

Chair:  
Councillor Clare Kober

Deputy Chair:  
Councillor Lorna Reith

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This report covers matters considered by the Cabinet at our meeting on 15 December 2009. For ease of reference the Report is divided into the Cabinet portfolios.
- 1.2 We trust that this report will be helpful to Members in their representative role and facilitate a fruitful dialogue between the Cabinet and all groups of Councillors. These reports are a welcome opportunity for the Cabinet on a regular basis to present the priorities and achievements of the Cabinet to Council colleagues for consideration and comment. The Cabinet values and encourages the input of fellow members.

## **ITEMS OF REPORT**

### **Leisure Culture and Lifelong Learning**

#### **2. WHITE HART LANE COMMUNITY SPORTS CENTRE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN**

- 2.1 We considered a report which advised us that the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games (LOCOG) which was responsible for the preparation and the staging of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympics Games had indicated that if Haringey was chosen the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) would pay for the track upgrade at White Hart Lane Community Sports Centre (WHLCSC) which had an estimated cost of £300,000. Negotiations with LOCOG would, in broad terms, require agreement for:
  - closure dates of the facility to the general public (6 to 8 weeks in July/August 2012 and disruption to the centre for some weeks prior to this)
  - Acceptance of the transfer of risk for commissioning and completing athletics facility works which LOCOG will fund.
  - Granting free use of the venue for the required period without compensation for lost income.
- 2.2 Securing 'In Games Training' status at WHLCSC would be a major benefit to Haringey as it would provide both substantial investment and a major opportunity for the Borough to share in the Olympics. We were informed that an announcement about the training venues was expected in the near future and at that time negotiations would commence with LOCOG. If a satisfactory agreement was reached the contracts would need to be signed off without delay in order for the commissioning process to begin in order to ensure that the works were completed by August/September 2011.
- 2.3 However, this investment and £250,000 which it had previously been agreed be spent on essential works at the site would only partly address overall investment needs and would be seen as the catalyst for further improvement. The facility was an important part of the Whole Sport Development Plans for a number of sports national governing bodies (NGBs) – but these did not have sufficient levels of available funding to meet the likely

cost of rebuilding and private sector investment in the site could help to secure the future of provision.

- 2.4 We noted that one of these buildings was used by the Wood Green Youth Project and as part of the redevelopment it was anticipated that the Youth Project would relocate to the HALS building across White Hart Lane in the adjacent Woodside High School and that this move would free up some of the site's footprint for future development. The report proposed that, in order to test the market, the Council draw up a Development Prospectus for the site that can be used to identify potential investors and investment.
- 2.5 It was also proposed that the potential for private sector investment at Finsbury Park be further explored. Initial exploration had indicated an interest from both football and tennis operators in Finsbury Park and should this come to fruition, it could assist in attracting investment in other park sports facilities. As part of this exploration, the potential to secure funding from the neighbouring boroughs of Islington and Hackney, from national governing bodies (NGBs) of sport and from charitable sources would also be investigated. In addition, management options at both sites would be explored to ensure that on site management could best deliver the Centre's objectives.
- 2.6 Sport England, as one of the key players in sports sector funding, had awarded £130,000 revenue grant funding to the Council for a three year period to March 2012 to develop a multi sport hub at both sites with specific targets to be achieved for increased participation, more coaches and more volunteers. These targets and performance were monitored and reported through our 'Hariactive' – Make a Change programme, and the Wellbeing Partnership Board.
- 2.7 The multi sports hub approach has been acknowledged by Sport England as the most effective approach available to maximise lifetime sports participation. This was because it could provide the key ingredients that best support this goal and it would therefore seem prudent to continue to build a funding package for the Centre's redevelopment and thus have in place public body finance to match and support any commercial opportunities that might arise – particularly looking forward to an improved economic outlook for capital developments generally and specifically in the White Hart Lane area.
- 2.8 We report that we agreed that, in the event that White Hart Lane Community Sports Centre was approved by the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games as an In Games Training Facility, that authority to enter into a contract with that body for the use of the venue for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympics Games and to conclude a funding agreement with the Olympic Delivery Agency to fund upgrade works at the venue be delegated to the Director of Adult, Culture and Community Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Lifelong Learning. We also agreed to the upgrade of the athletics facilities and other critical items of refurbishment in line with the previously approved Sports and Leisure Improvement Programme.
- 2.9 Officers would continue to seek investment for improvement and/or refurbishment works to facilities at both White Hart Lane Community Sports Centre and Finsbury Park Track and Gym (FPTG) from private, public and charitable sector investors and explore the optimum management arrangements for both centres in order to improve commercial

potential and align site management arrangements more directly to stakeholder objectives.

## **Housing**

### **3. REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN HARINGEY COUNCIL AND HOMES FOR HARINGEY**

- 3.1 The Council will be aware that in April 2006 a five year management agreement with Homes for Haringey was entered into which was due to expire on 31 March 2011 and that at least 12 months notice was required to extend or end the contract. We considered a report which advised us that a comprehensive review of the Management Agreement had now been completed by the Project Board that had overseen this work at bi-monthly meetings between June 2009 and October 2009. The review of the Management Agreement had afforded the Council and Homes for Haringey the opportunity to scrutinise the entire Agreement, to make recommendations affecting the Council's relationship with Homes for Haringey, and to reflect good practice for us to consider and approve.
- 3.2 The report proposed that a new performance management protocol be introduced to assist the Council in its efforts to assess Homes for Haringey's ongoing performance, its delivery of capital projects, its stewardship of the Housing Revenue Account and its contribution to the achievement of the Council's corporate and community objectives. It was also proposed that the existing governance arrangements between Haringey Council and Homes for Haringey (HfH) be reviewed in order to allow Homes for Haringey to produce an Annual Report that provided a holistic view of the organisation's performance, and analysed its achievements against service improvement plan targets. Also, for senior Council officers be allowed to sit on the Board (subject to nomination by the Council)
- 3.3 We were asked to consider and approve a series of amendments and additions to the Management Agreement which were reflected in the new draft Management Agreement. Schedules and Annexes to the Agreement reflected new and existing arrangements and incorporated numerous Service Level Agreements (SLA's), between the Council and Homes for Haringey, that were subject to annual review. Although the updating of these SLAs was not scheduled to be completed until the end of December 2009, the timing of this work and other routine amendments to the Schedules and Annexes would not impact on the main body of the Management Agreement.
- 3.4 We report that we agreed the amendments proposed to the content and wording of the Agreement subject to textural amendments made at our meeting and to the extension of the Management Agreement for another 5 years (until 31 March 2016), with the option to extend the Agreement for a further 2 years (subject to a review of Homes for Haringey's performance). We also agreed amendments to the dispute resolution arrangements; and the introduction of a performance management protocol between the Council and Homes for Haringey.
- 3.5 We further agreed that Homes for Haringey be required to produce an annual Business Plan and Annual Report to the Council and that the Business Plan should be the primary

document for the Council and the Company to set out the priorities for the delivery of Homes for Haringey's business. Senior officers of the Council may now be nominated to the Board of Homes for Haringey.

## **Environment and Conservation**

### **4. PALACE GATES AND DUKES AVENUE AREA TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND 7.5 TONNE WEIGHT RESTRICTION SCHEME**

4.1 We considered a report which advised us that extensive consultation had been undertaken between May and October, taking the form of area-wide stakeholder meetings, smaller focus group meetings, informal and formal consultations, a public exhibition and a statutory consultation about a proposed Palace Gates area traffic management scheme.

4.2 We were informed that the perceived problems within the area were:

- A high volume of through traffic
- A high percentage of HGV traffic
- Excessive congestion
- Speeding traffic

There had also been reported incidents of road rage and accidents due to aggressive driver behaviour.

4.3 In order to tackle these problems a scheme consisting of the following elements was proposed subject to public consultation:

- 7.5 tonne area wide weight restriction for the Palace Gates and Dukes Avenue areas
- 20mph speed restriction in the Palace Gates area
- Physical enforcement measures

4.4 We were informed that the results of the consultation revealed 85% support for a 7.5 tonne area wide weight restriction covering both the Palace Gates area and the Dukes Avenue area and this had been progressed under delegated powers ahead of the other elements of the proposed scheme. The 20mph zone proposal in the Palace Gates area was well supported but there was a legal requirement that this be supported by physical measures. The proposed physical measures had been amended since the previous consultation and, where possible, contentious issues had been resolved, removed or mitigated and further, statutory, consultation on these measures.

4.5 We report that we endorsed the implementation of a 7.5 tonne weight restriction for the Palace Gates and Dukes Avenue areas and we agreed that statutory consultation be carried out on the traffic calming and management scheme proposals for the Palace Gates area.

## **5. CODE OF PRACTICE ON CIVIL PARKING AND TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT**

- 5.1 We considered a report which advised us that the Council was required to publish a parking enforcement code of practice and policy on how discretion was exercised in the cancellation of penalty charge notices. This code of practice was to help motorists understand the parking regulations that applied in Haringey and how the Council enforced them. It would also explain how discretion was exercised and in what circumstances the Council might consider cancelling a penalty charge notice.
- 5.2 We reviewed and made changes our parking policy in September 2007 prior to the implementation of Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the code of practice submitted to us had been compiled from existing policies, procedures and operational practices which took account of the guidance on the Traffic Management Act issued by the Department for Transport and additional guidance issued by London Councils.
- 5.3 We noted that the aim of the Code of Practice was to –
- Ensure that parking services' enforcement activities were transparent and consistent; and
  - Ensure clarity of enforcement policies and practices for motorists.
- 5.4 The key areas covered in the code of practice were parking and traffic contraventions, observation periods and exemptions. There was guidance on the statutory appeals process and examples of when we might cancel a penalty charge notice. It also clarified the involvement of elected representatives in the appeals process who might ask for and receive information on behalf of a constituent about the progress of an appeal or representation, but might not play a part in deciding the outcome of individual cases.
- 5.5 We also noted that parking service staff would use the document in conjunction with the civil enforcement handbook and detailed guidance when considering representations (both formal and informal) and appeals.
- 5.6 We report for information that we approved the publication of the Code of Practice on Civil Parking and Traffic Enforcement.

## **Adults, Culture and Community Services**

### **6. CARE QUALITY COMMISSION'S ANNUAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OF ADULT SOCIAL CARE 2008/09**

- 6.1 The Council will be aware that the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) joined the Health Care Commission and the Mental Health Act Commission on 1 April 2009 to become the Care Quality Commission (CQC). CQC hold an annual review monitoring meeting with all Councils with Social Care responsibilities following which, CQC inform the Director of Adult Social Care Services of the progress achieved against performance targets in the year, drawing attention to key strengths and areas for improvement. It was a requirement that the CQC assessment and any action or improvement plan in response, was placed before the Council's relevant Executive Committee in open

session. The CQC assessment was based on a set of national standards and criteria and the judgement provided to Councils was open to challenge by them before the results were made public in the form of grade awarded for delivery of outcomes, early December.

- 6.2 We considered a report which advised us that following an annual review monitoring meeting which had taken place in August 2009 the CQC had sent the Council their summary report for 2008/09 annual performance assessment of social care for Adult Services in October 2009. This was based on a Performance Assessment Notebook (PAN). The purpose of the PAN was to provide the Council with an assessment from CQC which outlined strengths, achievements, and areas for development. We noted that a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) had been drawn up to ensure that identified areas for development in the PAN and the key areas for improvement, in CQC’s summary letter, were addressed.
- 6.3 The judgement reached by CQC resulted in the award an overall grade for delivering outcomes and a separate grade for each of the seven outcomes – *Grade 1: performing poorly; Grade 2: performing adequately; Grade 3: performing well; and, Grade 4: performing excellently.* The commentary of the two domains of leadership, use of resources and commissioning would be directly transferred to the Comprehensive Area Assessment.
- 6.4 We were pleased to note that the overall judgements in our 2007/08 performance rating were:

Delivering outcomes judgement determined as **Good**, with Capacity to improve as **Promising**.

The overall grade awarded for Delivery of Outcomes in 2008/09:

Adult Social Care Services was **Performing Well**, consistently delivering above the minimum requirements for people, was cost effective and made contributions to wider outcomes for the community. The next (and upper level) is *Performing Excellently*.

The Service Inspection (2009) found:

The Council’s capacity to improve as **Promising**, judged using the ‘Leadership’ and ‘Commissioning and Use of Resources’ domains.

Performance against the seven outcomes for adult social care as set out in the White Paper ‘*Our Health, Our Care, Our Say*’ is:

Overall Grade Awarded for Delivery of Outcomes	Performing Well
<b>Delivering Outcomes</b>	<b>Grade Awarded</b>
Improved health and well-being	Well
Improved quality of life	Well
Making a positive contribution	Well
Increased choice and control	Adequate

Freedom from discrimination or harassment	Well
Economic well-being	Well
Maintaining personal dignity and respect	Adequate

- 6.5 Significant improvements had been made in all of the National and Performance Indicators and Haringey was among the top ten for most of the indicators when compared to other London Boroughs, and to those with the same demographics. The CQC commented that: the Council provided strong political leadership and contributed to good partnership arrangements, promoting the modernisation of adult social care. The Service Inspection noted these strengths and the clear vision for older people and self-directed care services and judged the Council's capacity for improvement to be **Promising**;
- 6.6 CQC's recognition that Adult Social Care Services was **Performing Well**, consistently delivering above the minimum requirements for people, was cost effective and made contributions to wider outcomes for the community, and the Service Inspection's verification of capacity to improve as **Promising**, reflected that the Council was well placed in 2009/10 to build on the significant improvements made in 2008/09.

## Leader

### 7. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2008/09

- 7.1 We considered a report which sought our approval to the Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for submission to the Government Office for London as required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.
- 7.2 The report set out a brief summary of the planning performance in 2008/09. Key policy themes and performance indicators were summarised under the headings Development Management; Housing; Economic Activity; Town Centres and Retailing; Environment and Transport and Planning Obligations.
- 7.3 The Annual Monitoring Report concluded that the Council was performing well against the National Indicators for planning and had met its 2008/09 targets for planning applications and appeals and for building new homes on previously developed land. UDP policies had also been effective in delivery the Borough's environmental, economy and retail/town centre aims, and the Local Development Framework timetable - The Local Development Scheme – had met its milestones for 2008/09.
- 7.4 We noted that, overall, the Council had maintained its performance and achieved the milestones for the reporting year 2008/09. The Officer assessment from the national indicators and milestones was that overall the performance was positive. However, we also noted that core indicators did show concern about housing size on new applications and we were informed that this was being addressed through both Development Management operational work and Policy reviews.
- 7.5 We approved the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) 2008/2009 for submission to the Government Office for London and in so doing noted the conclusion that overall the aims

of the Council's current "place shaping plan", (the Unitary Development Plan 2004-2016) were being delivered and that the Plan's indicators for 2008-09 were generally positive. Full copies of the AMR had been placed in the Members Room and published on the Council's web site.

## **8. COMPREHENSIVE AREA ASSESSMENT**

8.1 The Council will be aware that the Comprehensive Area Assessment replaced the CPA in April 2009 and that it had two parts, the Area Assessment and the Organisational Assessment. The Area Assessment looked at the outcomes delivered by the Council and its partners, focussed on the activities of the Strategic Partnership and what had been achieved against priorities. The Area Assessment was not scored but where there were exceptional or innovative outcomes achieved, a Green Flag is awarded. If outcomes were not on track, a Red Flag was given.

8.2 The Organisational Assessment was focussed on the Council and had two sections:

### **1) Use of Resources**

- **Managing finances** looked at planning finances effectively, having a sound understanding of costs and performance;
- **Governing the business** considered the commissioning and procurement of quality services and the delivery of sustainable outcomes and value for money. It is also focused on having reliable data and information to support decision making, together with good governance and management of risk;
- **Managing resources** assessed the use of natural resources, management of assets and workforce organisation and development. Workforce issues were not included in this year's assessment, but will be part of the 2009/10 assessment.

### **2) Managing Performance**

Managing Performance assessed the Council's achievements. It looked at outcomes against Council priorities and the prospects for future improvement, through consideration of what had been achieved, and whether the Council had robust strategies and plans in place for the future. In making this judgement the Audit Commission considered the findings of the Ofsted inspection of Children's Services and the Quality Care Commission's assessment of Adult Social Care services.

8.3 We considered a report which advised us that Haringey's CAA results for 2009 were as follows -

<b>Area Assessment</b>
Draft narrative report with one red flag for safeguarding children.
<b>Organisational Assessment – overall score of 1 out of 4</b>



<b>Managing Performance – overall score</b>	<b>1 out of 4</b>
Adults Social Care Services – performing well	3 out of 4
Children’s Services rating – performing poorly	1 out of 4
<b>Use of Resources- overall score</b>	<b>3 out of 4</b>
Managing Finances	3 out of 4
Governing the Business	2 out of 4
Managing Resources	3 out of 4

8.4 While the Area Assessment report presented a positive picture of achievements, a red flag was given for safeguarding children and although the report for the Council’s Managing Performance assessment had many examples of positive outcomes, the overall score was 1 out of 4, reflecting Ofsted’s assessment of the Children and Young People’s safeguarding service, which carried considerable weight in the overall assessment.

8.5 The Use of Resources assessment scored three out of four; but when combined with the Managing Performance score of one out of four, the overall score for the **Organisational Assessment** was one out of four with a judgement that overall, Haringey London Borough Council performed poorly.

8.6 The areas where improvements needed to be made were recognised and Ofsted would be undertaking a further inspection of Children’s Services in January 2010 while the Audit Commission would inspect Housing Services in May 2010. We would also continue to strive to improve performance across a range of services provided by the Council and its partners that the inspection bodies recognised as areas where improvements had been made or that were performing well. These included:

- Street cleaning
- Tackling climate change
- Parks
- Reducing crime
- Adult Social Care
- Financial Management
- Managing resources.

8.7 We concluded that, overall, 2009 had been a challenging year, that progress had been made and that we would continue to work hard to address the fundamental problems in children’s safeguarding services. We looked forward to 2010 where we aimed to continue to make sustainable improvements in key services that mattered most to the residents of Haringey.

**9. THE COUNCIL’S PERFORMANCE: OCTOBER 2009 (PERIOD 7)**

- 9.1 We considered a report which presented on an exception basis financial and performance information for the year to October 2009, asked us to agree proposed budget virements in accordance with financial regulations.
- 9.2 We noted that overall performance on the monthly basket of indicators showed that of the 76 indicators 47% were on target with a further 18% close to target and 28% not currently achieving target. For the remaining 5 indicators (7%) data or targets were not available and their status could not be allocated. The report provided some key messages on performance for the year to October 2009 including an update on progress against Haringey's Local Area Agreement (LAA) targets particularly those where the Council was the lead agency. An Appendix served as an exception report for those areas where targets were not being met.
- 9.3 The overall revenue budget monitoring, based on the October position, showed a forecast gross spend of £4.9 million above budget an increase on the previous month of £0.5 million. This figure was made up of pressures across a number of Directorates. As highlighted in the report on the last period, a £1 million contribution from the general contingency and a £1.5 million saving on the inflation budget following the pay award settlement had helped to offset this figure. Additionally, from the beginning of October 2009 the Council had moved onto the new energy contract which offered prices significantly lower than those paid in the first half of the year. The current forecast saving on energy bills within the general fund was £0.6 million. This would give an overall outturn figure of a net £1.8 million above budget. Officers would continue to monitor the position closely to assess the impact of the measures being put in place to reduce costs wherever possible.
- 9.4 The aggregate capital projected position in 2009/10 was to under spend by £13.2 million which equated to 7% of the approved budget. We noted that a significant proportion of the current year's capital programme was funded from receipts generated as part of the Council's disposal programme. The target level of receipts assumed in 2009/10 was £9.1 million but, as previously reported, the projected actual receipt total was short of the target, currently forecast at £4.4 million. The underlying reason for this shortfall was the difficult property market conditions currently prevailing which had meant that some disposals were being deferred in order to achieve best value for the authority. Mitigating actions were still being explored to address the forecast shortfall although the re-profiling of some schemes this year would help the current year's position.
- 9.5 Under the Constitution, certain virements are key decisions. Key decisions are:
- For revenue, any virement which results in change in a directorate cash limit of more than £250,000; and
  - For capital, any virement which results in the change of a programme area of more than £250,000.

Key decisions are highlighted by an asterisk in the table.

- 9.9 The following table sets out the proposed changes. There are two figures shown in each line of the table. The first amount column relates to changes in the current year's budgets

and the second to changes in future years' budgets (full year). Differences between the two occur when, for example, the budget variation required relates to an immediate but not ongoing need or where the variation takes effect for a part of the current year but will be in effect for the whole of future years. Proposed virements are set out in the following table –

<b>Revenue Virements</b>						
<b>Period</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Key</b>	<b>Amount current year (£'000)</b>	<b>Full year Amount (£'000)</b>	<b>Reason for budget changes</b>	<b>Description</b>
P8	CY	Rev	146		Corrective Budget Realignment	Technical adjustment to correctly allocate catering income budgets between breakfast clubs and primary schools.
P8	CY	Rev	200	200	Corrective Budget Realignment	Younger Children Assessment Team is being restructured. Income from Supporting People and Children's Fund had ceased this financial year and salary budget reduced consequently.
P8	CR	Rev	122		Corrective Budget Realignment	Budget adjustment to reflect revised Smart Working spend profile as agreed by the Accommodation Delivery Board
P8	CR/PD	Rev	119	138	Corrective Budget Realignment	Contract savings on cash/cheque collection and agency managed service transferred to Corporate Procurement Savings code.
P8	UE	Rev	(151)	(151)	Corrective Budget Realignment	Funding for Smoking Grant used over 2 years has ceased.
P8	AC	Rev	220	220	Corrective Budget Realignment	Moving budgets to reflect where post costs have moved.
P8	AC	Rev	(122)		Corrective Budget Realignment	Moving Day Care transport under spends to Community Alarms in order to offset income shortfall.
P8	AC	Rev	287	56	Corrective Budget Realignment	Moving ABG and other budgets from ACCS contingency to specific cost centres.
P8	AC	Rev	112	112	Corrective Budget Realignment	Transfer of budget in the Safeguarding Team
P8	AC	Rev	104	104	Corrective Budget Realignment	Transfer of budget to reflect type of expenditure.
P8	AC	Rev	113	113	Corrective Budget Realignment	Virement to support approved revised staffing structure from Governance & Partnerships within the Commissioning & Strategy Unit
P8	CE/PD/PP/CR	Rev *	523	523	Corrective Budget Realignment	Haringey Forward efficiencies identified from VFM reviews of subjective expenditure
P8	UE/CY/AC	Rev *	293	293	Corrective Budget Realignment	Haringey Forward efficiencies identified from VFM reviews of subjective expenditure

<b>Capital Virements</b>						
Period	Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Reason for budget changes	Description
P8	CR	Cap *	(650)		Corrective Budget Realignment	Budget re-profiling to reflect revised Smart Working spend profile as agreed by the Accommodation Delivery Board
P8	UE	Cap *	310		2009/10 allocations	Allocation of the 2009/10 Growth Area Funding 3 to various projects
P8	UE	Cap *	266		2009/10 allocations	Allocation of the 2009/10 Growth Area Funding 3 to the Garden of Remembrance at the Mortuary

## **10. URGENT ACTIONS IN CONSULTATION WITH CABINET MEMBERS**

10.1 We were informed of the following action taken under urgency procedures by a Director in consultation with the Leader or other Cabinet Member -

### **Director of Corporate Resources**

#### Section 106 Agreement – Garage Colony Waverly Road N 17

Approval to the delegation of authority to the Head of Legal Services to agree and execute a Section 106 Agreement binding the Council in its capacity as the freehold owner of the land at the Garage Colony, Waverley Road N17.

#### Acquisition of Land and Buildings at 20 and 21 Cranford Way Industrial Estate to Facilitate the Relocation of Hornsey Re-use and Recycling Centre

Authorisation of the Head of Corporate Property Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources, to acquire industrial units 20 and 21 Cranford Way Industrial Estate and adjoining vacant land at Tottenham Lane, Hornsey by private treaty or at auction if necessary for the best negotiated or bid price.

### **Assistant Chief Executive**

#### Revision of Pricing Structure for Broadwater Farm Community Centre

Approval to the implementation of a revision of the pricing structure for the hire of Broadwater Farm Community Centre facilities.

## **11. DELEGATED DECISIONS AND SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS**

11.1 We were informed of the following significant action taken by a Director under delegated powers -

### **Director of Adult, Culture and Community Services**

Adaptations Service Establishment Changes – 3 additional Occupational Therapists.

GAP Staffing Structure

**Director of Corporate Resources**

Replacement of Gas Fired Boilers and Heating Control Upgrades – Approval to the award of the contract.