

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

## **PRESENT:**

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

**ALSO ATTENDING VIRTUALLY: Cllr Diakides, Cllr Palmer**

## **552. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

## **553. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Diakides and Hakata.

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

## **554. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

## **555. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

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

There were no representations made.

## **557. MINUTES**

### **RESOLVED**

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

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

None received.

**559. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

None received.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **RESOLVED**

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

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

### **Reasons for decision**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Alternative options considered.**

#### **Not to adopt the Local Lettings Policy or Leaseholder Offer**

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

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

#### **Not to proceed with the Love Lane Estate resident ballot**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **561. NEW PAYMENT OPTIONS POLICY FOR LEASEHOLDERS**

*Councillor Chandwani left the meeting as per item 555.*

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

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

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

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

## **RESOLVED**

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

### **Reasons for decision**

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

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

### **Alternative options considered.**

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

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

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

*Councillor Chandwani returned to the meeting room.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **RESOLVED**

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

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

### **Reasons for decision**

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

- the demolition of the Northolt tower, which is the nineteen-storey tower block situated directly north and approximately four metres from the Stapleford North block. Stapleford North and Northolt are joined via a link bridge, which is used to provide lift access from Northolt to properties in the Stapleford North block. The demolition of the tower is likely to take between 9-12 months to complete and significant hoarding will be required, which will surround the Stapleford North block. The demolition will lead to noise and dust disruption as the block is dismantled and removed from site. This will be caused as the panel system is deconstructed, craned to ground floor and removed by truck.
- the construction of new homes on the Northolt plot, which will take place following the demolition. The construction of the new homes is likely to take up to two years and will lead to further extensive hoarding surrounding the block, with dust and noise disruption caused by the construction process for new homes.
- the refurbishment works, which would be required to ensure that the Stapleford North block's structural issues are addressed and that the building meets existing building standards. This work is likely to take a further six to nine months to complete and is like to require the temporary decant of some residents within the block to facilitate.

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

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

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

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

**Alternative options considered.**

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

**563. PARKING FEES AND CHARGES REVIEW**

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

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

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

**RESOLVED**

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

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

### **Reasons for decision**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Inflationary increase to existing fees and charges**

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Diesel surcharge for on-street parking and car parks**

In March 2020, Cabinet approved<sup>1</sup>, amongst other changes to parking fees and charges, the introduction of a 25% surcharge for diesel vehicles parking in off-street public car parks and in on-street paid parking bays (commonly known as pay-by-phone bays). This decision was subject to the outcome of statutory (traffic management order) consultation.

In response to the feedback received during the statutory consultation, Cabinet approved<sup>2</sup> to implement only some aspects of the proposed traffic management order. Of relevance to this report *“consideration was given to introducing the 25% diesel surcharge on on-street and car park charges from November 2020, as part of a package of measures to reduce diesel related pollutants. However, following due consideration of the feedback to the consultation, this will not be implemented at this point in time. This will also help support our town centres in their recovery from the impacts of the Covid 19 pandemic.”*

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

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

It is noted that in March 2021 an EqIA was carried out<sup>3</sup> that identified that the proposal was robust and there is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact and that all opportunities to promote equality have been taken.

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

The main reasons for this proposal are to:

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

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

This proposal was subject to an equalities impact assessment (EqIA) in February 2021<sup>4</sup>. The EqIA demonstrated that the proposal was robust and there was no potential for discrimination or adverse impact and that all opportunities to promote equality had been taken.

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

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

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

### **Introduction of Sunday charges in Stop and Shop bays**

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

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

---

<sup>4</sup> [https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s121324/App%2010a.4%2020210115%20MNM%20Sunday%20charges\\_.pdf](https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s121324/App%2010a.4%2020210115%20MNM%20Sunday%20charges_.pdf)

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

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

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

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

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

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

This proposal was subject to an equalities impact assessment (EqIA) in February 2021<sup>6</sup>. The EqIA demonstrated that the proposal was robust and there was no potential for discrimination or adverse impact and that all opportunities to promote equality had been taken.

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

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

---

<sup>6</sup> [https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s121324/App%2010a.4%2020210115%20MNM%20Sunday%20charges\\_.pdf](https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s121324/App%2010a.4%2020210115%20MNM%20Sunday%20charges_.pdf)

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

in time losses from traffic congestion caused by searching for parking and loading<sup>8</sup>.

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

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

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

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

#### **Paid parking – purchase in 15-minute blocks.**

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

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

#### **Alternative options considered.**

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

## **564. RENEWAL OF DPS FOR RESIDENTIAL AND NURSING**

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

---

<sup>8</sup> [https://repository.lboro.ac.uk/articles/report/The\\_environmental\\_and\\_welfare\\_implications\\_of\\_parking\\_policies/13352660](https://repository.lboro.ac.uk/articles/report/The_environmental_and_welfare_implications_of_parking_policies/13352660)

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

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

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

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

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

## RESOLVED

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

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

### Reasons for decision

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Alternative options considered.**

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

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

## **565. 2020/21 FINANCE UPDATE AND PROVISIONAL OUTTURN**

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

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

The Director of Finance responded to questions from the Committee:

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

The Director of Finance responded to questions from Councillor Palmer:

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

### **RESOLVED**

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

### **Reasons for decision**

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

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

**Alternative options considered.**

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

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

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

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

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

Further to considering exempt information at item 21,

**RESOLVED**

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

**Reasons for decision**

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

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

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

**Alternative options considered.**

**Do nothing.**

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

**In-house provision**

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

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

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

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

Further to considering exempt information at item 22,

**RESOLVED**

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

**Reasons for decisions**

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

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

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

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

**Alternative options considered.**

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

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

**568. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

**RESOLVED**

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

**569. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

**RESOLVED**

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

**570. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**571. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED**

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the consideration of agenda items 21-24 as they contain exempt information as defined in Section 100a of the Local Government Act 1972; Paragraph 3 - information relating to the business or financial affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information), and Paragraph 5 – Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

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

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

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

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

**574. EXEMPT MINUTES**

**RESOLVED**

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

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

None.

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....