

MINUTES OF MEETING Cabinet HELD ON Tuesday, 8th December, 2020, 6.30pm

PRESENT:

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

ALSO ATTENDING: Cllr Dennison, Cllr Ahmet, Cllr Ogiehor

373. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

374. APOLOGIES

There were apologies for lateness from Cllr Mark Blake, Cabinet Member for Communities.

375. URGENT BUSINESS

The Leader advised that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had decided at its meeting of the 1st of December to refer the decision, taken by Cabinet, on 10th of November, on the Alterations Policy for Leaseholders back to Cabinet for reconsideration. The recommendations of Scrutiny will be dealt with as part of Agenda item 7.

According to the Call-in Procedure in the Council's Constitution (Part 4 Section H), the Cabinet had five working days to reconsider the key decision before taking a final decision.

To meet this requirement, the Cabinet needed to re-consider the Key decision at this meeting before making a final decision. The Leader confirmed that he had accepted this matter as an item of late urgent business to be considered with item 7 of the agenda.

376. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

On the basis of being a leaseholder in the borough, Councillor Chandwani declared an interest in relation to part of item 7 [the report dealing with the reconsideration of the key decision on the Alterations Policy for Leaseholders] and Item 12 payments policy

for leaseholder's consultation. Cllr Chandwani clarified that she had no personal or beneficial interest in item 14 as she did not own a car.

Cllr Bull declared an interest in items 7, 8, 12 and 14 by virtue of being a leaseholder and also had an interest in item 13 as a garage license holder in the borough.

The Leader, Cllr Ejiofor, declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 13, as garage license holder.

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

None

378. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 10th of November 2020 as an accurate record of the meeting.

379. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - NON KEY

The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny introduced the report on fire safety in high rise blocks. The Committee had met on the 15th of October to consider an update on the implementations of the Fire Safety Review which had been ratified by Overview and Scrutiny in March 2019 and responses to the recommendations agreed by Cabinet in July 2019. The Committee noted that efforts to recruit additional fire safety officers had not been successful, and concern was raised at the speed of progress. Therefore, there was a recommendation made to recruit at least two apprentice building control officers.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal responded and recommended that Cabinet accept the recommendation to recruit at least two apprentices in the Building Control service who would be recruited to start working with the Council in the 2021/22 financial year. This course of action was also agreed with by Cabinet.

It was noted that an officer working group had been set up to act on new building and fire safety requirements and its remit specifically included staffing issues to do with recruitment, retention, expertise, and training.

[Councillor Bull and Cllr Chandwani left the meeting at 6.42pm]

The Leader invited Cllr Ahmet to introduce the Scrutiny call in report on the Alterations Policy for Leaseholders and to outline the recommendations.

Cllr Ahmet outlined the outcome of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's consideration of the Cabinet's decision at a special meeting on 1st of December. The Committee heard representations from Michael Hardy and Barbara Tierney from the

Haringey Leaseholders Association and the call in signatories as well as the Cabinet Member and senior housing officers.

The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny highlighted the key themes of the representations considered, the resulting concerns which were listed at the report at paragraph 3, informing the recommendations at paragraphs 3.1 to 3.5.

The Leader thanked the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny for her presentation and invited the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal to respond.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal thanked the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee for presenting the concerns of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and referred to the detailed call - in meeting which had helped address a lot of the issues that had been raised in the report.

Responding to the concerns and subsequent recommendations raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the following information was provided:

- The recommended policy was based on the fundamental fact that the Council, as freeholder, was liable for resident safety and for the structure of the building, which under the terms of the lease included windows and external doors. The findings of the Hackitt Review, the first phase of the Grenfell Tower Public Inquiry and the Government's proposed Building Safety Bill, all provided firm evidence that the existing Alterations Policy was out of step with the direction of building safety regulations whereas the proposed policy reduced risk and clarified the Council's primary accountability for building safety.
- Both the Council and Homes for Haringey were monitoring any developments and outcomes from the second phase of the Grenfell Tower Public Inquiry and the need for this to inform the Council's approach to building safety within the Council's housing stock. The Council were aware that this phase would not conclude until 2021 and, in the meantime, the updated policy would ensure adherence to any new government guidance to maximise residents' safety within the Council's homes.
- Homes for Haringey worked in close partnership with the Council's procurement and housing teams to ensure a robust, open, and transparent procurement and delivery process. There were sufficient existing checks and balances, including regular internal audits, cost and quality assurance processes, scrutiny of contractor method statements and inspection of works during and after completion. Homes for Haringey was strengthening its internal project management and contract compliance teams. The Council was strengthening its housing client management team to focus further on building safety. [Recommendation 3.2a Not Agreed]
- The Council and Homes for Haringey were keen for leaseholders and tenants to participate in a meaningful way in procurement processes. HfH will strengthen its resident liaison team to support delivery of the HRA capital programme through wider opportunities to participate in procurement stages. [Recommendation 3.3 – Agreed]

- Homes for Haringey had undertaken additional safety tests and had a programme of safety checks for windows and doors, in line with industry best practice. [Recommendation 3.2a – Not Agreed]
- Oversight of the procurement arrangement to achieve high quality process for windows and doors fittings. The Cabinet Member referred to her earlier comment on the procurement and the oversight by the Council client management team and the HfH project management team. [Recommendation 3.2b - Not Agreed]
- The existing complaints process enabled any concerns to be raised initially with HfH and if the leaseholder was not satisfied with any part of the response it could be escalated to stage 2 (which was reviewed by the Council). If they were still dissatisfied, they could then go to the Ombudsman unless it was to do with the quality or cost of the works, then it would need to be referred to the first-tier tribunal. The process was clear and HfH staff could explain in more detail, if needed, to ensure full accessibility. [Recommendation 3.4 - Agreed but the challenge on this was that there was already a robust complaints process in place]
- The Council and Homes for Haringey were equally disappointed with the low number of responses to the consultation pack sent to over 5000 leaseholders and the three follow up online meetings. The Council and Homes for Haringey were always looking for new ways to broaden and deepen consultation processes and would work with colleagues across the Council to learn what new forms of engagement have been most successful during the pandemic[Recommendation 3.5 Agreed]
- Pausing the decisions on the Alterations policy to allow for a time limited scrutiny to be completed by March 2021 was not agreed with and the Cabinet member recommended that decisions proceed as agreed by Cabinet at their meeting on 10 November 2020.[Recommendation 3.1]

The Leader invited questions on the scrutiny report and response. Following questions from Cllr Amin, Cllr Dennison, and Cllr Ahmet the following information was provided:

- In relation to performance management of Homes for Haringey, there was the Homes for Haringey Board which had performance responsibility. There was an awareness of performance challenges with Homes for Haringey and the Cabinet Member was working closely with them on this issue.
- With regards to the Council or Homes for Haringey contributing to the £300 fee which was typical of putting forward a case to the first-tier tribunal, this was not possible.
- The specific causes of the spread of the Lakanell House fire were not known by the Cabinet Member. However, the Cabinet Member underlined that, following research she could not find another Council that would allow leaseholders to fit their own windows and doors.
- At the call- in meeting it was advised that poorly installed windows can have an impact on the spread of fire. An important part of ensuring fire safety was

accountability, and this was met when the ALMO/Council was responsible for installing the windows and doors. They provided a level of oversight as an organisation which was safer than an individual person/ contractor being responsible.

- The 2005 legislation outlined the clear responsibility of the freeholder and this called into the question the need for the existing policy to have been agreed in 2008. The proposed decision was based on the regulatory framework and should be taken seriously.
- It was accepted that this was not the only area where the Council saw low response rates from residents, especially those that the Council wanted to engage with in the Council processes. The Cabinet Member committed to continue to highlight the issues of consultation in her regular meetings with Homes for Haringey. This would be discussed when considering the consultations that were forthcoming, the processes to be used for engagement, the number of contacts to be made and the level of feedback to be sought. An example of a current consultation conversation was highlighted. The Council and Homes for Haringey would need to be fully aware of the best methods to engage with people. There was a change in the way consultations were taken forward over time, in particular the use of online platforms whose success could be argued. Therefore, there was a need to make sure a full suite of options was available for consultation.

The Leader thanked the Councillors for the discussion and moved to reconsideration of key decision CAB 348 on the Alterations Policy for Leaseholders.

In accordance with the Call-in procedure, having heard the responses to the scrutiny recommendations, he referred Cabinet to the key decision resolutions which were included in the supplementary pack at pages 37 to 38.

After re-considering the matter, the Leader asked Cabinet Members, individually, to indicate that they were happy to agree to confirm its original decisions made on the 10th of November and to the commitments made by Cllr Ibrahim to scrutiny recommendations 3.2b, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 as outlined above,

RESOLVED

1. To approve the revised 'Alterations Policy for Leaseholders' regarding the improvement works that leaseholders are permitted to make to their property as set out in appendix 1 of the policy.
2. To approve the introduction of a requirement that, where a leaseholder's external windows and doors need to be changed, all such installations are to be carried out by the Council and its approved contractors.
3. To approve the fee structure detailed in paragraphs 6.13, 6.16 and appendix 1 of the policy which will be subject to an annual review.
4. To note the process for deciding whether landlord consent can be granted as detailed in paragraphs 6.6 to 6.12 and appendix 1 of the policy.

Reason for decision

The recommendations in section 3 are being proposed to ensure there is a clear and transparent process in place for allowing leaseholders to improve their properties. In providing consent, the Council will consider the effect works may have on the structural integrity of Council owned buildings and the possible impact of these works on other tenants and leaseholders.

The recommendations also seek to ensure that all external installations have been manufactured and fitted correctly, in accordance with current regulatory standards and do not compromise fire safety. This is because the Council, as landlord, is ultimately responsible for the health and safety of all residents within Council owned buildings.

The recommendation also seeks to provide leaseholders with clarity on the fees payable for obtaining landlord's permission for alterations to their home.

Alternative options considered

The only alternative option was to continue with the existing 'Alterations Policy for Leaseholders' which was not feasible due to the Housing Health and Safety Rating System Regulations 2005 conferring powers on local authorities to ensure fire safety in occupied buildings. It is ultimately the Council's responsibility to have robust processes in place to ensure doors and windows are installed to current regulatory standards in the event of a fire.

380. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

[Councillor Bull left the meeting for the duration of the item]

Deputation in relation to item 14

Mr Paul Burnham and Mr Jacob Secker addressed the Cabinet in relation to item 14 on the agenda –Council Housing Parking Estate Charges.

Mr Burnham felt that parking on Council estates would become worse if the charges were implemented. He referred to the 2000 garages within Council estates and questioned why these were not integrated within the strategy. Mr Burnham also referred to a previous consultation, where less than 30% of consultees supported charging for parking on Council estates.

Mr Burnham considered that there was no economic need for the charges and that the Council could run estates without implementing charges.

Mr Burnham also questioned the transfer of funds received from parking charges between the Housing Revenue Account and the General Fund.

Mr Burnham advised that he was opposed to applying parking charges to carers, and to the transfer of funds from the HRA to the General Fund.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estates Renewal responded to the points raised by Mr Burnham and provided a copy of her response for the minutes.

- **“Resident charges were rejected in a full Statutory Consultation last year and also rejected by a resident focus Group earlier this year”**

The proposals outlined represent the only workable option identified which achieves the aims of the estate parking review approved by Cabinet in July 2019 and presented to residents in the consultation on the “Future of Estate Parking”. The proposals are designed to mitigate financial impact on residents by ensuring every household can apply for one free permit for any vehicle at or below the average emissions level.

The views of respondents to the “Future of Estate parking” consultation are detailed on page 3 of Appendix C (Resident and stakeholder consultation and engagement).

- 50.5% disagreed with introducing permit charges and 29.9% agreed.
- 36% agreed only service users should pay for it (i.e. by buying permits)
- 40.6% agreed to subsidising costs from rent and service charges.

As outlined at section 5.2 of the report (page 3-4), resident views on Permit charges were recognised and alternatives considered. In all instances the alternative options have had to be discounted for the following reasons.

1. A Free scheme would not generate enough income to pay for itself.
2. Service Charges could not be collected from all Leaseholders, Businesses and Freeholders
3. Permit charges for some (i.e. Leaseholders) and Service Charges for others (i.e. Tenants) would make the scheme financially unviable due to the additional administrative and fraud prevention costs.

- **“There is no business case for charges to residents and carers. The proposed scheme would generate an annual surplus of £245,000 while the income from residents and carers parking fees would be £55,350”**

Appendix B (Financial Assessment including permitting and permissions to park proposal) outlines the business case for levying some charges to ensure the proposed scheme is both financially viable and financed fairly.

Until end 2024/25 the Housing Revenue Account will be in net deficit on parking due to the payback period required to meet the costs of both rolling out the new scheme and maintaining the current scheme in the interim. From 2025/26 onwards the scheme has the potential to generate a net revenue, which if achieved would be reinvested back into services in compliance with Housing Revenue Account and Parking Account rules. In addition, once payback has been achieved Haringey Council would have the ability to review any fees and charges associated with the proposal.

Each household will be eligible to apply for one resident permit free of charge for any vehicle that is at or below the average emission level. Approximately 60% of vehicles are forecast to meet the average emissions level for a free permit. Charges will only apply for second or subsequent and high emission vehicles with the average annual permit price being £45.

Additional protections are in place for those who are disabled, over the state pension age or have a long-term limiting conditions. A charge of £12 per year for Carers permits is designed to cover the administrative costs of preparing these permits to ensure those who do not use the service do not subsidise costs for others.

The proposals will minimise financial impact on residents including ensuring only those who use the service contribute towards the running costs. In addition, the proposals will help to tackle the climate emergency by incentivising residents to reduce the number of vehicles they have and the emissions of each vehicle.

- **“The Council want the enforcement income from the scheme to go to the General Fund and not the Housing Revenue Account - more income being syphoned out of Council housing. we say that all income from Council estates should remain in the Housing Revenue Account”.**

The financial proposals for the new estate parking management scheme are designed to ensure that Haringey Council complies with all relevant legislation. To the extent legally possible, income will be collected by the Housing Revenue Account.

The Local Government & Housing Act 1989 Schedule 4 Part 1 sets out the credits that shall be placed into the Housing Revenue Account. These include charges for the provision of services and facilities to and contributions towards expenditure on housing within the Housing Revenue Account, but not enforcement income from statutory fines.

In addition, Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 requires Local Authorities maintain a Parking Account of all income and expenditure and ring-fences the application of surplus income generated by Parking enforcement to specific purposes.

In compliance with this legislation, the following is proposed.

1. An Estate Parking Scheme managed by Homes for Haringey on behalf of Haringey Council with charges collected by the Housing Revenue Account.
2. An enforcement scheme to administer parking rules via Traffic Management Orders managed by Haringey Parking Services with income collected by the Parking Account.
3. There is scope for use of any surplus generated from enforcement on estate parking for the Parking Account to be directed to highways-associated improvements on estates

- **“Homes for Haringey board members want to push ahead for full CPZ charges for the 280 Council estates which will be affected”**

The Deputation referred to questions raised by both residents and board members at the 30 September 2020 Homes for Haringey Board meeting. The questions and responses are outlined at Pages 6-9 of Appendix C and summarised as follows.

1. Homes for Haringey’s Board does not set Council Policy - including the fees and charges associated with this proposal.
2. The proposals will deliver a financially viable scheme without the same charges as CPZ parking permits.

381. COUNCIL HOUSING PARKING ESTATE CHANGES

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought approval to introduce a new estate parking management scheme which would meet both residents’ needs and the objectives of the estate parking review which Cabinet approved in July 2019. The current system for controlling estate parking was ineffective and it was not fair for residents to subsidise a poor service which they may not even be using. The new improved service would provide the best value for money offer. In the short term, the new scheme would deliver an improved service to over 280 estates across the borough. In the medium to long term it was hoped that the scheme would provide improved service to all Haringey estates.

Gethin Segel, Parking and Project Manager, responded to questions from Councillor Dennison:

- The charge for carers would be set at £12 annually, which was the admin cost to process a permit and no income would be generated from these applications.
- To comply with all relevant legislation there would be two schemes implemented. The Estate Parking Scheme would be managed by Homes for Haringey on behalf of Haringey Council and charges would be collected by the Housing Revenue Account. An enforcement scheme to administer parking rules would be managed by Haringey Council via Traffic Management Orders and income would be collected by the Parking Account.

RESOLVED

- 1) To approve the estate parking management scheme based on a Traffic Management Order (TMO) based scheme using powers provided to Local Authorities under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 2) To approve the proposal to in-source enforcement of estate parking to Haringey Council’s own In-House Parking Service with income derived from enforcement collected by the Parking Account of the General Fund; and
- 3) To Delegate the service design and service level agreement for the in-sourced service to the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods, and the Managing

Director of Homes for Haringey in consultation with the Cabinet Member(s) responsible for Housing & Estate Renewal and Parking.

Reasons for decision

The current ECPS is redundant because the Protection of Freedoms Act makes it hard to enforce and lack of DVLA support means it cannot collect enough income to cover costs. A Traffic Management Order (TMO) based scheme is the preferred solution because it is the only option, meets the aims of the estate parking review to deliver a financially viable scheme with the powers to effectively control parking and meets residents' needs as well as assisting in tackling the climate change emergency. In addition, a TMO scheme is the Department of Transport's recommended solution operated successfully by neighbouring boroughs including Enfield and Islington.

In-sourcing the delivery of estate parking enforcement to Haringey Council's own Parking Service meets the objectives of the estate parking review established by Cabinet. This will allow Haringey Council to share resources and expertise in a sustainable way to generate efficiencies and savings. In addition, estate parking management will benefit from the improvements delivered by the Parking Transformational programme including new IT systems, online offers and resource management. Enforcement income generated on Housing Land does not fall within the definition of Housing Revenue Account charges as set out in the Local Government & Housing Act 1989 Schedule 4 Parts 1 or 2. Therefore, this income and any costs associated with collecting the income must fall within the General Fund. The Financial assessment indicates that both the Housing Revenue Account and General Fund will cover any costs incurred and have the potential to achieve a small surplus.

Delegating authority for the service design to the relevant Haringey Council Directors and Homes for Haringey Managing Director will ensure an efficient process. Delegating authority to the Cabinet Members for Housing & Estate Renewal and Neighbourhoods will provide member oversight to ensure an outcome which meets the objectives of the estate parking management review. The service design and accompanying reverse service level agreement will be designed to meet the estate parking management scheme and in accordance with the relevant requirements of Haringey Council and Homes for Haringey standing orders, financial regulations, and constitutions.

Furthermore, the proposals will address financial fairness and ensure sufficient income to cover the operating costs, roll out capital and finance costs over a long time. The proposal to offer each household access to one free permit for vehicles at or below the average emissions level meets the needs of residents to address the potential negative financial impact of any new scheme. In addition, measures are included to protect vulnerable groups such as the disabled and OAPs with one free permit regardless of emission level offered. The proposal includes measures to tackle the climate emergency by financially incentivising households to consider both the number of vehicles they own and the emission level of each vehicle. Cabinet are required to approve any budget amendments. Approving a funding envelope will allow the Housing Revenue Account to ensure Homes for Haringey has sufficient budget to manage the new estate parking scheme on behalf of Haringey Council.

Alternative options considered

Alternative options, including retaining the current scheme, have been considered, as follows:

- **Discontinue all parking controls** - The option has been considered and discounted because residents indicated an expectation that parking be managed for their benefit and failure to control parking represents a health and safety risk to emergency access routes.
- **Continue with the current ECPS** – The option has been considered and discounted. Although residents indicated support for this option, further engagement identified concerns that a new scheme would lead to high charges for parking permits. The concerns of residents have been mitigated with the proposals outlined in this report, which include the ability for each affected household to access one free permit dependant on emissions. Continuing the current arrangements would require tenants to subsidise an ineffective service via the Housing Revenue Account regardless of whether they use it or live on affected estates, which is inequitable.
- **Adopt housing roads as part of the public highway** – This option may have to be used on a small number of roads which cannot be classified as off-street parking places or private roads. However, it is not a viable option borough wide, because it requires Secretary of State approval as well as significant capital investment to adjust the land to public highway standards. In addition, this option would still require the implementation of controlled parking zones to deliver the parking controls that residents have indicated they expect.
- **Utilising automated controls such as barrier gates and number plate recognition** - The option to replace onsite enforcement by officers with remote or automated controls has been considered and is deemed of limited application. Automated controls such as barrier gates and CCTV recognition are only viable on a small number of sites with entrances that could allow access to be controlled in this manner. In addition, the level of investment required to deliver each installation is prohibitive. This option will be reconsidered for specific sites that are deemed suitable if the new estate parking management scheme generates a surplus for reinvestment.

The proposal outlined at Appendix B include proposals for limited permit charges. Alternative financial options were explored, in response to the consultation where 50.5% of respondents indicated they were opposed to the introduction of permit charges, with 40.6% indicating a preference for subsidies from rent and service charges. Options considered including the following: -

- **Offering a free service to all end users** - The option has been considered and discounted because the scheme would not generate enough income to self-finance. In addition, this option would not allow the implementation of rules designed to reduce emissions and the number of carbon emitting vehicles.
- **Introducing a service charge to be paid by all residents** - The option has been considered and discounted because a service charge could not be levied on all potentially affected residents, including business tenants, freeholders, and sublessees. In addition, some leasehold agreements did not contain the clauses

necessary to introduce a service charge of the type required. Therefore, a service charge could not be levied on all service users and would not address the underlying issue of tenants unfairly subsidising services for other, potentially more financially able, groups.

• **Introducing permit charges for some groups (i.e. Freeholders and Sub-Lessees) and subsidies for other groups (i.e. Tenants and Leaseholders)** –This option has been considered and deemed impractical. As detailed above, it may not be possible to introduce a service charge for all leaseholders, requiring different leaseholders to be charged in different ways. In addition, the different offer for each group would require a manual verification process to prevent application fraud. The additional administrative costs could render any new scheme financially unviable.

382. AUTHORITY TO COMMENCE CONSULTATION ON AN ENHANCED PAYMENT OPTIONS POLICY FOR LEASEHOLDERS

Councillors Bull and Chandwani left the meeting for the consideration of this item.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which contained recommendations to improve the leaseholders' payment options for major works previously approved by Cabinet on 12 November 2013. Recent Section 20 notices outlining major works with a potential cost to 76 leaseholders of £60-£117k had resulted in them raising concerns around their ability to pay. It was recognised that leaseholders would require more support to pay these invoices and so it was proposed that flexible options be introduced to provide support and minimise the risk of leaseholders defaulting on their payments.

In response to Councillor Dennison, the Cabinet Member confirmed that all residents would receive a formal notice of consultation and follow up contact.

Tracie Downie, Executive Director of Housing Management, advised that Homes for Haringey had improved on contacting non-resident leaseholders and would be able to inform them of the consultation by letter.

RESOLVED

To approve consultation on the following payment terms for new major works invoices as follows: -

- a. For leaseholders living in their property (resident leaseholders): -
The payment period for invoices between £30k and up to £40k is set at 15 years, with the first 10 years being interest free and the remaining 5 years charged at the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) rate.
- b. The payment period for invoices between £40k and £60k is set at 20 years, with the first 12 years being interest-free and the remaining 8 years charged at the PWLB rate.
- c. The payment period available for invoices above £60k is set at 25 years with the first 15 years being interest-free and the remaining 10 years charged at the PWLB rate.

2. For resident leaseholders that are facing severe hardship, are unable to secure funding from a High Street Bank/Building Society, the Council will offer them an interest-only payment option. This will be secured by a charge on the property, for the actual amount of the invoice.
3. For leaseholders who are not living in their leasehold property (non-resident leaseholders): -
 - a. The payment period available for invoices between £30k and £60k is set at 10 years with interest charged at the PWLB rate with the Assistant Director for Housing in consultation with the Council's Finance Service, having discretion to approve an offer for the first 5 years to be interest-free, following a recommendation from Homes for Haringey. (That is, if the non-resident landlord has no other tenanted properties and an illness/disability or caring responsibility that is preventing their occupation of their Haringey Council home).
 - b. The payment period available for invoices above £60k is set at 15 years with the first 5 years being interest-free and the remaining 10 years charged at the PWLB rate.
 - c. An extended interest free period to be approved by the Assistant Director for Housing in consultation with the Council's Finance Service, following a recommendation from Homes for Haringey, if there will be a benefit to the Council's homelessness prevention strategy.
4. For all leaseholders: -
 - a. The Council offers a discount of 5% for full payments made within 60 days of the invoice being issued.
 - b. The Council offers an equity share scheme under section 308 of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008.
5. To note the intention to consult and the outcome from this will be considered by Cabinet in February 2021, to enable them to formally approve and adopt the payment terms for leaseholders.

Reasons for decision

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

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

Alternative options considered

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

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

383. RECOVERY AND RENEWAL: OUR FRAMEWORK FOR REFRESHING THE BOROUGH PLAN - NON KEY

[Clerks note: The Leader noted at 7.52pm] that Councillor Mark Blake joined the meeting during the consideration of this item]

[Councillor Bull and Chandwani joined the meeting]

The Leader introduced the report which provided an overview of the outcomes of the Council's Recovery and Renewal process and was intended to inform the refresh of Haringey's Borough Plan, 2019-23, in light of the impact of Covid-19 on both the borough's residents and on the Council, including the impact on Council finances.

The report was commended for being well written and containing an in-depth analysis of the issues.

In response to questions from Cllr Amin, and Dennison the following was noted:

- The pandemic had brought into sharp focus the issues that were already there, and some issues significantly exacerbated such as food poverty.
- The same process for publishing the Borough Plan was being followed as in previous years. The Council would be publishing the outcome of the refresh of the Borough Plan and delivery plan in time for the new financial year.
- Page 79 indicated that the borough had the 4th highest COVID-19 related death rates in London, this was per 100,000, but the number of confirmed cases had been lower and information on the reason for this mismatch was sought. Agreed that a written response be provided by the Director for Public Health.
- With regards to the residents in most need of mental health support outlined in the report, BAME, LGBT plus and trans people, and what the borough was doing to specifically support these people, it was noted that the level of support provided to LPA and LGBT+ community was quite specific and a response would be provided in writing on this.
- The Deputy Leader suggested that when the Borough Plan is refreshed, there could be additional 2 pages outlining the administration's delivery of services and reducing inequality over the last two years. This could be set out before outlining the forthcoming challenges.
- The Cabinet Member for Public Realm and Transformation emphasised that people had been suffering food poverty a long time before COVID-19 and

although the scale of the issue had changed, there was a need to recognise that there was level of individual poverty in Tottenham and Wood Green.

The Leader commented on the research undertaken after the first lockdown and the amount of hidden poverty and food poverty which was being addressed as part of anti-poverty strategy. It was important to ensure prevention of people slipping into poverty by understanding how they can access benefits when needed and helping to improve their life opportunities to get to better jobs.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the Recovery and Renewal report which is attached as Appendix 1.
2. To agree that the context and principles set out in the report be used as the basis for the refresh of the Borough Plan 2019 – 2023.
3. That stakeholders including residents, businesses, partner organisations and voluntary sector be consulted on the refreshed Borough Plan; and
4. That officers prepare a report on the outcome of the consultation and the refreshed Borough Plan for a decision by Cabinet.

Reasons for decision

The Borough Plan is the overarching strategic plan for the Council and partners. It sets out the partnership vision for the borough and how it will be delivered, including what will be prioritised and why, and how the Council will deliver the political priorities of the administration.

The Borough Plan for 2019 – 2023 was published in October 2018. At the time of publication, the Council proposed that the Plan should be treated as a living document, and it was anticipated that the plan would be refreshed during the time period covered, including to respond to the recommendations of the Haringey Fairness Commission.

The impact of Covid-19 is such that it is especially important to refresh the Borough Plan so that it reflects a number of different things including: the impact of the pandemic on our residents, communities and businesses; the changed context in which we are operating; and, the impact on the Council and its finances.

The Council led a programme of Recovery and Renewal work between April and October 2020 which sought to support a process of reflection on the part of the Council and partners about what has changed for our residents, what had changed for the Council and its partners and what this means for priorities and ways of working going forward.

The Recovery and Renewal work has included a strong emphasis on hearing from residents about their experiences and about the impact the pandemic has had on them, and the outcomes of these conversations are reflected in the appended report. Going forward, the Council is committed to ensuring that resident participation and co-production is central to the next phase of this work.

The Council has a statutory duty to publish equalities objectives. The Borough Plan is the core document through which the Council identifies and agrees where to tackle inequality in the borough, and this is reflected in the prominence given to equality issues in this document.

The report in Appendix A sets out some of the key learning from Recovery and Renewal process and provides the context for the Borough Plan refresh, including the principles and approach for how we will undertake the work to ensure that we are being consistent in reviewing our priority areas (Housing; People; Place; Economy; Your Council).

Alternative options considered

Two alternative options were considered, which is:

- a) Do not use the outcomes of the Recovery and Renewal process to refresh the Borough Plan for the period 2019-23; and,
- b) Do not refresh the Borough Plan for the period 2019-23.

It is not considered desirable to pursue option A if we are going to refresh the Borough Plan. The outcomes of the Recovery and Renewal process are informed by a robust process of data analysis, resident insight and engagement, partner conversation and reflection within the Council.

It is not considered either desirable or feasible to pursue option B. This is not just because a reviewing and refreshing the Borough Plan, as our key strategic document, represents good practice, but also because it is assessed that the scale and nature of the impact of the pandemic on our residents and organisation is such that it is important to critically assess the impact on our priorities and how they should be delivered within the new operating context (including a significantly reduced budget envelope and a reduced income stream).

384. 2020/21 FINANCE UPDATE QUARTER 2

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration provided an update on Medium Term Financial plan for 2020/21. The budget monitoring report covered the position at Quarter 2 (Period 6) of the 2020/21 financial year including General Fund (GF) Revenue, Capital, Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budgets. The report focused on significant budget variances, including those arising as a result of the forecast non-achievement of Cabinet approved MTFS savings but more significantly, the impact that Covid-19 was forecast to have on the Council's financial plans.

In response to questions from Councillor Dennison

- With regards to the waiver of parking restrictions in the lock down and resulting loss of income, this was not a mistake and was done with residents' safety in

mind. The Cabinet Member for Public Realm and Transformation added that this action was a government direction, supported by London Councils and the British Parking Association, and all London boroughs had followed this instruction. The local government compensation scheme recognised the connection of parking losses and the deterioration of Council budgets because of the lockdown 1. This was likely to be the reason that this instruction was not received for lockdown 2

- The levels of the Council's reserves was information that was readily available, online, and the location of the published accounts could be provided.

RESOLVED

1. To note the forecast revenue outturn for the General Fund (GF), including the impact of COVID-19, and known and estimated levels of announced COVID-19 funding, is a net overspend of £9.8m (Q1 £23.1m). This is before any further emergency grant support (Section 6, Tables 1a and 1b, and Appendix 1). This excludes the DSG forecast.
2. To note that Directors have been asked to focus on actions to bring the forecast overspend down before the end of the year.
3. To note the net Housing Revenue Account (HRA) forecast of £4.2m (Q1 £9.6m) overspend (Section 6, Table 2, and Appendix 2).
4. To note the net DSG forecast of £5.3m (Q1 £4.6m) overspend, the actions being taken to seek to address this and the potential implications for the GF (Section 7 and Table 3).
5. To note the forecast budget savings position in 2020/21 which indicates that £7.3m (45%) (Q1 £8.3m (50%)) may not be achieved. (Section 8, Table 4 and Appendix 3). This is incorporated in the GF budget pressures addressed in recommendation 3.1 above;
6. To approve the proposed budget adjustments and virements to the capital programme as set out in Table 5 and Appendix 5 and note the forecast expenditure of £218m (£251m Qtr1) in 2020/21 which equates to 40% (43% Qtr1) of the revised capital budget (Section 9, Table 5 and Appendix 4);
7. To approve the budget virements as set out in Appendix 5; and
8. To note the debt write-offs approved in Quarter 2 2020/21 (Appendix 6).

Reason for Decision

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

COVID-19 affects everything local authorities do – as community leaders, public health authorities, education authorities, employers, partners and service deliverers. The Leader, Cabinet and its officers continue to need to focus on responding to the crisis while ensuring normal critical services are provided.

Alternative Options Considered

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

385. 2021-22 BUDGET AND 2021-2026 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY REPORT

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report, setting out the details of the draft Budget for 2021/22 and Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2021/26, including budget reductions, growth and capital proposals. This included details of estimated funding for 2021/22 and the remainder of the planning period and highlighted areas of risk. The report recommended that budget proposals were released for public consultation and Scrutiny consideration.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the report addressed the impact that the Covid-19 pandemic had had on the financial planning process over the year and the steps that the Council had taken to respond to this challenge. It also incorporated the Council's present best estimate of the implications of the Spending Review 2020 (SR20). The implications of expected further details from Government were yet to be received, including the Local Government Funding Settlement, which would be taken into consideration before the Final Budget for 2021/22 and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2021/26 were considered by Cabinet – to include its response to the consultation - and Full Council for ratification in February 2021.

The Cabinet Member expressed that this was a progressive budget in a time of hardship where the Council needed to support the most vulnerable people in the community. COVID-19 had an impact on the Council finances, for this financial year, of £40m. However, the past and present sound management of finances provided confidence to provide this support despite the lack of clarity from Government about whether they would fulfil meeting the full cost of COVID-19 on Council budgets.

The budget savings set out in the report focused on delivering efficiencies, service redesign which was broader than departmental boundaries, involving and increasing income instead of service level costs. The Council would be reviewing all projects risks and savings programme whilst considering the budget issues that arise through demographic growth.

The Councils' reserves would be utilised to bridge the budget gap for 2020/21 of £5.4m. It was important to note that COVID-19 and likely recession would have a

continuing impact on finances and the Council would continue to call on the government to fund local authorities so that they can continue to serve communities.

The Cabinet Member continued to outline how the budget would continue to support the most vulnerable and set out:

- The investment in welfare assistance, the community voluntary sector, youth services, employment support, and university bursary scheme.
- Capital projects investment for improving school buildings, roads, pavements, empty properties, and Civic Centre.
- Continuing previous schemes such as the Council Tax reduction scheme, 1.99% Council tax precept for Adult Social Care.
- The Housing Revenue Plan supporting delivery of new Council homes at Council rents.
- Creating opportunities for young people and a cleaner and greener Haringey.

The Leader commended the budget and highlighted that the Council had managed its finances prudently and efficiently to allow this progressive budget to be put forward.

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health commented, with regards to the support for Adults services, and commended the compilation of budget in a difficult circumstances.

The Cabinet Member for Public Realm and Transformation spoke about capital investments stimulating the economy and creating new jobs for local people. Also, importance of local welfare assistance to support people in severe strife.

In response to questions from Cllr Dennison and Cllr Ogiehor, the following was noted:

- With reference to the service-based budget adjustments outlined at table 7.9.1 and the significant required savings for 2022 to 2025, the Council would continue with tight monitoring of the service base budgets and re-profile these according to circumstances. Future updates would take into account any increase in the levels of income and these figures would be reprofiled if they were not able to reach required target levels.
- The approach taken with the business rates basis was consistent with those in previous years and reflected the projections that the Council were able to make. It was important to note that the economic actions that the Council was taking engendered further growth in the number of businesses and achievement of the business -related objectives. This would also be taken account of in future forecasts.

- There was an additional report on Good Growth funding, on the agenda, which set out the funding that the Council would be receiving from the Mayor and would help support businesses in Wood Green. There was a project to ensure that business continued to survive in Tottenham.
- Responding on a question relating to the Council's sustainable level of debt, the Cabinet Member advised that the Council was not breaching any thresholds in relation to debt levels. When making decisions, there was a need to assess the issues of the time. The Council was audited by an External Auditor and the Council complied with the required CIPFA regulations. There was a consistent analysis of the debt situation with actions to be taken to deal with the situation.
- With regards to understanding the funding of the Streetspace Plan, this was an example of how parts of the capital programme were assumed to be at least part financed by external funding. The Director of Finance explained that like other capital growth items, some of which the receipt of funding was absolutely assumed and some projects where external funding was expected. This section on Streetspace was about providing members a clear idea of what grants the Council were expecting and what funding the Council may need to locate to support the project.
- In addition, later, it was advised that for the Streetspace plan, TFL funding of around £600k was expected. The Council were just awaiting to hear the announcements, and this was what would be expected on average. The proposal in the capital programme would help fill any gap in funding.
- With regards to the funding of the Climate Change Action plan and Walking and Cycling plan – it was clarified that there were external funding sources available and the Council were consistently bidding to fund climate change initiatives. The Planning service was optimistic that there was sufficient and growing external opportunities for accessing funding from the government, the GLA sources and other sources. Since the budget report had been published there was updates from these external bodies of further funds available.
- Assurance was provided that the issues being experienced by Crouch End and Muswell Hill High Streets was being factored and the Cabinet Member for Local Investment and Economic Growth was aware of the disproportionate dependency on the hospitality sector in Crouch End which had been affected by COVID-19 and was also awareness of a need for a nuanced based High street plan that addressed the specific needs in Muswell Hill and Highgate. The Cabinet Member asked Cllr Dennison to put forward his formulated question in writing to him and he would provide a detailed response. He provided assurance that it was recognised that Crouch End, Muswell Hill and Highgate did not have the same issues as Tottenham and Wood Green High streets, and they required tailored support.

The Cabinet Member further thanked the Senior Officers and Finance team for putting this budget together, in the required timescales, and in challenging times.

RESOLVED

1. To note the initial General Fund revenue and capital budget proposals and financial planning assumptions set out in the attached report and note that they will be refined and updated after the final Local Government Finance Settlement is received in January 2021 and also to incorporate further budget changes as required;
2. To note the Draft General Fund 2021/22 Budget and MTFS (2021/22 to 2025/26) detailed in this report and Appendix 1;
3. To note the Draft budget reduction proposals summarised in Section 7 and Appendix 2;
4. To note the Draft General Fund Capital Programme for 2021/22 to 2025/26 as set out in Appendix 4;
5. To note the Draft Housing Revenue Account (HRA) revenue and Capital Programme proposals and HRA Business Plan as set out in Section 9;
6. To note the 2021/22 Draft Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB) and update on the DSG reserve position set out in Section 10;
7. To note that the detailed proposals will be submitted to Overview and Scrutiny Committee / Panels in December 2020 and January 2021 for scrutiny and comments;
8. To agree to commence consultation with residents, businesses, partners, staff, and other groups on the 2021/22 Budget and MTFS.
9. To note that an updated budget 2021/22 Budget and MTFS (2021/22 – 2025/26) will be put to Cabinet on 9th February 2021 to be recommended for approval to the Full Council meeting taking place on 22nd February 2021.

Reasons for decision

The Council has a statutory requirement to set a balanced budget for 2021/22 and this report forms a key part of the budget setting process by setting out the forecast funding and expenditure for that year. Additionally, in order to ensure the Council's finances for the medium term are maintained on a sound basis, this report also sets out the funding and expenditure assumptions for the following four years in the form of a Medium Term Financial Strategy.

Alternative options considered

The Cabinet must consider how to deliver a balanced 2021/22 Budget and sustainable MTFS over the five-year period 2021/26, to be reviewed and ultimately adopted at the meeting of Full Council on 22nd February 2021.

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

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

386. FEES & CHARGES 2021-22

The meeting paused whilst Cllr Ejiofor, Leader of the Council recused himself from the meeting as he had a disclosable pecuniary interest, as a licensed garage holder in the report. Cllr Bull, Cabinet Member for Local Investment and Economic Growth also recused himself for his item as a licensed garage holder – 9.07pm

Cllr Amin, Deputy Leader, and Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families continued to chair the meeting for this item.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which sought approval to the Fees and Charges to be applied to services at the start of 2021/22.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the Council's income policy required, as a minimum, an annual review of the level of the fees and charges levied upon service users with a view to ensuring that income is maximised commensurate with the full recovery of costs.

This report considered the relevant factors affecting the review of fees and charges, identified those services where an increase was being proposed and sought approval to increase the fee or charge rate to those services where an increase is proposed in line with inflation. Member's agreement where an alternative approach is being proposed.

The Cabinet Member outlined that it was important that, as part of the Council's on-going financial planning, there was compliance with the Council's policy to review fees and charges, as a minimum annually, taking account of issues such as the general economic climate, the Council's overall financial position and delivery of the objectives of the Borough Plan.

In response to questions from Cllr Dennison the following was noted:

- There would be no charging for use of tennis courts in the 2021/22 financial year.
- Residents would be able opt out of using changing rooms and therefore not need to pay the prescribed charge.

- The Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Equalities and Leisure, would be exploring with officers how overall Parks were financed and in particular consider fees and charges, also making sure that people on low incomes were not disadvantaged.

RESOLVED

1. To agree the proposed non-statutory fees and charges to be levied by the Council with effect from 1 April 2021, unless otherwise stated, and as detailed in Section 8 and Appendices I – XIII taking into account the findings of equalities assessments as set out in section 10 of the report.
2. To note the statutory fees and charges to be levied by the Council with effect from 1 April 2021.
3. To note that the Council's draft 2021/22 Budget and Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2021/22-2025/26 assumes that the changes to Fees & Charges set out in this report are agreed.

Reasons for Decision

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

Alternative options considered

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

387. STRATEGIC CIL (SCIL) SPENDING

[Cllr Ejiofor and Cllr Bull returned to the meeting 9.17pm]

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Corporate Services introduced the report which recommended projects to be allocated Strategic Community Infrastructure Levy (SCIL) monies, in accordance with national legislation and guidance, and Haringey policy. The Cabinet Member highlighted some of the areas where it was proposed to allocate the money:

- £5.1m on street space projects
- £1.5m on School Streets
- £3.5m on District Energy Networks
- c.£1m on temporary Youth Space in Wood Green
- £0.5m on parks

RESOLVED

To approve £14.6m of Strategic CIL (SCIL) monies being spent on the projects set out in section 6 of the report.

Reasons for decision

The Council must spend 70-80% of CIL on Strategic CIL (SCIL) projects. As of the end of October 2020, there is £14.6m of SCIL available to spend.

The requirements, process, and criteria for spending SCIL are set out in national legislation and guidance, and also in adopted Haringey policy, summarised in this report.

Following consideration of the requirements, process and criteria, a shortlist of projects is recommended for SCIL spend. These projects are important to support the delivery of local infrastructure and development for the benefit of residents and businesses in the borough.

Alternative options considered

The alternative options considered to the recommended approach are as follows:

- **Option 1 – Do not spend SCIL at this time.** This is not considered appropriate as there are significant SCIL funds available to support residents and businesses through the development of the borough by capital expenditure on infrastructure which will also help address infrastructure impacts from Covid-19.
- **Option 2 – Spend SCIL on projects which are not infrastructure, or do not support development of the borough.** This is not an option as it would not comply with the legal requirements for spending SCIL.
- **Option 3 – Spend SCIL on projects through an approach different to that in the CIL Governance document.** This is not considered appropriate as it would not be in accordance with Haringey's adopted CIL Governance document. As the CIL Governance document has been shaped by previous public consultation, any further changes to the CIL Governance document would likely require further public consultation.
- **Option 4 – Spend SCIL to different projects within the Capital Programme.** This is not considered appropriate as the recommended projects have been selected as they best meet the relevant requirements and criteria for SCIL spend and support the Council's priorities.

388. PERMISSION TO CONSULT ON NEW WAY OF DELIVERING LEARNING DISABILITIES DAY OPPORTUNITIES

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced the report which sought approval to carry out a formal consultation over a period of 42 days on proposals for changes to the delivery of day opportunities for adults with learning disabilities and or autism in Haringey.

The Cabinet Member welcomed the consultation process recommended which built on the co-production work with users and carers which had led to the proposals for change. These proposals have been developed as part of a strategy to create more

buildings-based care in Haringey and better-quality support. If accepted, these plans aimed to provide greater support to families now and in the future.

The cabinet member expressed that, as the Council continued to provide more services in-borough so people with complex needs are able to stay living in their communities, there was a need to ensure that the day opportunities offer met the needs of people with a range of learning disabilities.

Responding to a comment on the change in approach to building based care from the Cabinet Member for Local Investment & Economic Growth, there had been significant co- production and the Council had listened to local people, families, carers and service users, recognising that there was a demand for this service.

In response to a question from Cllr Dennison, it was noted that the proposals had been considered at the Adult Re -Design Group and had also been discussed at the Day Opportunities working sub - group. There had been engagement already with the Partnership Board and there were many kinds of interconnection between the groups.

The consultation information, to be distributed, had been co- designed with the group as well. The Cabinet Member felt that the Council had done it best to propose changes with services users and other interested stakeholders' involvement. There was already a lot of awareness of the plans to be consulted on during December and January.

RESOLVED

1. To approve a 42 - day consultation on the proposals for a new model for delivering day opportunities for adults with learning disabilities in Haringey.
2. That the outcome of the consultation will be reported back to Cabinet in Spring 2021 for a decision on the proposals for a new model for delivering day opportunities for adults with learning disabilities in Haringey.

Reasons for decision

These service change proposals enable Haringey Council to increase the in-borough capacity of day opportunities for people with a learning disability and/ or autism, particularly for those with very high needs who often have to travel out of borough to receive a similar service.

All these proposals will provide person-centred support that it is believed will better meet an individual's needs, but which also make best use of the Council's resources and public money.

It is not anticipated that people who currently receive and require support in the day to lose an offer of day support. All changes will follow a strengths-based review by a social worker involving the individual and their circle of support wherever possible.

Compared to the current learning disabilities day opportunities offer as outlined in section 6 of this report, the proposals will mean that the Council will be better able to:

- Achieve community inclusion, reduce social isolation and loneliness.
- Develop or maintain existing social networks, community links and activities.
- Provide flexible support that is well connected to community-based resources.
- Provide breaks for carers.
- Maintain and improve resident's health and wellbeing.
- Build capability for employment and stable accommodation

Users and carers have already been involved in co-designing Haringey's new learning disability and autism day opportunities offer. This has been through developing the new service offer for the provisions at Waltheof Gardens and through helping to shape the Covid-19 offer at Ermine Road. It is through implementing these changes that we need to consult as it will require some people's day opportunity provision to change to deliver this new offer.

Alternative options considered

The alternative option for day opportunities was not to change anything. The 'do nothing' option is not an option as it does not provide for future and some current day service users who struggle to find support in the borough. In response to this and to leave our day opportunities in a better state post-Covid, providing more flexible and 'normal' support making good use of our local community assets, we need to plan and consult with our residents on how day services are delivered. This is particularly the case for family carers, where the impact can be acutely felt when they may have to provide additional care when day services are closed or limited.

389. GLA GOOD GROWTH ACCELERATOR FUND

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which sought approval for the receipt of additional grant funding to the Good Growth Funding round 3 (GGF3) and to agree to the variation of the existing GGF3 Grant Agreement by way of a Deed of Variation of the GGF3 Grant Agreement for the receipt of the accelerator grant.

Haringey had submitted a bid for GGF3 in September 2019 for a project called 'Adaptive Wood Green'. This bid had been successful, and Haringey received a grant of £972,500 in March 2020. Subsequently, the Wood Green Regeneration team submitted a bid for funding from the Mayor of London's 'Getting Building Fund', which was also successful, and the Council would receive £850,000 as a 'Good Growth Fund 3 Accelerator'.

The GGF3 accelerator would fund three new projects in Wood Green, alongside the original six GGF3 funded projects to unlock much needed town centre and public realm improvement projects for Wood Green.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the receipt of additional grant funding to the Good Growth Funding round three (GGF3) via the Good Growth Fund Accelerator and agree to the variation of the existing GGF3 Grant Agreement by way of a Deed of Variation of the GGF3 Grant Agreement for the receipt of the accelerator grant.
2. To receive the total value of the additional grant funding from the GLA which is £850,000.

Reasons for decision

Haringey was awarded £972,500 from the Good Growth Fund in March 2020.

In June 2020, the Wood Green Regeneration Team applied for the Mayor of London 'Getting London Building Fund', and in August 2020 were shortlisted to receive £850,000 in the form of the 'GGF Accelerator Fund'.

In March Cabinet approved the decision to enter into a grant agreement for the initial grant of £972,500. Haringey entered into this grant agreement with the GLA in October 2020.

In November 2020, the GLA confirmed that LBH had been awarded £850,000 GGF Accelerator Funding.

As the accelerator fund is also above £500,000, the decision to enter into the grant funding agreement is a Key Decision.

We therefore require Cabinet to approve the additional funding, and approve its inclusion into the pre-existing GGF3 grant agreement via a Deed of variation.

Alternative options considered

Do not accept additional Accelerator Funding - If Cabinet does not agree to allow the accelerator fund to be accepted, then the three identified projects will be unlikely to progress. This would also fail to make best use of available external funding to support limited Council budgets.

390. UPDATE ON CAPITAL LETTERS TO AGREE FUNDING PROCESSES

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which provided an update on Capital Letters and sought authority to make on-going payments to cover the incentives and staffing costs.

The Cabinet Member outlined the administration's commitment to end homelessness through new generation of Council homes, helping people sleeping rough in Haringey

with accommodation, and providing accommodation to 3,098 homeless households currently provided with temporary accommodation.

The Cabinet Member added that the Council had bought 200 good, local homes and let them to homeless Haringey families through the Community Benefit Society that it had established.

It was noted that since October 2019 when the Council joined Capital Letters as one of its founder members, the scheme had provided good, local homes for 132 homeless Haringey households.

The Cabinet Member outlined that, instead of boroughs competing with each other for accommodation across the capital, driving up prices and sending families to distant parts of London, Capital Letters sourced accommodation on behalf of all its member boroughs and then allocates it on a geographical basis. As a result, 132 Haringey households been able to stay within their communities and the Council had also saved £140,000.

The Capital Letters scheme showed what can be done when London boroughs cooperated. This report recommended that the Council allocate the necessary resources to remain part of that initiative.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the payment of a sum of up to [EXEMPT] to Capital Letters to fund a member of staff, for the financial year period 2020/21 in line with the service level agreement and Borough Service Plan.
2. To approve the payment of a sum of up to the maximum total of [EXEMPT] to Capital Letters for Private Sector Landlord Incentives, including related insurance and void period payments for the financial year period 2020/21 in line with the service level agreement and Borough Service Plan.
3. To approve future payments to Capital Letters for Private Sector Landlord incentives, to fund one member of staff, and to cover void and insurance cost annually for the financial year 2021/2022; and gives delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, after consultation with the Director of Finance, to approve all such future payments to Capital Letters from 2021/22 financial year onwards in accordance with the Service Level Agreement, Borough Service Plan; and subject to continued part funding of incentives by MHCLG and government allocation of future Flexible Homelessness Support Grant (FHSG).

To notes that all these payments would be made from the Council's FHSG allocation from Government; and that these payments will only continue as long as there is allocation of FHSG to cover the cost, and on condition that the part-funding of Capital Letters from MHCLG continues.

Reasons for decision

Recommendation 3.1 is proposed as it is a membership requirement of the Capital Letters scheme to provide four members of staff, and to date only three have been seconded from Homes for Haringey. Payment will be made on a pro-rata basis dependent on the date of appointment of the additional member of staff, and the amount will be advised prior to invoices being submitted.

Recommendation 3.2 is proposed as it is a membership requirement of the Capital Letters scheme to reimburse the costs of incentives, insurance, and void payments. The cost of the incentive per tenancy of Capital Letters sourced tenancies is partly funded by MHCLG and so are at a lower rate than those previously obtained by Homes for Haringey. The amount to be paid will depend on the number of lets entered and will be advised prior to the invoices being submitted.

Recommendation 3.3. is proposed as these payments will depend on the number of properties sourced and allocated in each period and the Council will be invoiced frequently during each financial year.

Alternative options considered

The Council could decide not to make these payments. This option was rejected because it would mean that the Council would lose the benefit of joining Capital Letters and would be a breach of the membership terms.

391. CIVIC CENTRE FUTURE USE AND CAPITAL WORKS

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which sought approval to support investment in a project to repair, restore, refurbish, and extend the Civic Centre. The project would bring the Civic Centre back into use by the Council as its new civic headquarters, including a high-quality refurbishment of the democratic spaces and the provision of modern office space.

The Cabinet Member reminded Members that the Civic Centre had closed in March 2020 for safety reasons. There had been work completed on helping the Council decide the future use of the Civic Centre and necessary repairs included in the capital programme. However, it had become clear that the costs of the repair work were very high due to its nature as a listed building and the Cabinet Member stressed that the Council had no other alternative but to spend money on the building due to its listed status.

The Cabinet Member put forward plans to spend additional funds to bring the Civic Centre up to a standard that reflected its listed English Heritage status. It was planned to modernise the services and continue to use it as a civic premise, not just for the Council but the community in the long term.

The Cabinet Member commended the report for approval and asked Cabinet to agree proposals to allow delivery of new Civic headquarters for use in 2024. The Cabinet Member would keep member informed of progress.

In view of the time, 9.40pm, the Leader moved to invoke Committee Standing order 63 to allow Committee Standing Order 18 to be suspended and allow the meeting to continue after 10pm. This was to complete the business on the agenda. Cabinet agreed this motion without dissent.

In response to the Leader, the Cabinet Member confirmed that it would cost more than £10m just to carry out basic repairs to the building.

In response to Councillor Dennison, the Cabinet Member stated that the decision to refurbish and improve the building was prudent and would be money well spent. It was more cost effective to spend money on the Civic Centre rather than to spend over £100m on building new Council premises. He added that he could not commit to a final cost, as it was always a risk when carrying out building work that extra costs may arise. He also advised that the car park was separate to these works and any decision on the future use of it would be a separate decision for the Cabinet to make.

The Leader reiterated that, if the Council did nothing with the building, apart from the absolute minimum it would cost £10m. It was further felt that this was not the right time to build a new civic centre which would cost more. Given the listed status and responsibility of the Council, it was prudent to invest in the asset, to allow development of a civic hub used by Council and community.

RESOLVED

1. To agree to the proposed use of the Haringey Civic Centre as the Council's headquarters and democratic functions building, and to the repair, refurbishment and extension works as set out in more detail in paragraph 6.7 and 6.8 in this report.
2. To agree to a total sum of £24m towards the cost of the works, comprising of the £9.75m already in the capital programme and an additional £14.25m required for the project over 2020/21 to 2024/5, subject to the Council's budget setting process.
3. To authorise officers to carry out further work to develop the design brief which will include exploration of the option to extend the Civic Centre or add an annex which could meet all of the Council's HQ accommodation needs.
4. To note that, subject to the outcome of the work described in paragraph 3.3, a separate report will be brought to Cabinet in 2021 to recommend the contract for design works for this project.

Reasons for decision

The Civic Centre is a listed building, and the Council has a responsibility to ensure it is repaired and does not deteriorate further. Therefore, doing nothing with this building is not an option. The cost of basic repairs is estimated in excess of £12m, which the Council would need to spend in any case; whatever the decision about the future use of the Civic Centre. No serious alternative use for the Civic Centre has been found or

could be found quickly given this liability, and therefore the responsibility will be retained by the Council to repair the building.

In doing the recent feasibility work, it has become clear that the additional cost of the project recommended in this report would lead to a much better outcome and better value for money. Investing a larger sum in a full repair, extension and refurbishment would enable the Council to provide a high quality democratic and office headquarters building within a relatively short timescale in comparison with other options being considered.

In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the Council's accommodation requirements, with new agile and flexible working in place over a very short period of time. Whilst it will be important that staff do spend time in the office in the future, the effect is still that the Council's longer-term accommodation needs will be smaller than previously thought. In addition, the work to locate more staff in localities has continued during the COVID-19 pandemic period, and this will further reduce the number of staff who need to be located in Wood Green itself.

On this basis, it is now considered possible that the Council could use the Civic Centre as its main headquarters, with all of the civic democratic functions and a large proportion of the centrally located staff teams based there. Work will continue to test the extent to which the Civic Centre will be able to accommodate all the Council's headquarters needs, alongside George Meehan House and also work will continue on the future plans for the Council's existing accommodation and buildings in Wood Green, including the Library.

Even though there is a new context for decision making regarding the Council's accommodation strategy, a constant aim is the need to ensure that the overall accommodation strategy contributes to the MTFS. This contribution can be a mixture of reduced running costs and/or the application of capital receipts to reduce the borrowing costs incurred in delivering the strategy. This aim was previously agreed as being central to the accommodation strategy and remains so.

The refurbishment of the Civic Centre is the quickest way to provide a modern Council chamber and committee rooms which, in addition to a new and improved ground floor layout, can be used for a range of civic and community activities. The rooftop extension to the North wing will create a substantial increase in office area, meeting a significant proportion of the Council's HQ office requirements.

This project will help the Council to plan to reduce, over time, the number of sites in Wood Green that it uses for accommodation to deliver savings in response to the Council's financial position. Work is continuing to ensure that savings from accommodation can be identified over the course of the current Medium Term Financial plan, whilst also ensuring that any site which the Council ceases to use for accommodation as part of its plans and following the completion of the Civic Centre project is used in ways which will support economic growth and regeneration of Wood Green as well as the underlying business case for any capital investment.

Cabinet has previously agreed to take a future decision about the location of the Council's office accommodation and civic space between the Library and Civic Centre.

In making a decision to invest in the Civic Centre, it is possible due to changed needs that the Civic Centre, along with George Meehan House could meet most or all of the Council's accommodation needs, which would mean that at an appropriate time later, a separate decision may be required about investment in the Library. Further work is required to test whether an extension or annex to the Civic Centre, with continued and more intensive use of George Meehan House could meet all of the Council's headquarter accommodation needs. A separate report will be brought to Cabinet in 2021 about this along with a further report seeking agreement to the contract award for design works for this project.

Alternative options considered

As the Civic Centre is Grade 2 Listed, the building needs to be retained and repaired and made viable for future use and therefore doing nothing is not a realistic option to consider.

A range of options have been explored from basic repair on the basis of possible short life use pending a decision about the Library site, through to different levels of refurbishment and extension on the current footprint.

Carrying out basic repairs only would significantly restrict the capacity of the building and some parts of it would remain unusable, the existing cellular layout of the North Wing would not provide a modern fit for purpose office environment which would enable the open plan shared collaboration spaces we need. Basic repairs would mean the building would remain tired in appearance and fail to provide an uplifting environment for members, officers and residents to enjoy.

The option, which is being recommended, as is described in section 6.7 and 6.8, provides a better value longer term investment for the building.

This decision allows for the option to build an annex to the Civic Centre in the car park site to continue to be explored and a recommendation about this, which will include the site's suitability for housing as an alternative, will be made in early 2021.

392. EXTENSION AND VARIATION OF HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT CONTRACTS - MENTAL HEALTH PATHWAY- SHORT TERM SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health outlined that the Council and its statutory partners are committed to supporting people with mental health needs to live in the community and to achieve a sustainable recovery, preventing crisis interventions and the risk of homelessness. Housing Related Support services were a valuable provision delivered by specialist practitioners which enable and empower people to develop and rebuild the confidence and skills needed to achieve this.

It was noted that the Council currently commissioned a range of mental health supported accommodation and Housing First services and I believe it is appropriate that these should be extended as set out here, offering users continuity and the support which they need, while a new service model is co-designed and set in place.

RESOLVED

That, pursuant to Contract Standing Order 10.02.1(b) to approve the following:

1. To vary the contracts for the provision of short term specialist housing related support services for people with mental health needs awarded to St. Mungo's and Sanctuary in order to provide for an option to extend the contracts for two further periods of up to one year each, in place of the current option to extend for two further periods of exactly one year each.
2. To extend the aforementioned contracts for up to twelve (12) months, as permitted under the terms of the varied contracts. The extension will be for an initial period of six (6) months, commencing from 1st April 2021 to 30th September 2021 and will be extended for further periods of up to six (6) months, if required. The breakdown of costs for each contract is as follows:
 - The contract for the provision of short-term supported housing specialist mental health services with 24-hour support and visiting support (Mental Health West) is delivered by St Mungo's. The cost of the service for duration of initial period of six (6) months extension will be £265,816 and the total value over the full twelve (12) months, if used, would therefore be £531,631. The aggregated value of the contract over a period of 6 years will be £2,989,786, including the proposed extension.
 - The contract for the provision of short-term supported housing specialist mental health services with forensic provision is delivered by Sanctuary. The cost of the service for duration of initial period of six (6) months extension will be £194,859 and the total value over the full 12 months, if used, would therefore be £389,717.
The cost of the service (£194,858.50 for initial period of 6 months and £389,717 for full 12 months) includes a 6.5% uplift on the current contract price which amounts to £23,786 over a period of 12 months.
The aggregated value of the contract over a period of 6 years will be £2,019,387, including the proposed extension.
3. To vary the terms of the following contracts and to extend for further periods of up 12 months:
 - (i). The contract for the Community Mental Health Floating Support Service delivered by Richmond Fellowship to be extended for further periods of up to nine (9) months, commencing from 16th July 2021 at the cost of £197,847. The extension will be applied for an initial period of two and half (2½) months, commencing from 16th July 2021 to 30th September 2021 and will be extended for further periods of up to 6 months, if required. The aggregated value of the contract over a period of 27 months will be £593,541 including proposed extension.
 - (ii). The contract for the Integrated Response Mental Health Floating Support service provided by One Housing Group to be extended for periods of up to nine (9) months, commencing from 16th July 2021 at the cost of £185,250. The extension will be applied for initial period of two and half (2½) months, commencing from 16th July

2021 to 30th September 2021 and will be extended for further periods of up to 6 months, if required. The aggregated value of the contract over a period of 27 months will be £555,750 including proposed extension.

(iii). The contract for the provision of the Housing First Intensive Floating Support Service delivered by St. Mungo Community Housing Association to be extended for a further period of up to 12 months, commencing from 1st April 2021. The extension will be applied for initial period of six (6) months, commencing from 1st April 2021 to 30th September 2021 and will be extended for further periods of up to 6 months, if required.

The estimated cost of the service for duration of initial period of six (6) months, from 1st April 2021 to 30th September 2021 would be £97,445, this includes uplift of £5,500. The total value over the full 12 months, if used, would therefore be £194,890 including total increase of £11,000 on the current contract price.

The aggregated value of the contract over a period of 6 years will be £1,114,340 including proposed extension.

4.To give delegated authority to the Assistant Director Commissioning to approve the further extensions to the contracts for mental health supported accommodation, floating support services and Housing First if required as set out above and up to the maximum durations specified in 3.1.3 above.

Reasons for decision

The mental health supported accommodation pathway offers a range of provision types and services, including those staffed 24-hours a day, specialist women's provision and a forensic service for people involved with the criminal justice system.

The pathway makes a key contribution to the health and wellbeing of local residents and there is a clear strategic need and strong evidence base to continue to provide a mental health supported accommodation pathway going forward. The pathway operates to prevent homelessness and to facilitate hospital discharge and prison releases for people with ongoing mental health needs and supports residents to develop and strengthen the skills required to live independently. There is a continued and high demand for mental health supported housing, with residents referred via Barnet, Haringey and Enfield Mental Health Trust (BEHMT) and Homes for Haringey's Housing Needs Service.

Mental health supported housing and Housing First are important elements of the accommodation pathway for single homeless adults. The recommissioning process for the Mental Health Pathway is underway. The Housing Related Support (HRS) service have completed the review of existing Mental Health Pathway services and refreshed the service delivery model to maximise positive outcomes for service users and realign the recommissioned provision with strategic objectives for vulnerable adults.

Due to the Coronavirus (Covid-19) pandemic staff in the HRS service were diverted to support vulnerable homeless residents placed in emergency accommodation under the 'Everybody In' directive from government. As such some slippage in the redesign timeline occurred, and extra time has been required to implement virtual consultation and stakeholder feedback processes, which have informed the development of the

refreshed approach and service specifications for the Mental Health Pathway services to be set in place in the future.

Given the above, it is paramount to extend all five (5) existing contracts so that they all come to an end together and so that sufficient time is allowed for the redesign process. The new approach will bring greater coherence to the landscape for mental health services and create a single pathway offering a range of options to support people in the community. It will also allow time to implement a smooth transition and mobilisation process for the new services and allow flexibility to accommodate any future slippage due to Covid-19, if required.

The performance of the contractors has been evaluated as good throughout the contract period and demand for the service outstrips availability. Performance returns have been submitted by both providers throughout the course of the contract and targets are being met.

The proposed uplifts to the current contract values is recommended to reflect inflation and staffing cost increases of the contracts since their commencement in 2016.

Alternative options considered

Do Nothing - It would be possible to leave the contracts to expire at the end of this contract period. However, as noted above, there is continued demand for this service, and it was not felt viable to have no mental health supported housing service in place particularly given other pressures on other elements of the pathway. Rather, it was agreed to carry out an evaluation to recommission the accommodation pathway to best meet the needs of Haringey Residents. Therefore, it would not be in the Council's interest not to continue with mental health supported housing.

Go out to tender – It would be possible to go out to tender to seek a new and refreshed service, which could result in a new delivery provider. However, this option is considered to be not suitable given that there is a need for redesign and for changes to the existing model. Furthermore, short term contracts would cause significant disruption to vulnerable service users and may be detrimental to their mental health recovery. Therefore, continuing to deliver these services through existing providers is the most economically viable and efficient option while redesigning the new service delivery model for the Mental Health Pathway and the re-commissioning of these services is underway and the new contracts likely to start from 1st October 2021.

Deliver the services in house – Sanctuary Housing and St Mungo's (Mental Health West) are using their own accommodation to support this service, as well as agreements and leases with other landlords, and for the Council to ensure appropriate accommodation from which to deliver the service in-house would not be possible in the time frames available. All extensions requested are for a minimal period of 6 months and would not change the existing arrangements.

393. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

394. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as the following items contained exempt information under paragraph 3 and 5, Part 1 Schedule 12a of the Local Government Act 1972

395. EXEMPT - UPDATE ON CAPITAL LETTERS TO AGREE FUNDING PROCESSES

As per CAB 390 and the exempt minutes.

396. EXEMPT MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the exempt minutes for the meeting held on the 10th of November 2020.

397. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

None.

CHAIR: Councillor Joseph Ejiofor

Signed by Chair

Date