

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY, 22ND APRIL, 2025, 6.30 - 8.22 pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Ajda Ovat, Peray Ahmet (Chair), Mike Hakata, Emily Arkell, Zena Brabazon, Dana Carlin, Seema Chandwani, Lucia das Neves, Ruth Gordon and Sarah Williams**

## **IN ATTENDANCE:**

**Councillors: Pippa Connor**

### **169. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair referred to the filming at meetings notice, and attendees noted this information.

#### **RESOLVED:**

To note the filming procedure

### **170. APOLOGIES**

There were none.

### **171. URGENT BUSINESS**

There was none.

### **172. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

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

There were no representations received in relation to the exempt items.

### **174. MINUTES**

The minutes of the previous meeting, dated 18 March 2025, were discussed

**RESOLVED:**

The minutes of the previous meeting, dated 18 March 2025, were approved as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

**175. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

A deputation was received from Mr Dave Morris as per standing orders in the Haringey Constitution, Part Four, Section B, Paragraph 30.

Mr Morris made the following points as part of his deputation:

- He explained the historic and current policy of the Council's support of Community Centres in the borough. He explained that the current Cabinet had committed to improved partnership working, which was welcomed, but stressed that there needed to be a focus on securing appropriate leases for buildings utilised. He explained that there needed to be a 100% rent offset based on services provided by Community Centres, which would benefit the Council through the lessening of the burden on Council services. He explained that he recognised the current financial challenges, but noted that good partnership work with the community would help resolve pressures on Council services with the Council's support.
- It was explained that there were concerns with the Social Value Matrix and the potential for constraints on officers to meet arbitrary targets.

The Cabinet Member for Communities made the following points in response:

- That the Voluntary, Community and Faith sector provides vital support to communities, including most vulnerable, and that the Council welcomes their support. It was stressed that the Council was working to seek common ground with the Voluntary, Community and Faith sector within the policy framework, and that the policy aimed to create a good framework and stability for these groups. It was explained that the Council had worked to co-produce the policy with Voluntary, Community and Faith sector groups
- It was explained that the Council's property portfolio needed significant attention, as it had not been managed well in the past, and that this policy sought to address some of the issues.
- It was explained that the Community Assets Social Value policy, which had been developed by the Council in collaboration with Voluntary, Community and Faith sector, aligned with the approach which had been taken by other

comparable local authorities.

- The social value criteria was outlined and it was explained that this would be used to assess the impact of the service for the community. It was additionally explained that the request for a 100% rent offset was not sustainable for the Council, and that the 80% proposed offset would be sufficient, and that funds raised would provide support in maintaining buildings, as well as officer time to help community groups to develop their offer further.
- It was stressed that the Council would continue to work with VCFS partners and will work to find an effective way of acknowledging and valuing the services provided.
- It was explained that the Council was working with early adopters to understand impact, and the Council was also open to amending capping arrangements following work with early adopters. It was stressed the need to test the Social Value Matrix with early adopters to consider the impacts on community groups.

**RESOLVED:**

1. To note the deputation

Following discussion on this item, it was asked whether the Community Assets Social Value Policy, linked with this deputation, should be brought forward to follow this discussion.

**RESOLVED:**

That the agenda be amended to bring the Community Assets Social Value Policy next on the agenda.

**176. COMMUNITY ASSETS SOCIAL VALUE POLICY**

The Cabinet Member for Communities introduced the report.

They explained that the report set out the new policy to determine subsidy levels on leases for voluntary and community sector (VCS) organisations operating out of council buildings and that this was an opportunity to ensure equality, equity, and fairness across Haringey assets, as well as support for organisations that brought social value to Haringey.

It was stressed that the Council recognised the importance of the work carried out by our VCS and the services it provided, especially at a time when global instability had a significant impact on our residents' wellbeing and living standards.

Voluntary and community organisations worked closely with the council to deliver highly valued services and activities across the borough. However, there had been a historical lack of consistency in how we managed our property portfolio, including our Community Assets Portfolio.

The Cabinet Member explained that some rents were zero or peppercorn, while others approached market rates. Many leases had expired, and there was no formal policy or framework for determining the basis on which VCS organisations should occupy Council-owned buildings.

It was additionally noted that the Council's proposed Strategic Asset Management and Property Improvement Plan (SAMPIP) 2023–2028, which this policy aligned with, committed to addressing these inconsistencies, which left the council vulnerable to perceptions of unfair treatment, lack of transparency, and ambiguity.

In line with our Haringey Deal, since March 2024, we engaged in extensive collaboration and consultations with a wide range of VCS and community networks in our borough. It was explained that the feedback received shaped the policy to ensure it was as robust and fair as possible.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Brabazon, Arkell and Connor, the following information was shared:

- It was explained by the Cabinet Member that the rent for each site utilised by a community group would need to be assessed on own merits, but noted an example of community centre on a full repair lease, on £150,000 per year, would have a 80% social value rent reduction to £30,000 per year, which would be utilised for repairs.
- It was explained by the Cabinet Member that other comparable local authorities had undertaken similar schemes to the one proposed by Haringey.
- How to ensure equality of access. It was explained that Haringey Community Collaborative would provide support to grass root organisations to ensure that they can get the highest value possible.
- It was noted by officers that long term leases would be generally referred back to Cabinet, while short term leases could potentially be taken at an officer level. It was explained that this would be dependant, generally, on lease length and value, rather than repair liabilities.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Noted the engagement work conducted since the Cabinet meeting of 12 March 2024 to co-design and consult on a social value matrix for this policy,
2. Adopted the policy entitled 'Community Assets Social Value Subsidy' and approved the use of the self-assessment form.
3. Approved the implementation of this policy, initially for the 23 community centres that were out of lease in the council's Community Assets portfolio, followed by the remainder of that portfolio as leases came up for renewal—noting that work continued under SAMPIP 2023–2028 to finalise the assets within that portfolio.
4. Approved the immediate commencement of lease negotiations with the two early adopter organisations.
5. Delegated any minor changes to the policy, following the application of the policy to early adopter organisations, to the Director of Culture, Strategy & Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities.
6. Required a report on implementation of the policy to be provided to Cabinet by summer 2026 to enable an assessment of the policy's impact, as recommended by the Equality Impact Assessment.

## **Reasons for Decision**

The Cost of Living Crisis, following the Coronavirus pandemic, left Haringey's residents extremely vulnerable. This increased the urgency of the VCS's work, which delivered a range of affordable and accessible services and support across the borough.

Haringey had a rich fabric of VCS organisations. Some of these organisations—though not all—occupied Council-owned buildings under various arrangements, including leases at differing rental levels, expired leases held over, licenses, and tenancies at will.

There previously was no formal policy or framework determining the basis on which VCS organisations should occupy Council-owned buildings. This led to inconsistencies and the potential for perceptions of unfairness or lack of transparency.

The SAMPIP 2023–2028 included a commitment to a Property Review Process. A Cabinet decision in March 2024 set out principles for a new approach to managing and delivering subsidised rents reflecting the social value contributed by VCS organisations. The report recommended a social value matrix enabling organisations to self-assess their impact. Council officers would then verify this and assign a corresponding level of subsidy.

The March 2024 Cabinet decision authorised an engagement process with the VCS to co-design the matrix.

This process was concluded and this report presented the final proposal with the full policy and the self-assessment form.

The March 2024 report also committed to identifying early adopter organisations to test the framework. Following discussions with the Haringey Community Centres Network (HCCN), two out-of-lease organisations—Hornsey Vale and Markfield Park Community Centres—were selected. Property officers worked with these groups to inform the development of the policy and accelerated lease negotiations contingent on Cabinet approval.

Following this, officers planned to work through the remaining out-of-lease community centres using the policy.

Given that this was a new policy and process, minor amendments could be delegated to account for learning from early adopters. For instance, one proposed improvement included aligning subsidy levels to score quintiles within the matrix, e.g. scores between 80–100 receiving the maximum 80% subsidy.

The Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) identified the importance of reviewing the policy's impact to avoid unintended consequences and to begin capturing and recognising the social value delivered. A follow-up report to Cabinet after one year of implementation was proposed to provide insight and assurance.

## **Alternative Options Considered**

**Do Nothing** – Without a new policy, Property and VCS teams would have to manage the portfolio without a consistent basis. This would have meant renewing lapsed

leases at market rent, which would be unaffordable for many VCS groups and left the Council open to accusations of arbitrary or inconsistent treatment. This was not a viable option.

**Circular Grant Model** – This would have involved charging market rent and then awarding grants equivalent to the subsidy level. Although the same matrix could be used, this would have required additional budget lines, administrative complexity, and cashflow capacity from VCS organisations, which many did not have. The circular grant approach was rejected due to its impracticality, added administrative burden, and incompatibility with the Council's current financial pressures.

**Apply a 100% Subsidy** – While recognising financial pressures on the VCS, this option was also rejected. The Council needed income to contribute to maintenance costs, especially as it retained responsibility for major repairs. The EQIA highlighted concerns that some organisations may struggle to pay even 20% rent; this would be reviewed after implementation to assess whether mitigations were needed.

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

There were none.

#### **178. 5 YEAR PARKING INVESTMENT PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality introduced the report.

It was explained that the report explained the plan to deliver parking controls and management in the programme areas under my portfolio. With safety playing a key role, it was important that, where the Council provided parking for motor vehicles, it did not create a safety risk. It was explained that the Council was keen to provide a safe and accessible space for those using footways, whether on foot, wheeling or pushing prams. It was highlighted that enforcement played a part in creating a safe environment, whilst ensuring parking and servicing only took place where permitted, and the Red Route trialled in Brantwood Road had shown improved compliance with parking controls through the replacement of enforcement by foot with remote enforcement. This scheme was since made permanent and this report brought forward two other areas that would have benefited from a similar

approach. It was recognised by the Council that parking was an essential public service and that residents needed safe and fair access to their homes, whether they were drivers or users of other forms of transport. It was stressed that provision of parking for those with a Blue Badge was especially important to ensure they had access to their local high streets and amenities whether leisure or otherwise. It was explained that it was important to take a balanced approach whilst being mindful of the various policies and objectives of the Council, including those that prioritised walking and cycling.

It was explained that the report set out the 5-year investment plan and referenced other developments planned or underway that would impact parking provision. The Cabinet Member explained that, to deliver change and manage parking in the future, it was important that funding was set aside from Council Capital beyond the then-current 5-year investment plan period to facilitate this.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Connor, the following information was shared:

- It was questioned whether no-idling signs could be included as part of the plan. The Cabinet Member agreed that this could be implemented. It was additionally explained that the Council was working with Trade Unions to discuss with Council drivers to discourage idling wherever possible.
- That the Council had worked with residents to ensure a good balance of ~~road~~ yellow road markings in local areas. However, it was stressed that there was a priority to minimise risk of accidents at road junctions through the utilisation of yellow road markings for pedestrian safety.
- That the Council would consult with local Councillors on developments and adjustments to street furniture on adjacent wards. It was stressed that engagement in areas which would have an effect on multiple wards would take place with Councillors from those wards.

**RESOLVED:**



That Cabinet:

1. Agreed the 5-year Parking Investment Plan for 2025/26 – 2029/30
2. Delegated, where appropriate, authority to the Head of Highways and Parking:
  1. To make decisions relating to scheme design and implementation.
  2. To carry out consultations and, in compliance with the Constitution, with regards to objections received during statutory consultation, consulted with the Cabinet Member for Tackling Inequality and Resident Service; and
  3. Agreed that, having followed the legal process, make traffic management orders to give effect to those schemes.

### **Reasons for Decisions**

This report sought approval for the 5-year Parking Investment Plan 2025/26 – 2029/30, which set out the priorities and funding levels for the next 5 years. The Council had a statutory obligation to manage its road network, and parking played a key role in congestion reduction and improving road safety. It could also encourage healthier travel options, while optimising use of limited kerb space.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

A 'Do Nothing' option was considered and rejected, as this would not have allowed the Council to deliver changes to parking controls necessary to meet its policies, address resident and business concerns, and respond to requests over the next 5 years. It would also not have allowed schemes approved in the 2024/25 Parking Investment Plan to be progressed to delivery in 2025/26.

## **179. ACQUISITION OF 29 COUNCIL HOMES AT 76 MAYES ROAD, N22 6SY**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning, and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report.

It was explained that the proposed acquisition would deliver twenty-nine additional new council homes on the 76 Mayes Road site, providing much-needed high-quality and affordable housing for those who were living in temporary accommodation. It was

stressed that the Council was seeing a homelessness emergency across the UK, felt particularly acutely in London. It was explained that, as of November 2024, 183,000 Londoners were estimated to be homeless and living in temporary accommodation arranged by their local borough. London boroughs were collectively spending £4 million daily on temporary accommodation. It was explained that, in Haringey, the Council had managed to keep numbers in temporary accommodation relatively stable, despite an anticipated 13% increase by year-end in the number of people experiencing homelessness and approaching the council for support. It was explained that this was partly due to schemes like this, which provided stable long-term accommodation for people to move into.

It was noted that, out of the twenty-nine affordable homes, eight were two-bedroom and eleven were three-bedroom, providing much-needed accommodation for families on the waiting list.

The Cabinet Member explained that housing contributed to 50% of emissions in the borough. The houses on the Mayes Road site helped deliver on our ambition to reach net zero in the borough by 2041 through improved energy efficiency standards and the potential to connect to a District Energy Network (DEN) in the future.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Hakata and Cllr Connor, the following information was shared:

- It was explained by the Cabinet Member that there would be a net bio-diversity gain for the site and that the site proposed would be above planning policy minimums for energy efficiency.
- It was explained by officers that the Council was buying 29 properties on the site, and that these were contained within a block. However, it was stressed that this was not the entire block, and therefore, the Council could not acquire the entire freehold at a reasonable cost.
- Officers explained the legal advice given on liabilities and noted that the utilisation of Right to Buy receipts subsidised the purchase of the properties and that this also ensured that the purchases would not be subject to stamp duty.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the acquisition of 29 council homes at the Former Petrol Filling Station, 76 Mayes Road, Wood Green N22 6SY for the payment as set out in the Part B (Exempt) report and based on the draft Heads of Terms contained in the Part B (Exempt) report.
2. Approved the total scheme cost for the acquisition as contained in the Part B (Exempt) report.
3. Approved the use of Right to Buy (RtB) for the transaction. The total amount of RtB receipts was contained in the Part B (Exempt) report.
4. Granted delegated authority to the Director of Capital Projects and Property, following consultation with the Head of Legal and Lead Member for Housing, to finalise the Heads of Terms, agree the final legal documentation, and complete the transaction.
5. Noted that these homes would be leased by the council to the Haringey Community Benefit Society (HCBS), who, in turn, would let these homes at Local Housing Allowance (LHA), thereby allowing the council to discharge its homelessness duty to Haringey households.

## **Reasons for decision**

The acquisition of these properties resulted in 29 additional new council homes, thereby assisting the council to house households in need of good quality housing.

The proposed council homes were well located to enjoy the amenities of the High Street in Wood Green.

The homes were expected to be of a good standard and allowed the council to discharge its homelessness duty to Haringey households.

### **Alternative options considered**

Not to acquire the homes. This option was rejected because it would have been a missed opportunity for the council to:

1. Secure 29 new council homes.
2. Assist in maintaining momentum and progress in the overall aspiration to provide affordable housing in the borough.

## **180. ADOPTING NEW BUILDING SAFETY COMPLIANCE POLICIES AND AN ACCESS FOR EMERGENCIES, SAFETY OR WELFARE POLICY**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning, and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report.

It was stressed that nothing was more important than residents' safety and that the Council was committed to ensuring that the Council's 20,000 tenants, leaseholders, and their families lived in safe homes where they could thrive. It was explained that these policies were an important next step in the transformation of the Council's landlord services and that they aligned with broader plans to enhance housing services for tenants and leaseholders and to improve the quality of Council homes, as outlined in the Housing Strategy 2024–2029 and the Housing Improvement Plan.

It was additionally explained that these policies helped the Council meet the government's Social Housing Regulator's consumer standards. They outlined the reasonable steps the Council would take to ensure the health and safety of tenants in their homes and communal areas.

It was stressed that the insights and experiences of our residents, particularly through the Resident Voice Board, played a key role in shaping these policies. This Group, comprising tenants and leaseholders, ensured ongoing resident engagement and co-creation in housing policies.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Hakata, Cllr Connor, the following information was shared:

- It was explained that the Building Safety Policies had been written in collaboration with leaseholders and tenants. However, it was stressed that fire safety was paramount to the development of Building Safety Policy and that it would always take precedence. It was explained that experts would determine the operational matters relating to ensuring fire safety. Officers explained that there had been some work undertaken to ensure this safety while also addressing the concerns of residents.
- It was explained that residents in tower blocks had their own building safety manager, and appraisals were taken on a regular basis, as well as ensure that compliance checks were undertaken to address concerns around building safety. This was to reflect the changes to building safety following the Grenfell Review.
- It was explained that there was a requirement to regularly review policies and undertake a review if there were any changes in regulations, which would ensure that policies were up to date with central government regulations.
- Concerns with reporting structure for residents. Resident engagement strategy bespoke to individual high rise buildings, and additionally have an allocated building safety manager who manages building compliance and manage building safety concerns.
- It was explained that the Council did not undertake fire risk assessments on an ad hoc basis and that it applied the Central Government fire risk appraisal tool, which the Council utilises to assess priority order and frequency of assessments, and the publicly available standard for fire risk assessment.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet

1. Approved the draft:

- a. Asbestos Safety Policy; Access for Emergencies, Safety or Welfare Policy;
  - b. Electrical Safety Policy;
  - c. Fire and Structural Safety Policy;
  - d. Gas and Heating Safety Policy;
  - e. Lift Safety Policy; and Water Hygiene Policy
- to come into effect from 6 May 2025.

2. To delegate authority to the Corporate Director for Adults, Housing and Health to amend reports to resolve any minor errors.

### **Reasons for Decision**

These newly drafted, clear, and accessible policies outlined the Council's approach to building safety for Council tenants and their wider households. The new access policy confirmed the Council's approach to obtaining access to tenanted and leaseholder homes (including gardens and other outside areas) when necessary.

The new policies helped the Council meet the Social Housing Regulator's consumer standards, specifically the Safety and Quality Standard and the Transparency, Influence and Accountability Standard.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

The Council could have continued with current compliance and access policies. This option was rejected because the existing policies were outdated and no longer met the Council's needs or those of its tenants. Introducing these new policies assisted the Council in meeting the Social Housing Regulator's Consumer Standards, particularly the Safety and Quality Standard requirement. This option also would not have met our commitment to introduce updated policies in the Housing Strategy 2024–2029 and the Housing Improvement Plan 2023.

## **181. WAIVER AND AWARD OF THREE CONCESSION CONTRACTS TO OPERATE AND EXPAND CAR CLUB SERVICES IN HARINGEY (FIXED BAYS AND PILOT) OVER THE NEXT 5 YEARS**

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport introduced the report.

It was explained that car clubs were an important and powerful tool that helped reshape the Council's relationship with transportation.

It was suggested that car clubs created ripple effects that extended far beyond the realm of transport in its traditional sense and reshaped urban landscapes, freed up valuable space previously dedicated to parking, and enabled the creation of more liveable, people-centric environments.

It was explained that the adoption of car clubs had the potential to fundamentally alter the way we thought about mobility in our cities and create a holistic vision of sustainable transport that integrated car clubs with public transport and active travel.

It was explained that car clubs were aimed to work in synergy with investments in public transport, cycling infrastructure, and pedestrian priority schemes, and create a borough that prioritised people over cars.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Connor, the following information was shared:

- Officers explained that a five-year timescale was the expected reasonable timeframe to allow for the development of a customer base for car clubs in the borough.
- It was explained that the Council had been working with car club operators to develop fair and equitable fees and charges.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Noted the responses received as part of the community engagement on the future of fixed bay car club services in Haringey.

2. Waived the provisions of the Council's Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.01.1 (requirement to let a contract following publication of appropriate advertisement) and approved the appointment of the Fixed Bay selected supplier for the 79 car club bays, with the possibility of expansion across the borough for the next 44 months.
3. Waived the provisions of CSO 9.01.1 and approved the appointment of the selected supplier for the Fixed Bay Pilot programme to introduce a new provider of car club services in the borough and expand its service over the next five years, with the possibility of extending for a further two years at annual intervals, subject to performance.
4. Waived the provisions of CSO 9.01.1 and approved entering into formal agreements with the selected suppliers of each service to deliver the fixed bay car club services, as permitted under CSO 9.07.1(d). The anticipated contract start date was 1st June 2025. The Fixed Bay contract lasted for 44 months, ending on 31st January 2029. The Pilot programme contract lasted for five years, ending on 31st May 2030.

### **Reasons for Decision**

Car clubs were a vital service in Haringey, aiming to reduce car reliance by catering to residual car trips within the borough and reducing the need for private vehicle ownership. This, in turn, freed up space that could be repurposed for other uses. The Corporate Delivery Plan for 2022–2023 included the retendering of the car club contract to introduce multiple operators in the borough, enhancing service quality and availability. The re-tendering of fixed bay car club services was a key aim within the “A Zero Carbon and Climate Resilient Haringey” section of the Haringey Corporate Delivery Plan 2024–2026. This initiative aligned with the Council's adopted Walking and Cycling Action Plan (2022) and Transport Strategy (2018), both of which supported car club schemes as a means of creating alternative travel options to help reduce reliance on private cars, thereby reducing congestion and pollution.



At the time, the only operator of car clubs in the borough was ZipCar, which continued to operate fixed bay services and their floating service under the terms of lapsed contracts. This issue was highlighted in the previous Corporate Delivery Plan, which aimed to introduce multiple operators to improve service and foster competition. A new tender, the “Fixed Bay Car Club Tender (Pilot),” was developed to introduce a new supplier and allow growth and customer base development alongside the existing 79 bays.

The Council had engaged extensively on the future of fixed bay car club services. A dedicated community engagement was conducted from 11th December 2023 to 21st January 2024, seeking views from residents, businesses, and other stakeholders. The Council also engaged with groups protected under the Equality Act 2010 through the Transport Inclusion Group. Extensive market testing ensured the deliverability of the specifications. A “Haringey Approach” was developed to maximise benefits and minimise impacts.

A competitive procurement exercise was conducted, resulting in the selection of a supplier to deliver the Haringey Approach. The tender process, open from 2nd December 2024 to 31st January 2025, included two contracts: a Fixed Bay contract for the existing 79 bays with potential expansion and a Fixed Bay Pilot for a new supplier.

Submissions were evaluated based on quality (90%) and cost (10%). Key quality criteria included fleet management, bay expansion, innovation, monitoring, and social value. The winning bidders scored 80 and 82 for the main contract and pilot programme, respectively.

There were no known significant inequalities associated with the car club service in Haringey. However, concerns included access for those with mobility needs, age restrictions (minimum age of 25), income barriers, and digital literacy requirements.

While these issues were not documented as significant inequalities, they were noted for future service improvements. A formal contract provided a framework for cooperation and granted enforcement powers to the Council for addressing poor operator performance.

## **Alternative Options Considered**

**Option 1: Do Nothing** – This option would have allowed the current operator to continue under an assumed contract. Though resource-light, it posed legal risks and lacked opportunities for better value or renegotiated terms.

**Option 2: Tender Only for the Main Contract** – This option excluded the Pilot programme. It streamlined the process but reinforced ZipCar's dominance, contrary to the goal of promoting competition and improving service.

**Option 3: Cease Operation of Car Clubs** – This would have meant asking ZipCar to cease operations. This option was rejected as it ran counter to Council policy, reduced access to sustainable transport, and undermined strategic objectives on congestion, climate, and public health.

### **182. CONSULTATION ON HARINGEY'S DRAFT AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN (2025-2030)**

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport introduced the report.

The Cabinet member explained that the proposed Air Quality Action Plan set out measures to improve air quality in Haringey between 2025 and 2030. This Action Plan would replace the Council's third plan (2019–2024), published in 2019. It was explained that Haringey remained committed to making the borough a better place to live and work. Air quality affected everyone living and working in the borough and was therefore an integral part of this vision.

The Cabinet Member explained that there were a number of initiatives already in place to improve air quality both London-wide and locally, and that these had been working well. The Council intended to build on these initiatives to further encourage active travel, implement transport improvements, reduce emissions from new developments, and reduce exposure for residents. It was explained that the proposed Action Plan outlined how the Council would work together to meet national air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and PM10. It was stressed that the Council recognised that this could not be achieved alone and took a partnership approach, both across Haringey and with adjoining boroughs.

Haringey had previously been awarded Cleaner Air Borough Status by the Greater London Authority (GLA), which meant the borough met the following principles: political leadership, taking action, leading by example, using the planning system, informing the public, and integrating air quality into the public health system. While the GLA no longer awarded Clean Air Borough Status to individual boroughs, these

principles and examples of best practice continued to be incorporated into the action plan.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr das Neves and Cllr Connor, the following information was shared:

- It was asked what the impact of the Air Quality Action Plan would be on resident experience and what the expected achievements of the plan would be. It was explained that the Council wanted to ensure that residents had the ability to help in tackling climate change was accessible to residents, including behaviour and information sharing programmes were included to ensure accessibility. It was highlighted that the Council was working collaboratively with other teams, including the public health team and schools' team to ensure that there was a joined-up approach to tackling air pollution issues and reduce preventative deaths due to poor air quality.
- It was explained that the Council undertook traffic assessments for School Streets to ensure that the other adjacent roads would not become dangerous. It was additionally explained that the Council was undertaking consultation work to understand the impact upon the road network to ensure a positive scheme.
- It was explained that the Key Performance Indicators of the Air Quality Action Plan were reported on annually.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Noted the content of the draft Air Quality Action Plan.
2. Agreed to consult on the Draft AQAP 2025–2030 in accordance with the consultation plan.
3. Delegated the sign-off of the Final AQAP, following public consultation, to the Director of Environment and Resident Experience, and the Director of Public Health, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport.

## **Reasons for Decision**

1. Haringey had been declared an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) by the Council in 2001, due to air quality levels for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and particulate matter (PMs) exceeding statutory limits. Haringey's Annual Air Quality Report showed that national, regional and local programmes had helped reduce the number and concentration levels of air pollutants. Despite this progress, several areas of the borough still failed to meet UK Air Quality

Standards—and no areas met the WHO Standards.

2. Under Part 4 of the Environment Act 1995, Haringey was required to provide an AQAP to address areas of poor air quality identified within the AQMA, with a specific duty to monitor and work towards reducing NO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.
3. NO<sub>2</sub> was produced by burning fuel, with road transport and gas boilers (domestic and commercial) identified as the primary sources in Haringey.
4. PMs consisted of soot, dust, and other secondary particles formed by reactions in the air. The main sources in the borough included road transport, construction, domestic biomass/wood burning, and resuspension.
5. The Government identified poor air quality as the UK's largest environmental risk to public health, attributing an estimated 28,000–36,000 deaths per year to it. Exposure to NO<sub>2</sub> and PMs was harmful in the following ways:
  - a. Short-term exposure worsened pre-existing conditions like asthma and increased the risk of cardiovascular events.
  - b. Long-term exposure increased the risk of respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, cancer, dementia, and led to reduced life expectancy.
  - c. Vulnerable groups, including the elderly, very young, those with health conditions, and pregnant individuals, were more affected, even on lower-pollution days.
6. The Haringey Health and Wellbeing Strategy (2024–2029) highlighted the impact of poor air quality and made it a key objective within the Healthy Place Shaping theme. This, alongside the Council's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) on air quality, informed the draft AQAP 2025–2030 and illustrated the co-benefits of clean air interventions.
7. The draft AQAP 2025–2030 replaced the 2019–2024 plan. When preparing the new plan, the Council had a statutory duty to consult with a range of stakeholders, including the Mayor of London.
8. Cabinet delegated the sign-off of the final AQAP to the Director of Environment and Resident Experience and the Director of Public Health, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport. This approach was in line with GLA guidance and ensured Haringey fulfilled its duty under the Environment Act 1995.

## **Alternative Options Considered**

To not undertake an Air Quality Action Plan – This option was not viable, as the development and implementation of an AQAP was a statutory requirement.

To not consult on the Air Quality Action Plan – Also not a viable option. Statutory consultation was required, including engagement with:

- The Secretary of State;
- The Environment Agency;
- Transport for London and the Mayor of London;
- Neighbouring boroughs or district/county councils;
- Other public authorities;
- Local business groups;
- Other relevant stakeholders.

The statute did not define a minimum consultation period, but a 6-week consultation was proposed as standard practice. Other councils had consulted for periods ranging from 4 to 12 weeks.

An online questionnaire via the Commonplace platform was planned, with accessible formats provided. During the consultation period, two community events were proposed to support further stakeholder engagement.

### **183. EXTENSION OF THE HARINGEY COMMUNITY CARBON FUND**

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport introduced the report.

The Cabinet Member explained that the array of projects related to the Community Carbon Fund over the first four years was a testament to the remarkable spirit of innovation and collaboration they represented.

The Cabinet Member highlighted the community response, including schools tackling food waste, Haringey Borough Women's Football Club creating recycling solutions for sports equipment, and community centres upgrading to energy-efficient lighting, which suggested a borough-wide commitment to climate action that spanned every sector of the community.

The Cabinet Member explained that the engagement statistics for the Community Carbon Fund showed that 36 projects were delivered across the borough, leveraging an additional £261,000 in match funding and creating lasting partnerships between community organisations that might otherwise never have collaborated.

He explained that, as the programme looked toward the next four years, the aim was to increase the annual funding pot to £100,000. The proposed enhancements directly responded to community feedback, making the fund more accessible and impactful. By shifting application deadlines away from the busy holiday period, more groups

were enabled to develop thoughtful proposals. It was stressed that a stronger focus on high-impact carbon reduction projects maximised environmental benefits, while the introduction of mandatory carbon literacy training created a ripple effect of knowledge and advocacy throughout the borough, equipping community leaders to inspire wider climate action beyond their funded projects.

It was explained that the fund exemplified the Haringey Deal in action and that it sought to share power with communities and creating genuine opportunities for residents to shape the climate response.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Connor, the following information was shared:

- It was explained by officers that the outcomes of grant utilisation by community groups were recorded in the Annual Carbon Report.
- It was explained by the Cabinet Member that the Borough of Culture was aimed to bring together the whole borough and that it aimed to utilise culture to help tackling climate change and improve engagement.
- It was explained that the Council issued a short questionnaire to prospective community representatives to understand their background and experience and allocate the best candidate. It was explained that the criteria for selection of community representatives would be further developed to ensure the best candidate.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Noted the Cabinet decision on 11th February 2025 to allocate £0.64m of the Carbon Offset Fund monies collected under s106 obligations for the extension of the Haringey Community Carbon Fund and its administration. The spend over four financial years was agreed at:
  - a. £100k per funding year in community grants (total £400k)
  - b. £60k per funding year to manage and promote the fund (total £240k).
2. Noted the current process, and agreed to the changes to the Haringey Community Carbon Fund for Years 5 to 8 following internal and external engagement to improve the management of the fund and delivery of outcomes.
3. Agreed that the decision to allocate the annual funding to specific carbon reduction bids in this period was delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment, and Transport, and drawing on the

advice of the Programme Director Wellbeing & Climate and the Haringey Community Carbon Fund Panel. And, where funds were not fully spent at the end of each year, that unspent funds would be rolled over to the next spending year.

### **Reasons for decision**

Allocating the carbon offsetting funds to community schemes continued to deliver Objective Com2 of the Haringey Climate Change Action Plan. This committed to “empower and enable community-owned projects to deliver carbon reduction”, with a specific action under Com2 to set up a community energy fund. Grants to local community organisations encouraged residents, community groups and local businesses to live and operate more sustainably. Residents and community groups were well-placed to identify, set up and run carbon reduction projects, whilst developing their skills. Funding enabled organisations to have a wider reach, with more projects coordinated and delivered across the borough.

The borough’s community groups also used this funding to access and match fund external funding streams for carbon reduction. Examples included the National Lottery, the GLA’s London Community Energy Fund, the NLWA’s North London Community Fund.

This funding strategy delivered on Haringey 2035: the vision, and the action on “Supporting greener choices” by empowering the community to tackle the climate emergency. Funding created opportunities for community-led initiatives to mitigate climate risks and be climate resilient.

### **Alternative options considered**

#### **Do nothing – rejected**

This would have run counter to the Cabinet decision in February 2025 allocating £640,000 for the extension of the Haringey Community Carbon Fund Years 5 to 8. It would have failed to meet the objectives and outlined actions of the Haringey Climate Change Action Plan to support and empower community-based carbon reduction and undermined the council’s declaration of a climate emergency.

#### **Do same as the first 4 years – rejected**

The first four years were very successful; however, continuing the same would not have enabled community feedback and council learnings to be incorporated into the extension. This would have been a missed opportunity for more beneficial outcomes regarding carbon reduction, community engagement and contribution to equalities. This would also have gone against the recommendations of the community engagement for the extension of the Haringey Community Carbon Fund, and the principles of the Haringey Deal.

### **Alternative ways of funding community groups: Funding community groups but excluding businesses, schools, and individuals – rejected**

This option was ruled out for the following three reasons:

- Schools, individuals and small and medium enterprises were an integral part of Haringey's community and excluding them would have been against the plan to support and empower community-based carbon reduction.
- The council had limited direct control or influence over borough emissions, and supporting community action and behaviour change was key to delivering the borough-wide net zero carbon target of 2041. This group had a deeper reach within the community. Excluding them would have meant losing the opportunity to tap into this.
- Excluding these groups would have gone against the GLA guidance on Community Funds and use of Carbon Offsetting Funds.

### **Alternative ways of funding community groups: Funding council projects and reducing the amount allocated to community groups from the Community Carbon Fund – rejected**

This option was ruled out as it would have run counter to the Cabinet decision in February 2025 allocating £640,000 for the extension of the Haringey Community Carbon Fund Years 5 to 8 to empower community groups and support community-led carbon reduction projects, as set out in the objectives and outlined actions of the Haringey Climate Change Action Plan.

## **184. GRASMERE COURT, N22 - APPROVAL OF HOUSING CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AND LAND APPROPRIATION**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning, and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report.

It was explained that Haringey was a borough with diverse needs when it came to housing and that the Council was committed to making the borough a place where everyone could thrive, no matter how complex their needs. It was explained that around a third of residents in the greatest need on the housing waiting list had a disability, or a family member with a disability, living in homes that were overcrowded or did not meet their medical requirements. The bespoke housing programme was an important part of the Council's needs-led approach to solving the housing crisis.

The Cabinet Member explained that the proposal for Grasmere Court delivered three new large council rent homes that were designed to meet the needs of the families who would live in them. This was a particularly special scheme, as the Council was able to design a home to suit a family with very specific challenges for which there was no suitable property in the Housing portfolio, and the impact on the family was immeasurable. This scheme enabled a family to move out of overcrowded accommodation and live together in a home that suited their needs and enabled a new level of independence that would have otherwise been impossible.



It was stressed that the Council had committed to building 3,000 new council homes by 2031 to help tackle the acute need for affordable housing in the borough—a demand directly caused by the national housing crisis. Haringey had already made great strides towards this target, with work either completed or under way on over 2,000 homes across the borough. All homes had high levels of insulation, efficient heating systems and solar panels that kept running costs low and avoided overheating. They were constructed with responsibly sourced and environmentally friendly materials.

**RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Pursuant to the Council's Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1(d), approved the appointment of Contractor A to undertake the new build works to provide a total of three homes at Council rent for the total contract sum set out in the exempt part of the report; and approved the client contingency sum set out in the exempt part of the report.
2. Approved the appropriation of the Grasmere Court development site edged red on the plan titled 'Development Plan' from housing purposes to planning purposes under Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972, as it was no longer required for the purpose for which it was currently held, and for the purpose of carrying out the development as set out in part 6 of the report.
3. Approved the use of the Council's powers under Section 203 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 to override easements and other third-party rights and interests infringed upon by the Grasmere Court estate development, under planning permission Ref: HGY/2024/2098.
4. Delegated authority to the Assistant Director for Capital Projects and Property, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning, to make payments of compensation resulting from genuine claims of third-party rights affected by the Grasmere Court development and payable, within the existing scheme of delegation.
5. Approved the appropriation of the Grasmere Court development site, edged red in the plan titled 'Development Plan' from planning purposes back to housing purposes under Section 19 of the Housing Act 1985, after practical completion of the development.
6. Approved the total scheme cost set out in the exempt part of the report.

7. Approved the issuance of a letter of intent for up to 10% of the contract value as set out in the exempt part of the report.
8. Noted the engagement and consultation carried out on the proposed scheme.

### **Reasons for Decision**

The site known as Grasmere Court was approved by Cabinet in July 2019 to be included in the Council's Housing Delivery Programme. Resolution to grant was received first on 16th December 2021 and again on 2nd October 2024 in relation to the updated design. This report therefore marked the third and final Cabinet decision to develop the site.

Contractor A was identified by a formal tender process to undertake the works.

There were no reasons for the Council to believe that any third-party rights would be infringed upon by the development: resolution to grant was received on 16th December 2021 and again on 2nd October 2024 in relation to the updated design, and no applicable concerns about the loss of rights were raised during extensive local engagement and consultation, including a Section 105 consultation from February to March 2021 with residents. However, appropriation of the Grasmere Court development site for planning purposes was recommended as a precaution. It allowed the Council to use the powers contained in Section 203 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 to override easements and other rights of neighbouring properties and prevented injunctions that could delay or prevent the Council's proposed development. Section 203 converted the right to seek an injunction into a right to compensation. The site needed to be appropriated back from planning purposes to housing purposes upon completion of the development to enable the Council to use the land for housing and let three new Council homes.

The site proposal provided three much-needed family-sized homes.

These three homes also contributed to the Council's commitment to start 500 homes on site as part of the GLA 21–26 Affordable Homes Programme.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

The Council could have chosen not to appoint a contractor to complete the development of the site; however, this option was rejected because it would not have supported the Council's commitment to deliver a new generation of Council homes, in particular family-sized homes.

This opportunity was procured via a competitive tender using the London Construction Programme (LCP) and the Construction Dynamic Purchasing System, using the JCT Design & Build Contract 2016 with amendments—the route recommended by the Strategic Procurement team. The alternative would have been to procure a contractor

via a restricted, competitive tender to the open market, or the Westworks Procurement Ltd Development.

The Council could have continued with the scheme without appropriating the site for planning purposes, but this would have risked the proposed development being delayed or stopped by potential third-party claims. By utilising the powers under Section 203 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 (HPA 2016), those who benefited from third-party rights would not have been able to seek an injunction, since those rights or easements that were overridden were converted into a claim for compensation only. The Council recognised the potential rights of third parties and paid compensation where a legal basis for such payments was established. The housing delivery team actively engaged with local residents about the development of the site as the scheme proceeded through the feasibility and design stages, and any comments or objections raised were taken into consideration by Planning Committee in reaching its decision.

The Council could have decided not to appropriate the land for housing purposes upon practical completion of the building works. This option was rejected because it could have prevented the Council from being able to offer these homes for occupation, thereby not supporting the delivery of much-needed affordable homes.

#### **185. HIGHWAYS AND STREET LIGHTING DELIVERY PLAN 25/26 TO 29/30**

The Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality introduced the report.

It was explained that highways played a pivotal role in daily life and that Haringey was one of London's best-connected boroughs, with a local highway network that was well used. It was additionally stressed that Haringey would be the host of the Borough of Culture and UEFA European Football Championships in 2027 and 2028, and that there was a particular focus on allocating capital funding for carriageway and footway maintenance in the initial three years of the delivery plan to ensure safe access to all relevant venues.

It was explained that there would also be a focus across service areas to ensure alignment with other funded work streams contributing to the overall fabric of the public realm, and that external funding was sought wherever possible to supplement the Council's own funding.

The Council had adopted highway asset management policies and practices that ensured the greatest benefit for the whole community. It was noted that longer-term planning could now take place, ensuring the best use of resources, including

alignment with other improvements to the public realm, planned utility works where opportunities arose, and, in addition, the phased introduction of new innovative treatments as they emerged.

It was explained that the proposal set out the first 5-year Delivery Plan, comprising some £35.775m investment to improve Haringey's highway infrastructure.

This included over £2m towards essential repairs to three highways bridge structures—namely Ferry Lane, Wareham Road and Cornwall Road—to be delivered in year one, and £4.925m of street lighting improvements to be delivered over the 5-year period. Should any additional funding have been allocated to the Council, where possible, these funds were to be considered first to reduce the Council's borrowing.

It was explained that engagement with residents, businesses, and other interested parties continued to take place during the development of major highway schemes, thereby allowing contributions to design solutions where applicable.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Hakata and Cllr Connor, the following information was shared:

- Officers noted that the Council was in discussions with Transport for London regarding a local Lane Rental Scheme and had mapped out potential roads which this could be applied to.
- Officers explained that the Council would be able to comply with the Department for Transport's requirement to submit a local highway's maintenance transparency report, additionally noting that not much officer time would need to be spent compiling this as the information was already held by officers. The limited amount of time needed would be an excellent return on investment in securing the 25% incentive fund component of the overall £571k Government allocation.
- The Cabinet Member explained that £35 million was allocated to highway assets in 2025/26. It was additionally noted that, over the previous five years, £60 million had been spent, which additionally included S106, CIL, and other external funding.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the Highways and Street Lighting 5-Year Investment Plans in Appendices 1 and 2 of the report.
2. Delegated decisions relating to the development of detailed improvement/maintenance programmes to the Head of Highways and Parking, within the parameters set out in the Highways Asset Management and Streetlighting Strategies, and Delivery Plan, subject to Key Decisions being taken to Cabinet.
3. Authorised the Head of Highways and Parking to:
  - a. Carry out any required consultation in the delivery of the 5-year plan in accordance with Appendix 3; and, having had due regard to all consultation responses submitted as part of the statutory consultation process, and having considered whether the Council should have caused a public inquiry to be held,
  - b. Having had due regard to all consultation responses submitted as part of the statutory consultation process, and having considered whether the Council should have caused a public inquiry to be held, make any necessary traffic management orders to give effect to the schemes in each year, subject to key decisions being taken by Cabinet.

## **Reasons for Decision**

Local highway authorities were expected to adopt asset management principles of 'predict and prevent', and planned works were an essential element to ensure the safety and resilience of the highway network. Any alternative to sustained levels of capital funding would have gone against prevention and proper asset management and the principles set out in *Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure: A Code of Practice*, which all local highway authorities were expected to follow.

This report set out a 5-year delivery plan for highways and street lighting maintenance and improvements. As set out in the Highways Asset Management Strategy adopted

in March 2024, developing a prioritised longer-term programme of works gave greater transparency of funding levels and the work to be delivered. For residents and businesses, this allowed a greater understanding of priorities and the volume of work that could be delivered. For contractors delivering the works, there was greater certainty of future work, allowing them to better resource and deliver work efficiently. A longer-term view of highway asset investment also allowed the Council to focus on delivering a forward-looking strategy, ensuring the most benefit was derived from the overall funding available.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

The Highways and Street Lighting Investment Plans reported to Cabinet had historically been restricted to the forthcoming year's programme of works. This annual cycle of programming and approvals at times impeded opportunities for efficiencies and flexibilities that could be achieved through longer-term planning.

The stability in the level of investment agreed through the MTFS, underpinned by the recently adopted asset management strategies covering highway assets and street lighting, enabled a wider strategic planning horizon that yielded a range of forward-planning benefits. The benefits included alignment of this rolling programme of investment with other public realm improvements, planned utility works where those opportunities arose, and, in addition, the phased introduction of new innovative treatments as they emerged. The delivery plan set out expected outcomes to support the delivery of the Highways Asset Management and Street Lighting Strategies.

## **186. STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT & PROPERTY IMPROVEMENT PLAN (SAMPIP)**

The Cabinet Member for Placemaking and Local Economy introduced the report.

It was explained that the Council owned a broad range of property assets in Haringey, from corporate properties where staff provided services, to our schools' estate, retail units, tenanted industrial estates, and community spaces. As well as being a valued source of income to the Council, and providing social value to our residents, these properties also required significant running and maintenance costs. It was explained that the Council had to ensure that they were managing these assets to the highest standard on behalf of council taxpayers and for the benefit of all residents, and in line with the aspirations set out in the Corporate Delivery Plan.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that the Strategic Assets Management and Property Improvement Plan (SAMPIP) provided the Council with a robust and transparent process to care for these properties in line with statutory regulations, and to make decisions on these assets, including whether to maintain, invest, divest, or repurpose them. It was explained that this second annual update provided Cabinet with a report on the progress made against its objectives. This included the conclusion of the property audit work, the full resourcing of the Capital Projects and Property team, the opening of four family hubs by the end of March 2025, and the approval of the final business case for the refurbishment of the Civic Centre.

It was noted that the Council continually revised and renewed its approach, working alongside the appropriate scrutinising bodies and collaborating across directorates. Several of our outputs and priorities had been achieved through actions implemented in years 1 and 2. Therefore, it was proposed to reduce the number of objectives in the plan from 10 to 6, closing objectives 1, 7, 8, and 9 that had largely been completed, and incorporating any ongoing outputs under these into the remaining objectives to provide more streamlined and efficient reporting.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Hakata, Cllr das Neves and Cllr Connor, the following information was shared:

- It was explained by officers that there were 630 Properties in the property portfolio that didn't meet Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) standards. However, it was explained that the role of the Council as the Corporate Landlord would be to assess buildings and determine what actions would need to be taken to understand requirements to improve sustainability. It was noted that EPCs were assessed when a lease comes up for renewal, and it was explained that the Council was working to improve on these wherever possible.
- It was noted that there was a challenge in managing the different needs of the Council estate and the use of Council buildings. Officers explained that the Council was developing more in this area, and explained that they would like to see more proactivity, and work more with the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector.
- It was explained that the Council had been successful in securing funding for Family Hub for 2025/26.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Noted the year two SAMPIP Roadmap updates for each of the ten objectives as set out in Appendix 2: SAMPIP Road Map (Year 2), with specific reference to the delivery of the three core areas that underpinned the SAMPIP as stated below:
  1. Delivery of a Corporate Property Model

2. Implementation of the Property Improvement Plan that included 46 recommendations from the Property Audits, across three core themed areas of governance, best practice, and people
  3. Work on the Commercial Property Strategy, which continued to assess which properties should be retained, re-invested, divested, or repurposed
2. Agreed to a revised SAMPIP Road Map for Year 3, which set the direction for new priorities and actions for the subsequent SAMPIP years.
  3. Agreed to the closure of objectives 1, 7, 8, and 9, as the outputs and priorities had been achieved through various actions implemented in years 1 and 2. Some existing and ongoing actions were merged with objectives 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 10.

### **Reasons for Decision**

The reason for the decision was to determine the future priorities and actions for the six objectives under the revised year three SAMPIP and to streamline reporting requirements to increase efficiency and make savings to contribute to efforts to tackle budgetary pressures.

The approach of assessing and rationalising the corporate and investment portfolio assets continued to deliver capital and revenue savings that were aligned to current and future service delivery requirements.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

The alternative option considered was the do-nothing option. This would have meant the four objectives recommended to be closed would have remained in the SAMPIP Road Map for years 3–5 but would not have had an active action plan. This would not have reflected as clearly the priority areas that the Council needed to focus on.

## **187. THE FUTURE OF ST PETER IN CHAINS AND ST GILDAS' CATHOLIC INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS**

The Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families introduced the report.

It was stressed that every child and young person, wherever they lived in the borough, deserved an excellent education, and the Council was committed to supporting schools in delivering high-quality teaching, learning, and support across Haringey. It was explained that, in recent years, as widely reported, Haringey, like many other London local authorities, had been experiencing a significant decrease in pupil numbers, which caused some schools to face serious and irreversible financial and sustainability pressures. The critical London-wide factors – lower birth rates, the cap on rent benefits, families leaving the capital due to the housing crisis, Brexit, and



the Covid-19 pandemic – resulted in a reduction in demand for primary school places, through no fault of the Council or schools.

School leaders and the Council had been working to mitigate the risks from falling rolls, especially for schools at risk of closure or amalgamation.

Measures included restructuring staff, reducing support staff, limiting extracurricular activities such as school trips, combining year groups (vertical grouping), capping class sizes, and requiring deficit recovery plans.

It was explained that the Council had a statutory duty to ensure there were sufficient high-quality school places, and that places were planned effectively. Financial pressure had a significant impact on schools and threatened the stability and quality of education. The Council needed to ensure that all children had access to excellent education to fulfil their potential – hence the consideration of the difficult option of closure for these two schools.

Significant concerns had been raised about the schools' long-term sustainability, particularly regarding financial viability and their ability to attract new pupils – partly due to a declining birth rate and a sharp reduction in demand for faith school places across the borough. For these reasons, and following a full pre-publication consultation, the Cabinet Member recommended that the Council proceed with publishing the statutory notice. Although alternative options had been considered (including academisation), the rapid decline in school places and financial challenges made it impossible to pursue them seriously. As of March 2025, the schools had a combined roll of only 51 pupils, with some year groups entirely empty.

It was highlighted that many families had already been offered alternative schools via in-year admissions, and children had settled well. If closure was confirmed, the Council would ensure remaining families were supported in transitioning to new schools, including a dedicated admissions officer available on-site and by phone. There were sufficient places in local schools rated 'Good' or 'Outstanding' by Ofsted to accommodate all displaced pupils. The Council also recognised that children with SEND, including those with EHCPs, would need tailored support. All EHCP families had attended review meetings to evaluate progress and plan next steps, including possible alternative provision.

It was explained that, if the process moved forward, all staff would receive individualised support and access to normal redeployment procedures. Staff would be added to the Council's redeployment register and offered support including CV and interview coaching, as well as access to the Employee Assistance Programme for counselling and career advice.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr das Neves, the following information was shared:

- It was stressed that the school building was owned by the local Diocese. It was explained that, as a result, the Diocese would need to undertake work with the Secretary of State for Education to determine any future usage of the site.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Considered the feedback received from the pre-statutory consultation on the closure of St Peter in Chain's Infant and St Gildas' Junior Schools.
2. Noted the reasons for not favouring any alternative options.
3. Agreed to the publication of a statutory notice to close St Peter in Chain's Infant and St Gildas' Junior Schools from September 2025. That a four-week period of statutory consultation would follow, providing the final opportunity for people and organisations to express their views about the proposed closure.

## **Reasons for Decision**

Following years of growth, the number of primary-aged children joining Haringey primary schools had been in steady decline since 2014, a trend observed across London. Primary pupil rolls in Haringey had reduced by over 2,000 in just five years: from 21,300 in 2019 to 19,100 in 2024 (January school census data), and pupil numbers were forecast to continue falling until at least 2028.

Both St Peter in Chain's Infant and St Gildas' Junior Schools were substantive two-form entry (2FE) Voluntary Aided Catholic schools located at Oakington Way, London, N8 9EP. Since 2019, the number of pupils on roll had dropped significantly at both schools, and they operated as one-form entry schools. From April 2024, some year groups had been merged, and the governing body moved the infant school to the federation's junior school site on Oakington Way in September 2024.

School funding was primarily determined by the number of children on roll, and falling rolls equated to reduced funding. This meant that more and more schools were facing serious financial pressures after year-on-year declines to their roll, resulting in smaller one-form entry schools such as St Peter in Chain's Infant and St Gildas' falling into financial deficit. This was not just felt by Haringey schools – many primary schools across London and England ended 2023–24 in financial deficit.

The Council had a duty of care to ensure children in its schools were able to receive a good education and access the full curriculum. A school with a declining roll was challenged to do this effectively because of inevitable financial pressures from reduced funding. Reduced funding could impact the efficient running of schools, financial stability, and education standards.

It was a principle of the Council to protect Haringey's high quality of education, and this may have been compromised where the cost of teaching staff, equipment, and enrichment activities became unaffordable. The link between pupil numbers and

school funding meant that it was not always feasible to keep a school operating while guaranteeing the standard of education that families and pupils deserved.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

None

## **188. TO APPROVE ACCEPTANCE OF LOCAL ELECTRIC VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING**

The Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment and Transport introduced the report.

The Cabinet Member explained that the Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (LEVI) funding represented a practical partnership between central government, local government, and the private sector, allowing the Council to deliver charging points for residents without off-street parking. It was explained that, by working collaboratively with six London boroughs and leveraging £1.25 million of government funding alongside private sector investment, the Council was able to create infrastructure that addressed one of the most significant barriers to electric vehicle adoption.

It was highlighted that there was a need to develop a reliable charging infrastructure to remove a physical and psychological barrier to transitioning to electric vehicles.

The partnership model at the heart of this project demonstrated the power of coordination between different levels of government and commercial operators. Working together enabled the Council to maximise resources and deliver strategic deployment of charging infrastructure across the borough. It was explained that this approach ensured more equitable access for all residents while eliminating the financial risk to the Council.

It was clarified that every charging point installed became part of the Council's broader commitment to cleaner air, reduced carbon emissions, and a more sustainable transport network. The Cabinet Member noted that, by making electric vehicles a visible, accessible option on the streets, the Council helped transform how residents moved around the borough. This project was one part of Haringey's ambitious plans to decarbonise the transport network, creating the foundation for meaningful climate action through partnership, investment, and forward-thinking urban planning.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Connor, the following information was shared:

- Officers explained that the lead borough for co-ordination of the fund was chosen based on the amount of resource that could be allocated to the project by a borough, stressing that this would be a resource intensive project.
- Officers explained that, given current financial challenges, the Council would be reviewing charges across charging bays. It was explained that the Council had already undertaken formal consultation on the costs for using electric vehicle charging bays already and those charges were now in operation.
- It was stressed that the Council would aim to diversify the suppliers and speed of charging points across the boroughs to ensure choice in prices for users.

**RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. Approved the Council accepting Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (“LEVI”) funding, administered by the Government’s Office for Zero Emission Vehicles (“OZEV”), for the purpose of procuring on-street electric vehicle charging infrastructure within Haringey. The individual funding agreement, with the Office for Zero Emission Vehicles, was for the sum of £1,257,333.
2. Noted that the Council would be collaboratively procuring, as part of a partnership of six London boroughs, a Charge Point Operator(s) (“CPO”) to supply, install, operate, and maintain on-street electric vehicle chargepoints (“EVCPs”) in Haringey.
3. Noted that the Council would be required to sign an inter-borough legal agreement, to delegate authority to a lead partner borough to lead the procurement of a Charge Point Operator(s) to supply, install, operate, and maintain on-street electric vehicle chargepoints in Haringey.

4. Delegated authority to the Director of Environment and Resident Experience, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment, and Transport, to award concessionary contract(s) with the successful bidder(s) to provide on-street electric vehicle chargepoints within Haringey, in accordance with the finalised contractual terms.

## **Reasons for Decision**

The LEVI fund provided the Council with an opportunity to invest in developing on-street electric vehicle charging infrastructure across the borough, in line with policy objectives, without requiring capital investment from the Council.

The expansion of on-street electric vehicle charging infrastructure in the borough formed a key component of the Council's current and emerging policies around mitigating climate change and improving air quality, as well as creating a sustainable transport network. However, progress was largely dependent on the provision of third-party funding.

Strategic deployment and expansion, to ensure equitable and sufficient coverage of on-street EVCP infrastructure, depended on grant funding to ensure CPO(s) made available match funding to provide, install, operate, and maintain the infrastructure delivered through this project.

The award of a concession contract(s) to a competitively tendered CPO(s) enabled the Council to transfer the operating risk and reward in exploiting the chargepoints. This exposed the CPO(s), rather than the Council, to market fluctuations and incentivised the CPO(s) to deliver operation and maintenance to higher standards to protect profitability.

Acceptance of, and awarding a contract(s) through, LEVI funding did not preclude the Council from having entered into existing, or entering into new, arrangements with CPO(s) to supplement the Council's EVCP network across the borough.

## **Alternative Options Considered**

***The Council not accepting LEVI funding.***

If the Council had not accepted LEVI funding, it would have needed to establish on-street EVCP infrastructure through other financial or procurement arrangements, or develop its own provision.

Combined with LEVI grant funding, match funding from a CPO(s) helped establish sufficient financial capacity to deliver the volume of EVCPs required to meet projected demand. Without LEVI funding, it would have been less likely that investment in less financially viable areas would occur, resulting in insufficient EVCPs to encourage adoption of electric vehicles across the borough.

***The Council accepting LEVI funding, but not as part of the partnership.***

The Council could have accepted the funding on an individual basis, maintaining full control of how funds were utilised. A few other London boroughs had done so.

This option would have depended on sufficient service area capacity and capability to deliver independently, while ensuring alignment with LEVI's overall objectives. Additionally, it would have reduced the Council's leverage with the market, limiting investment interest from prospective CPO(s).

There was also a risk that OZEV would not have granted the funding to the Council on an individual basis.

***The Council developing its own EV charging infrastructure.***

The Council could have pursued a public ownership or 'own and operate' model, taking on full ownership of infrastructure including charging hardware and network connections. This would have required significant upfront investment and placed all commercial risk on the local authority. While this model allowed the Council to retain all revenue generated, it was dependent on having the service capacity and expertise to deliver under such a model.

**189. TUITION SERVICE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE AGED 5-16 AND AGED UP TO 25 FOR YOUNG PEOPLE WITH AND EDUCATION, HEALTH AND CARE PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families introduced the report.

It was explained that the Council was required to ensure that it provided sufficient services to meet its statutory responsibilities to arrange education for children who could not attend school due to health needs and other reasons. Therefore, pupils who required individual or small group tuition in a non-school environment needed to have suitable educational arrangements in place to meet their needs.

It was stressed by the Cabinet Member that the arrangements for delivering such a service were required to ensure that the service was high quality, delivered positive outcomes for children and young people, and provided value for money for the Council.

**RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

1. In accordance with Contract Standing Order 2.01(b) (approval to proceed with a procurement in excess of £500k), 7.01 (establishment of a framework), and Section 49 of the Procurement Act 2023, approved the establishment of an open framework for tuition services for a period of eight years.
2. Delegated the award of the suppliers onto the Framework to the Chief Procurement Officer.

**Reasons for Decision**

Commissioning this provision via the recommended procurement approach of an open framework in line with the Procurement Act 2023 supported and enabled the delivery of high-quality, value-for-money tuition services. This ensured that children and young people who could not attend school and required tuition support were able to access education.

Through this mechanism, quality and price were standardised. Providers were required to meet minimum quality standards and adhere to competitive pricing mechanisms and specified quality assurance measures, thereby ensuring compliance with the Procurement Act 2023.

The procurement of an open framework was considered the most suitable and efficient route to market. It offered the Council the potential to swiftly access a range of providers, more effectively than alternative procurement approaches. Providers were able to apply to join the framework periodically throughout its duration, ensuring that competition and choice remained present to meet the varied educational needs of children and young people.

Opportunities to secure efficiencies, high-quality services, and cost savings were enabled through this procurement route, including improved tracking of usage and expenditure and increased market competition.

Procuring the proposed option offered the opportunity to secure efficiencies that aligned with the aims and objectives of the Safety Valve agreement.

Allowing other public sector organisations to access the framework made it more attractive to suppliers, leveraged collaborative purchasing power, and promoted efficiency across the public sector with minimal additional effort.

Under the Procurement Act 2023, the Council had the flexibility to establish an open framework that allowed for direct awards, mini competitions, block contracts, pilot operations, and negotiated fees following competition. This ensured the Council achieved best value while maintaining required quality standards.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

#### ***Option 2: Extend and increase the capacity of Haringey Tuition in the Community Service.***

The Haringey Tuition in the Community Service continued to provide education in small group settings for pupils, mainly aged 11–16. The commissioning of the open framework did not affect the continuation of this service, which remained operational in its existing form.

Although expansion of this provision was explored, it was not recommended. The service was not Education Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) funded for post-16 education, which limited its alignment with responsibilities under the Children and Families Act, including for A-level and vocational course support.

The service would have required a broader subject specialist teaching team beyond the current core staff. A proposal was explored with internal stakeholders but was not deemed suitable to meet the requirement.

#### ***Option 3: A hybrid in-house and commissioned model.***

A hybrid model involving both directly employed Council staff and commissioned providers was considered but not recommended. The necessary infrastructure, supervision, and support for this model were not deemed viable within current structures, and the resulting service was not considered sufficiently dynamic or flexible to meet the wide range of pupil needs.

#### ***Option 4: Do nothing, continue with existing arrangements.***

Continuing with the current spot purchase arrangements was not recommended, as they were high cost overall and the value for money was variable.

## **190. UPDATES ON THE COUNCIL HOUSING DELIVERY PROGRAMME**



The Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning, and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report.

It was explained that Haringey Council's housebuilding programme directly responded to the urgent need for affordable and environmentally sustainable homes, enabling people to settle and thrive in the borough. The housing emergency was a national issue, but was particularly acute in London. By November 2024, record numbers of people had been experiencing homelessness, with an estimated 183,000 Londoners homeless and living in temporary accommodation arranged by their local boroughs. London boroughs collectively spent £4 million daily on temporary accommodation.

The Cabinet Member noted the historic underspending on housing development, compounded by policies such as Right to Buy, which had left council housing stock severely depleted at a time when it was most needed. Haringey Council responded to this crisis with one of the most ambitious housebuilding programmes in the UK. As of March 2025, the Council had completed 721 new council homes, with construction underway on 1,358 homes. The Council remained on track to potentially exceed its target of 3,000 new, high-quality council homes by 2031, as outlined in the Corporate Delivery Plan and Housing Delivery Strategy. The programme also focused on zero-carbon development in line with Haringey's net-zero target by 2041, which was especially important given that around half the borough's emissions came from buildings.

Since the last Cabinet update, 522 homes were completed across 12 sites, including 85 three- and four-bed homes, which addressed the needs of families facing homelessness or overcrowding. In 2024, the Watts Close scheme—Haringey's first net-zero scheme—won the Building Development of the Year award from Unlock Net Zero, and the team received the UK Housing's 'Council of the Year' award. Three of the Council's schemes had been occupied for over a year, with resident feedback largely positive; 95% of survey respondents at Rosa Luxemburg reported satisfaction.

It was stressed that finding new build sites in a densely built urban area remained a challenge. As the programme progressed, the Council needed to think creatively to identify suitable locations. Eight further under-used sites—including car parks and vacant lots—were proposed for inclusion in the programme. These sites had the potential to deliver over 255 council homes and five pitches for Gypsy-Roma-Traveller communities, whose housing needs are often overlooked.

This work demonstrated Haringey's ongoing commitment to serving its most vulnerable residents and building a legacy of affordable housing for generations to come.

In response to comments and questions from Cllr Connor, the following information was shared:

- It was asked what proportion of homes expected to be Passivhaus. Officers offered to provide a written response to Cllr Connor. It was additionally explained that performance on delivery of Passivhaus was high, but noted that some sites were not possible due to the nature of the building.
- Officers noted that the Avenue Mews scheme was unable to be viable following work to determine its viability as a scheme.

## **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet:

- 1 Approved the removal of three sites from the programme—251 Lordship Lane, Avenue Mews (rear of Muswell Hill Library), and Broad Lane—due to specific issues detailed in the report.
- 2 Noted the post-completion reports for Rosa Luxemburg N17, 22–28 Scales Road N17, Romney Close N17, and Mountview Court N15.
- 3 Noted the completion of new homes since the last update at: Nilgun Canver Court (formerly Chocolate Factory Phase 1), Stainby Road, Rowan Court (formerly Remington Road), Nightingale Lane, St. Mary's Close, Farrant Avenue, Walter Tull House (formerly Welbourne Centre), Hale Wharf, Aaron Gayle Court (formerly 2–26 Partridge Way), Hornsey Town Hall, Edith Road, White Hart Lane
- 4 Approved inclusion of the following eight sites in the housing programme: Land to rear of 165 The Roundway, Brookside Green, Summerland Gardens Car Park, Garman Road Car Park, Westerfield Road Car Park, Stoneleigh Road Car Park (Sites A, B, and C)
- 5 Retrospectively approved an overspend on one scheme.
- 6 Noted the continued success of the programme, achievements to date against targets, and forecast performance.

## **Reasons for Decision**

The Corporate Delivery Plan 2022–24 committed to delivering 3,000 new council homes by 2031. This commitment was reaffirmed in the 2024–26 Corporate Delivery Plan, prioritising the construction of high-quality, sustainable social housing. The decisions in this report supported that pledge by enabling site-specific and project-specific progress and ensured the Council continued to build a sustainable pipeline of housing delivery sites.

## **Alternative Options Considered**

As this was an update paper, alternative options were considered only for the recommendations requiring Cabinet approval.

Regarding 3.1.1, the alternative option was to retain the sites within the programme and explore alternative future uses. However, this would likely result in continued expenditure on sites already deemed unviable or unsuitable.

Regarding 3.1.4, the alternative was not to include the eight sites in the housing programme. This would have limited the Council's capacity to deliver much-needed housing in the borough.

Regarding 3.1.5, further options were outlined in Appendix 3 – Exempt Report

### **191. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

The minutes of other bodies were discussed.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The minutes of other bodies were noted

### **192. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

The significant and delegated decisions taken by officers were discussed.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The significant and delegated decisions were noted

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

There were none.

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

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as items 27, 28, 29 and 30 contain exempt information as defined under paragraph 3, Part 1, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972: Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

### **195. APPROVAL OF HOUSING CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AND LAND APPROPRIATION, GRASMERE COURT N22 8QR - EXEMPT APPENDIX**

Approval of housing construction contract and land appropriation, Grasmere Court N22 8QR - EXEMPT APPENDIX was discussed

**RESOLVED:**

That the Approval of housing construction contract and land appropriation, Grasmere Court N22 8QR - EXEMPT APPENDIX was noted

**196. ACQUISITION OF 29 COUNCIL HOMES AT 76 MAYES ROAD, WOOD GREEN, N22 6SY - EXEMPT APPENDIX**

The Acquisition of 29 Council homes at 76 Mayes Road, Wood Green, N22 6SY - EXEMPT APPENDIX was discussed

**RESOLVED:**

The Acquisition of 29 Council homes at 76 Mayes Road, Wood Green, N22 6SY - EXEMPT APPENDIX was noted

**197. WAIVER AND AWARD OF THREE CONCESSION CONTRACTS TO OPERATE AND EXPAND CAR CLUB SERVICES IN HARINGEY (FIXED BAYS AND PILOT) OVER THE NEXT 5 YEARS - EXEMPT APPENDIX**

The Waiver and Award of Three Concession Contracts to Operate and Expand Car Club Services in Haringey (Fixed Bays and Pilot) Over the Next 5 Years - EXEMPT APPENDIX was discussed

**RESOLVED:**

The Waiver and Award of Three Concession Contracts to Operate and Expand Car Club Services in Haringey (Fixed Bays and Pilot) Over the Next 5 Years - EXEMPT APPENDIX was noted

**198. UPDATES ON THE COUNCIL HOUSING DELIVERY PROGRAMME - EXEMPT APPENDIX**

The Updates on the Council Housing Delivery Programme - EXEMPT APPENDIX was discussed

**RESOLVED:**

The Updates on the Council Housing Delivery Programme - EXEMPT APPENDIX was noted

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

There was none.

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank