this agreement was also allowing them, to continue with their current arrangements with artists for employment space.
- The employment space that the Council can use on the land, which becomes wholly Council owned, would be for the Council to develop over time. This was not restricted in use and assurance was provided that further cultural employment provision would be considered in the future. The meeting was advised that the primary and most important development for this site was the first phase of the housing scheme

- In relation to the surrounding areas which had significant developments coming forward, and query about the Station Road Re-use and Recycling Centre site, and the plans for future development, the Cabinet Member was not aware of any plans to relocate the Recycle and Reuse centre in the present arrangements. It was further confirmed by the Assistant Director for Capital Projects and Property that the Recycling and Reuse site was owned by the Waste Authority and there were no propositions or proposals being considered, at this time, for the development of this site.

Further to considering the exempt information at item 24,

RESOLVED

1. To acquire part the leasehold interest from Workspace of the land shown coloured green on the red line plan in Appendix A and known as the Chocolate Factory for a sum set out in Part B to this report; and
2. To acquire the whole of the leasehold interest from Workspace of the land set out in blue in the red line plan in Appendix A and known as Mallard Place for a sum set out in Part B to this report; and
3. To the extension of the remainder of the existing term up to a maximum of 250 years of the existing lease of the part of the Chocolate Factory site remaining in Workspace ownership and shown coloured red on the plan attached at Appendix A for a sum of £1.00 A; and
4. To the transfer of the freehold land shown coloured orange on the plan attached at Appendix B to Workspace for a sum of £1.00; and
5. To the acquisition of the freehold land shown coloured yellow on the plan attached at Appendix B from Workspace for a sum of £1.00; and
6. All in accordance with the Heads of Terms attached in Appendix D.
7. To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing Regeneration & Planning after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration to agree any minor variations to the Heads of Terms and the final terms of the documents.

Reasons for decision

The opportunity to acquire the two leasehold interests offers value for money to the Council and is a unique opportunity to take control of part of the Chocolate Factory site and Mallard Place site in the vicinity in order to effect the regeneration of the area. The retention of part of the demise in the Chocolate Factory Lease will also enable Workspace to take forward the planning consent on their site increasing investment into the area.

By acquiring the part of the Chocolate Factory leasehold interest the Council would then benefit from controlling part of the site and allow the new housing to be delivered (and employment space) on its own land. The site would form part of the Council's five-year housing supply by the acceleration of housing delivery on the portion of land for which there is a planning consent. The development would provide a more appropriate mix and better percentage of housing on the site including Council rented homes as well as private homes through the acquisition of the leaseholds.

The acquisition would mean that the Council can move swiftly to implement delivery of council homes on Council land with a start on site within 18 months for the land on the Chocolate Factory site. Some minor elements of the design of the scheme would require amending through a S73 application as would the s106 associated with the existing permission. This accelerated delivery is fully in line with the Council's Good Economy Recovery Plan and the accelerated delivery of the units will help stimulate employment opportunities in the local economy, which will complement the employment and skills initiatives being brought forward part of the wider plan.

By acquiring the lease for Mallard Place site and with a frontage to Coburg Road there will be an opportunity to deliver housing, mixed use floorspace, and quality public realm on this site and others fronting onto Coburg Road as part of the regeneration of this area.

Alternative options considered

An option considered was for the Council to acquire the whole of the consented area (minus the Chocolate Factory building). This opportunity was discounted on the basis of additional risk to the Council in taking on private development, notably a large element of employment space, in the current marketplace.

Another alternative option is to sell the Council freehold or grant Workspace a long lease on the whole of the consented area. However, this was discounted on the basis that the scheme would produce a lower level of affordable residential units and the opportunity to acquire the site and provide Council rented accommodation on Council land.

The option proposed provides the most viable option and provides an opportunity for the Council to build Council rented accommodation on a Council site with planning consent, rather than relying on a private development with a more modest affordable element. This option can also be delivered more quickly than those discounted.

A further alternative option would be for the Council not to agree to the acquisition of the two leasehold interests from Workspace. This would mean that the consented scheme for the whole of the Chocolate Factory site would not be implemented. Therefore, the site would remain in its current use, the planning consent could lapse, or the site could be sold onto another owner. The new homes and employment space together with the refurbishment of the existing Chocolate Factory would be unlikely to go ahead or would be delayed for some time. This may have implications for the Council's five year housing supply.

324. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR PROVISION OF ICON MANAGED SERVICE & MID CALL SOLUTION

The Cabinet Member for Transformation and Public Realm Investment introduced the report, setting out the benefit of the proposed contract decisions for improving the efficiency of the Council's electronic payment system and improving the customer journey for residents, businesses, and partners.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the current contract was called off from a LASA framework that had since expired so further services could not be called off from it. The Council intended to purchase a mid call solution as part of the Customer First programme which allowed the customers services representative to stay on the line whilst payment was being made by the customer to help with any issues and deal with further queries they may have that are unrelated to the payment. The solution being purchased was PCI compliant and would prevent loss of income due to customers abandoning the call if they got stuck at any point and would improve the service offered to residents. The Council's current payment processing contract did not expire until 2022 but the intention was to terminate this contract and to let a new contract for 5 years with options to extend for 2 further one-year periods and include the mid call solution at the same time. This new contract was to be called off from the DAS framework which replaces the LASA framework.

The Cabinet Member outlined that, as the current contract only has a year left to run, it seemed prudent that the new contract should be placed and that this should include the mid call element so that there is only one contract to manage, one invoice to pay.

A written response would be provided by the Director for Customers, Transformation and Resources to the following questions from Cllr Cawley – Harrison:

1. Whether the £170k cost per annum for the payment processing service was an all -inclusive cost or were there additional commissioning payments made to the provider per transaction? Also, if there were any additional costs, were these made to the provider per transaction?
2. How many transactions were processed per annum by the Council?

Further to considering the exempt information at item 25,

RESOLVED

1. To approve, in accordance with Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1d), the award to the supplier identified in the exempt report of a contract for the payment processing managed service including a mid call solution for an initial 5-year term valued at £1,095,160.00 with options to extend for 2 further one-year periods together valued at £405,876.00 with a total contract value of £1,501,036.00 over the maximum term of 7 years.
2. To approve, under CSO 11.02, the early termination, with the consent of the supplier, of the current contract with the same supplier which started up on

1/6/2019 and was due to expire on 31/5/2022. This contract would be superseded by the one to be awarded under the paragraph above.

Reasons for decision

The current contract was called off from a LASA framework that has since expired so that further services cannot be called off from it. The Council intends to purchase a mid call solution as part of the Customer First programme which allows the customers services representative to stay on the line whilst payment is being made by the customer to help with any issues and deal with further queries they may have that are unrelated to the payment. The solution being purchased is PCI compliant and will prevent loss of income due to customers abandoning the call if they get stuck at any point and will improve the service offered to residents. The Council's current payment processing contract does not expire until 2022 but the intention is to terminate this contract and to let a new contract for 5 years with options to extend for 2 further one-year periods and include the mid call solution at the same time. This new contract is to be called off from the DAS framework which replaces the LASA framework. As the current contract only has a year left to run it seemed prudent that the new contract should be placed and that this should include the mid call element so that there is only one contract to manage, one invoice to pay and Cabinet can deal with all this in one go now.

Alternative options considered

Do Nothing – not an option as a mid call solution is required to ensure the Council is fully Payment Card Industry (PCI) compliant and to prevent customers losing income from abandoned calls.

Do a separate contract for a mid call solution to integrate with our current system - this would mean having two contracts with different end dates and could prove problematic when/if either contract expires.

Tender for a new contract - this would be a major piece of work, as the payment processing application integrates with many systems that take income, and could be disruptive. It is also not ideal during COVID when as little face to face contact is required as possible.

Research was carried out with a number of suppliers who could provide an alternative to the mid call solution but all were found to be more expensive. It was therefore decided to stay with the incumbent where integration is streamlined and compliant under PCIDSS.

325. VARIATION TO THE SAP CONTRACT

The Cabinet Member introduced the report which sought approval of variation of the Council's contract with Support Revolution that provided hosting and support for the Council's Enterprise, Resource Programme. The ERP was explained to be a software platform at the core Haringey's Finance, Human Resources, and other complex processes. It allowed those processes in separate functions of the organisation to share data, co-ordinating the organisation.

The Cabinet Member was pleased to announce that the programme would deliver: a platform for insourced permanent recruitment by April 2020; process, policies, and technology solutions for strategic procurement activity. This would provide significant improvements to Human Resources, Finance, and other functions of ERP so that users can work faster and easier; and fundamental changes to Finance, Human Resources and other reporting making it more easily accessed and more effective.

The programme required access to planned resources which were within the scope of both the contract with the Council's ERP support partner, Support Revolutions, and the project scope and budget, to deliver.

The programme would allow decision making at an appropriate level for minor increases to and requests under the contract.

The Director for Customers, Transformation and Resources agreed to provide a written answer on the following questions to Councillor Cawley- Harrison.

- What were the hourly or daily consultancy rates for the provider that the figure of £272,000 had been arrived at?
- Beyond the initial £130k how much additional service was forecast and was expected to be the full £272k or lower?

RESOLVED

1. To approve, under Contract Standing Order (CSO) 10.02.1b), a variation to the contract with Support Revolution Ltd for SAP Hosting and Support in order to confirm an option for the Council to request consultancy services to support work on the Council's ERP Improvement Programme between 01/10/2020 to (est.) 22/12/2021, at a value of a total of up to £272,000 (calculated based on pre-agreed rates) and to be ordered by issue from time to time of one or more purchase orders.
2. To approve, under Contract Standing Order (CSO) 10.02.1b) and pursuant to the variation referred to in the paragraph above, an initial order for a tranche of consultancy services valued at £130,000.

Reasons for decision

The Council is undergoing an ERP Improvement programme. ERP is a software platform at the core of Haringey's Finance, HR and other complex processes. It allows those processes in separate functions of the organisations to share data – co-ordinating the organisation. It is provided by a company called SAP and supported by an SAP partner organisation called Support Revolution.

The programme will deliver:

- A platform for insourced permanent recruitment by April 2020;
- Process, policies, and technology solution for strategic procurement activity;

- Significant improvements to our HR, Finance and other functions of ERP so that users can work faster and easier;
- Fundamental changes to Finance, HR and other reporting making it more easily accessed and more effective.

The programme requires access to planned resources which are within the scope of both the contract with our ERP support partner, Support Revolution, and the project scope and budget, to deliver.

The programme will allow decision making at an appropriate level for minor increases to and requests under the contract.

Alternative options considered

- Do nothing – we will be unable to deliver the ERP Improvement Programme.
- Insourcing talent – It will not be possible to recruit an in-house expert SAP team and have them operational in time to deliver the project.
- Open market tender – rejected as would have to onboard a new SAP support partner which would involve purchasing support days from existing partner in any case and unlikely to lead to reduced price/unit.

326. GRANTING OF A LEASE TO A GP PRACTICE OF ACCOMMODATION AT 54 MUSWELL HILL

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which sought agreement to the granting of a lease at 54 Muswell Hill to the Muswell Hill GP practice. This proposed decision would allow the Council to help ensure communities had a good quality local GP practice in an area where there would otherwise be a shortage.

It was noted that the Council had been working with the Haringey and Islington CCG's and the NHS to plan future care and health services in the borough. The granting of a new 25year lease of the ground and 2 upper floors would provide a new modern facility capable of serving up to 25000 patients from one site. The decision would ensure that this part of the borough had new modern facilities and ensured the Council retained its interest in the asset.

Cllr James responded on the question of whether, with the proposed addition of this facility in the Muswell Hill area, there was still required additional health facilities in the area or would the area require additional facilities but with a lesser priority. It was noted that the borough CCG representatives were keen to go ahead with this facility and the provision would solve the problems of having a shortfall of GP's in the Muswell Hill area. The Cabinet Member had a keen interest in this decision and was fully aware of the pressure from community representatives for more GP's in the area and this decision would respond to this concern.

Further to considering the exempt information at item 26,

RESOLVED

1. To grant an under lease of 54 Muswell Hill (shown edged red on the plan attached in Appendix A of the report) to The Muswell Hill Practice for a term of up to 25 years for a premium and/or rental income that would represent best consideration as set out in the exempt section to this report (Part B) and as set out in the draft Heads of Terms attached and set out in Part B to this report. The costs of the transaction to the Council are set out in Part B to the report.
2. To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing Regeneration & Planning after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration to agree the final terms for the lease including the premium and/or rental amount that would represent best consideration.

Reasons for decision

The long lease of 54 Muswell Hill was acquired by the Council on 14 July 2017 to support the provision of GP services in this area. At the time of the 2018 Cabinet decision it had also been intended to include a small number of shared ownership residential units in this property. However, the structure and fire protection issues following Grenfell has made the residential units difficult to implement, and at the same time the CCG see a solution to their own medical services needs in taking a lease on the whole building rather than part of it as originally proposed. From the Council's perspective, this ensures a beneficial public use of this asset supporting health partners in local service delivery and secures a capital receipt for the Council whilst enabling the Council to maintain a long term interest in the property.

Alternative options considered

The alternative option is not to lease the building to The Muswell Hill Practice. However, this would mean that the existing Muswell Hill Practice would continue to not be DDA compliant and undersized for the current patient list.

In this option the building at 54 Muswell Hill would remain vacant until either a solution to the residential use of the upper floors is found and the ground floor let separately or the whole of the building is let for another use.

327. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR HOMES FOR HARINGEY INTERNAL WORKS (NORTH) IN (YEAR 3) 2021-22

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought agreement to the award of a contract to enable internal improvement works to 300 dwellings in the Woodside, Stroud Green, Noel Park and Bounds Green area.

The proposed works would bring all homes up to the full Decent Homes Standard. The overall project will contribute towards achieving Haringey Council's objectives to increase the number of homes achieving the Decent Homes Standard across the borough. This would ensure all homes were safe and improved resident satisfaction.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the overall population of these wards mirrored that seen in Haringey more widely. Households in areas like Bounds Green were more

likely to be rented by social housing tenants than the average within the borough. However, areas such as Stroud Green have smaller proportion of social housing tenants and a slightly larger proportion of owner/occupiers. The wards in this area have a mixture of high -rise blocks and non-traditional dwellings.

In response to Councillor Cawley- Harrison's questions on: the communication with residents about the proposed works, ensuring the quality of the works, compensation to any tenants for any works that fall below the required standard and potential vacation of properties of the works, the following information was provided by the Cabinet Member and Director for Broadwater Farm.

- There were no leasehold implications for these works.
- The impact of the Noel Park Pod consultation on improving communications were that lessons were learned for future schemes . Homes for Haringey were considering the implications of the project in more detail and talking to residents more closely, and earlier about the works that were likely to be brought forward and the implications that they may have for the individual.
- An in house clerk of works which will ensure that they reviewed the finished works being completed on properties in North and South areas to ensure tenants were happy with the quality of work. There would be resident satisfaction surveys to make sure that works were completed to the right standard.
- In terms of compensation, Homes for Haringey would seek to rectify issues as part of any complaints that may emerge from the works. The initial response would be to identify, from residents, where work was not up to the required quality and bring this up to the right quality, checking that the resident was satisfied.
- A majority of internal works were completed without the need for the residents moving but the contract provides the opportunity for residents to leave properties where messy or disruptive works were happening during the day with provision of welfare facilities at particular times. The Resident Liaison Officers would facilitate those discussions with the contractor and tenant so there was an awareness at the start on the different elements of the works and the disruptions likely to be caused.

Further to considering the exempt information at item 27,

RESOLVED

1. Pursuant to the Council's Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1(d), to approve the award of a contract to the preferred contractor identified in exempt Appendix A to the report for the renewal of kitchen, bathroom and internal electrics in the Woodside, Stroud Green, Noel Park and Bounds Green areas. This will be for the sum of £2,354,041.

2. To approve the issue of a letter of intent for an amount up to, but not exceeding £235,404 that represents 10% of the contract sum.
3. To approve the professional fees of £230,719 that represents 9.801% of the contract sum.
4. To approve the contingency sum set out in the exempt part of the report.
5. To note the total project costs set out in the exempt part of the report.

Reasons for decision

Homes for Haringey requires Cabinet approval to award the contract for internal works to 300 dwellings in the Woodside, Stroud Green, Noel Park and Bounds Green areas. This will enable the essential internal works such as the renewal of kitchens, bathrooms and internal electrics to progress. This is following a direct award in conjunction with Haringey Council's Procurement team via the London Construction Programme (LCP) framework and processes.

The award process was carried out in accordance with the framework requirements that was based on price. LCP carried out quality evaluation when they tendered the framework. The successful contractor satisfied the requirements in relation to these criteria.

Alternative options considered

An alternative option would be for Homes for Haringey to either use third party industry frameworks or a standalone OJEU compliant tender process to deliver the works. Homes for Haringey sought support and advice from Haringey Strategic Procurement and determined the LCP framework as being the optimum route to the market. This was due to the speed of access to quality-checked contractors and focus on companies that concentrate their resources in the local area.

The option of not undertaking this work would leave Haringey Council open to residents' disrepair challenges and complaints, because the properties need to be improved to meet the Decent Homes Standard.

328. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR HOMES FOR HARINGEY INTERNAL WORKS (SOUTH) IN (YEAR 3) 2021-22

The Cabinet Member for Housing, and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought Cabinet approval for the award of a contract carry out internal improvement works to 300 dwellings in the Tottenham Hale, Bruce Grove, White Hart Lane, Northumberland Park areas.

The Cabinet Member noted that proposed works to the outlined dwellings would bring all homes up to the full Decent Homes Standard. The overall project would contribute towards achieving Haringey Council's objectives to increase the number of homes achieving the Decent Homes Standard across the borough. This would ensure all homes are safe and improve resident satisfaction.

The Cabinet Member expressed that the highest concentration of social housing fell particularly in the White Hart Lane, Northumberland Park and Tottenham Hale areas. These wards were densely populated with comparatively lower life expectancy. The proposed Homes for Haringey works aimed to provide decent homes, improving the living conditions for its residents including the most vulnerable and the elderly.

Further to considering the exempt information at item 28,

RESOLVED

1. Pursuant to the Council's Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1(d), to approve the award of a contract to the preferred contractor identified in exempt Appendix A to the report for the renewal of kitchen, bathroom and internal electrics in the Tottenham Hale, Bruce Grove, White Hart Lane and Northumberland Park areas. This will be for the sum of £2,290,009.60.
2. To approve the issue of a letter of intent for an amount up to, but not exceeding £229,000.96 that represents 10% of the contract sum.
3. To approve the total professional fees of £224,443.84 that represents 9.801% of the contract sum.
4. To approve the contingency sum set out in the exempt report.
5. To note the total project costs of set out in the exempt report.

Reasons for decision

Homes for Haringey requires Cabinet approval to award the contract for internal works to 300 dwellings in the Tottenham Hale, Bruce Grove, White Hart Lane and Northumberland Park areas. This will enable the essential internal works such as renewal of the kitchens, bathrooms and internal electrics to progress. This is following a direct award in conjunction with Haringey Council's Procurement team via the London Construction Programme (LCP) framework and processes.

The award process was carried out in accordance with the framework requirements that was based on price. LCP carried out quality evaluation when they tendered the framework. The successful contractor satisfied the requirements in relation to these criteria.

Alternative options considered

An alternative option would be for Homes for Haringey to either use third party industry frameworks or a standalone OJEU compliant tender process to deliver the works. Homes for Haringey sought support and advice from Haringey Strategic Procurement and determined the LCP framework as being the optimum route to the market. This was due to the speed of access to quality-checked contractors and focus on companies that concentrate their resources in the local area.

The option of not undertaking this work would leave Haringey Council open to residents' disrepair challenges and complaints, because the properties need to be improved to meet the Decent Homes standard current decency levels.

329. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES

The Leader referred to the urgency decision taken on acquiring the New River lease from Fusion for the sum of the New River loan outstanding to the Council, and highlighted that, whilst the Council were keen to ensure that local residents have recreational activities and facilities provided by the Council, there was an options appraisal to be completed to understand how this site will be potentially managed going forward.

RESOLVED

To note the minutes of the following:

Urgent decision 29/09/20

Urgent decision 05/10/20

330. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

331. 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 paragraphs 3 and 5 of Part 1, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

332. EXEMPT TANGMERE AND NORTHOLT COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER

As per item 322 and the exempt minutes.

333. EXEMPT THE ACQUISITION OF TWO HEAD LEASES AND GRANT OF A NEW LEASE AT THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY, WOOD GREEN

As per item 323 and the exempt minutes.

334. EXEMPT AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR PROVISION OF ICON MANAGED SERVICE & MID CALL SOLUTION

As per item 324 and the exempt minutes.

335. EXEMPT GRANTING OF A LEASE TO A GP PRACTICE OF ACCOMMODATION AT 54 MUSWELL HILL

As per item 326 and the exempt minutes.

336. EXEMPT AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR HOMES FOR HARINGEY INTERNAL WORKS (NORTH) IN (YEAR 3) 2021-22

As per item 327 and the exempt minutes.

337. EXEMPT AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR HOMES FOR HARINGEY INTERNAL WORKS (SOUTH) IN (YEAR 3) 2021-22

As per item 328 and the exempt minutes.

338. EXEMPT MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the exempt minutes of the meeting on 15 September 2020.

339. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

None

CHAIR: Councillor Joseph Ejiofor

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank