

Chair:  
Councillor Clare Kober

Vice Chair:  
Councillor Lorna Reith

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This report covers matters considered by the Cabinet at our meeting on 14 September 2010. For ease of reference the report is divided into the Cabinet portfolios.
- 1.2 We trust that this report will be helpful to Members in their representative role and facilitate a fruitful dialogue between the Cabinet and all groups of Councillors. These reports are a welcome opportunity for the Cabinet on a regular basis to present the priorities and achievements of the Cabinet to Council colleagues for consideration and comment. The Cabinet values and encourages the input of fellow members.

## **ITEMS OF REPORT**

### **Housing**

#### **2. BOROUGH INVESTMENT PLAN**

- 2.1 We considered a report which sought our approval of Haringey's first Borough Investment Plan.
- 2.2 We noted that that the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) had been established in December 2008 as the national housing and regeneration agency for England. The HCA worked nationally, but supported the ambitions of local partners to provide better places that offered great homes and good jobs in well served communities where people enjoyed living and could afford. We also noted that the HCA wished to move away from its traditional grant funding of expenditure to establish a long term investment partnership with local authorities. The 'single conversation' process provided the context for the HCA to agree with local authorities their housing and housing led regeneration priorities. These were then translated into a joint Local Investment Plan through which each organisation will channel their investment and act as a lever to other public and private sector investment. The HCA had re-branded the single conversation as 'Investment Planning' to reflect this emphasis.
- 2.3 We were informed that, subject to our approval of the Borough Investment Plan and the HCA's Board, the Council would be required to enter into a Local Investment Agreement (LIA) with the HCA. The LIA would consider individual programmes in more detail and seek to agree levels of investment from all partners to ensure on-going delivery.
- 2.4 Having noted the Single Conversation (Investment Planning) process we approved the Haringey Borough Investment Plan which was set out as an Appendix to the report. We also authorised the Director of Urban Environment to make any minor additions/amendments to the Borough Investment Plan including updates to the appendices prior to agreement with the Homes and Community Agency and to commence discussions with the Homes and Community Agency to develop a Local Investment Agreement as the next stage of the Single Conversation process.

## **Neighbourhoods**

### **3. DRAFT LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 2011-14 AND ANNUAL SPENDING SUBMISSION FOR TRANSPORT PROPOSALS 2011-12**

- 3.1 We considered a report which sought approval to commence statutory consultation on the Draft Local Implementation Plan (LIP) for 2011-14 and to the Annual Funding Submission to Transport for London (TfL) for 2011-12.
- 3.2 The Council were legally required by the Greater London Authority (GLA) to prepare a Local Implementation Plan (LIP) containing proposals for the implementation of the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) within the borough during the period 2011-14. The Council were also required to submit an Annual Spending Submission for 2011-12 providing detailed information for the Corridors and Neighbourhoods, Smarter Travel and Maintenance programme which represents transport investments in the borough of over £3.2 million.
- 3.3 We noted that TfL had provided informal advice of a likely reduction in LIP funding for 2011-12 and for future years and that two options for reducing our spend were set out in the report. The first was to reduce both the Corridors/Neighbourhoods and the Smarter Travel allocation by 30% with the Local Transport Projects (£70,000) used for Smarter Travel. The second was similar to the first but with Local Transport Projects funding used for Corridors/Neighbourhoods allocation. For Smarter Travel there would be very much reduced scope than currently planned on school travel planning and road safety education, training and publicity.
- 3.4 We report that we approved the draft Local Implementation Plan (LIP) which was set out as an Appendix to the report for consultation and the Annual Spending Submission for 2011-12 which was set out as a second Appendix B for submission to Transport for London. In the event of a reduced Local Implementation Plan allocation we delegated to Director of Urban Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods the choice of option for the reduced spend.

### **4. MUSWELL HILL AND CROUCH END STOP AND SHOP SCHEMES**

- 4.1 We considered a report which informed us of recent changes made to the parking management schemes in Muswell Hill and Crouch End town centres following representations received during the first eight months of the experimental Traffic Management Order period.
- 4.2 The measures were introduced to improve the short stay parking facilities in town centres for the benefit of the local community, particularly traders during the current economic climate. Although this had impacted on projected parking income it had provided the two town centres with much needed short stay facilities along the commercial roads and had been supported by the local community since their introduction.
- 4.3 We were informed that London Buses had raised some concerns regarding the operational and location of some of the bays with regard to their impact on bus journey

times. Our officers advised that although they had addressed some of London Buses concerns to remove identified congestion spots during peak periods, statistical evidence had been requested to substantiate reports of delayed journey times within these areas prior to considering if further changes were required.

- 4.4 We report that we agreed, subject to further consultation with London Buses, to the experimental parking management measures in the Muswell Hill and Crouch End town centres being made permanent.

## **Planning and Regeneration**

### **5. LDF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME**

- 5.1 We considered a report which sought our approval for the revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) for Haringey for the preparation of a set of planning policy documents to complement the emerging Core Strategy.
- 5.2 We noted that the report set out the Council's timetable and project plan for the delivery of the Haringey Local Development Framework (LDF) which comprised the Core Strategy and other critical planning documents that shaped the planning and regeneration of the Borough up until 2026. We also noted that the LDS was a three-year project plan and needed to be revised as the timetable for plans changes.
- 5.3 We report that we agreed to the submission of the Haringey's revised Local Development Scheme to the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) for approval. We also agreed that any amendments required to be made to the revised Local Development Scheme document following comments from GLA and DCLG to be approved by the Assistant Director (Planning and Regeneration) in consultation with the Lead Member for Planning and Regeneration before the adoption of the Revised Haringey Local Development Scheme.

### **6. TOTTENHAM HALE GYRATORY SCHEME AND CHANGING THE 2010/11 GROWTH FUND PROJECT ALLOCATIONS**

- 6.1 We considered a report which advised us that the Central Government had imposed a reduction in the Council's Growth Fund capital allocation for 2010/11 which reduced the funds available by £1.505 million. With planned carry-forward from 2009/10, a total of £4.759 million was available from Growth Fund resources in 2010/11.
- 6.2 We noted that seven projects have Growth Fund allocations in 2010/11 but some of that funding was contractually committed. The Gyratory Scheme represented 90% of the uncommitted funding which meant that it must, of necessity, bear a major share of the funding reduction. While it was an important element of the Tottenham Hale regeneration programme involving the changing of the Gyratory system to two-way traffic flow, incorporating pedestrian and cyclist improvements together with a new bus interchange at Tottenham Hale Station and represented a high priority for the Council, so too were the other Growth Fund projects in supporting growth, improving accessibility, promoting sustainable transport and enhancing quality of life.

- 6.3 Cutting the funding for projects other than the Gyratory places would place those projects at substantial risk, and some may have to be abandoned, and even then, given that the Gyratory Scheme represented the major share of the total Growth Fund allocation, it would still have to face a significant funding cut of over £0.9 million and it was recommended that the required funding reduction of £1.505 million be applied wholly to the Gyratory Scheme to prevent any impact on the other Growth Fund projects although this left the Gyratory Scheme with a funding gap. The necessary Growth Fund reduction for the Gyratory of £1.505 million left a funding gap and in order to address this, further negotiations would be required with the statutory agencies which our officers would urgently progress with a report back on the outcome at a future date.
- 6.4 We also noted that that separate external funding had also been secured for a design study to improve pedestrian access to/from Hale Village and this made it possible to release a further £60,000 of Growth Fund money towards the first phase of planned improvements in Down Lane Park, Tottenham Hale, making the total allocation for the Park in 2009/11 £145,869. This would compensate in large measure for the withdrawal by the Central Government of £70,000 'Play Builder' money that the Council had secured for the Down Lane Park improvements.
- 6.5 We report that we noted the £1.505 million reduction in the Council's Growth Fund capital allocation for 2010/11 imposed nationally by the Central Government and approved a revised project funding allocations imposing the full funding reduction on the Tottenham Hale Gyratory Scheme authorizing officers to secure replacement funding from other sources. We also noted that a Memorandum of Understanding had been signed by the Council, Transport for London and the London Development Agency securing a tripartite commitment to the progression of the Tottenham Hale Gyratory Scheme to support improved local accessibility and growth.
- 6.6 We agreed to enter into two legally-binding funding agreements with Transport for London and/or other appropriate partners to commit phased funding contributions to the Gyratory Scheme when resources were secured appropriately and we authorised the Director of Urban Environment, in consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to approve the detailed wording of those agreements. As part of these funding agreements we also agreed that the Council's funding contribution of £12.495 million be made up as follows:
- Growth Fund 2009/11 (£3.495 million) (resources received from the Homes and Communities Agency – which replaced the original allocation of £5 million approved by Cabinet in April 2009);
  - Community Infrastructure Fund 2009/11 (£4 million) (resources payable to the Council by the Homes and Communities Agency);
  - £0.5 million from the Council's Local Implementation Scheme funding allocation from Transport for London for resurfacing works on Watermead Way and Ferry Lane (subject to Transport for London approving a bid if submitted by the Council in the future);
  - Section 106 funds (£3.5million) (subject to the receipt of funds due in connection with the Hale Village, Tottenham Hale development using the £1 million Transport Contribution and £2.5 million of the Tottenham Hale Urban

Centre Master Plan Contribution including appropriate interest accrued from the date of receipt);

- A capital contribution of £1 million funded from Council resources.

We noted that Transport for London would be responsible for funding any increase in costs above the estimated total cost of £35.5 million for the Gyratory Scheme.

6.7 We also granted approval be granted in principle (without fettering any future decisions of the Council) to up to £13 million of the investment by Transport for London and up to £2 million by the London Development Agency in the Gyratory Scheme being reimbursed to those organisations by the Council subject to:

- the approval and collection of appropriate monies for the Gyratory Scheme from a Community Infrastructure Levy (or other development tariff system) if such a Levy/tariff is introduced by the Council in the future; and
- if, having introduced such a Levy/tariff, future development remains viable by requiring contributions to the Gyratory through that system as well as contributions to other necessary community infrastructure as agreed by the Council's "community infrastructure plan"; and
- any cost reduction on the Gyratory Scheme will be used to reduce the Transport for London and London Development Agency investment that is reimbursable by the Council from this possible Levy/tariff system.

6.8 We noted that, subject to receiving appropriate third party consents including Secretary of State approval, only two areas of Council-owned land, not three, which would be appropriated to highway purposes and transferred to Transport for London to facilitate localised road widening for the Gyratory Scheme and we granted approval in principle to the transfer to the Council (at nil capital cost) of that part of the Transport for London - owned land at Monument Way/Park View Road that was not required for the Gyratory Scheme or general highway purposes to link with adjoining Council-owned land occupied by the Welbourne Centre. We also granted approval to the re-allocation of £60,000 of Growth Fund money to fund improvements at Down Lane Park bringing the total allocation for the Park in 2009/11 to £145,869.

## **7. CROUCH END CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER APPRAISAL**

7.1 We considered a report which set out the results of the public consultation exercise held in respect of the draft Crouch End Conservation Area Character Appraisal and which sought our approval of its adoption.

7.2 The process of conservation area assessment and management was outlined in an appendix to the report of the Director of Urban Environment. We noted that in June 2009 the third phase of the ongoing programme of public consultation with the draft Crouch End Conservation Area Character Appraisal had begun. A public meeting was held at the Area Assembly in July 2009 and, following representations made at the meeting the consultation period remained open until July 2010. Copies of the draft Conservation Area Character Appraisal were made available on the Council's website and printed copies were available for viewing in local libraries and the Council's Planning Office.

- 7.3 The consultation was publicised in the local and national press and the local MP; local Councillors; local conservation groups; amenity groups; local residents associations; North London Chamber of Commerce; Crouch End Business Forum and local businesses were notified in writing of the publication of the draft Appraisal, and invited to comment.
- 7.4 A second public meeting was held in March 2010 and representations received as a result of the extended public consultation period had been considered and the draft Appraisal had been amended where appropriate. The amended Appraisal aimed to give a clear assessment of the conservation area and to suggest broad guidelines for its preservation and enhancement.
- 7.5 We report that we noted the contents of the draft Crouch End Conservation Area Character Appraisal and approved its adoption. We also noted that the earlier draft Appraisal had been re-circulated to all of the people who attended the public meeting in March 2010 and further amendments had been carried out to the Appraisal now adopted. It was intended that the adopted Appraisal would provide a sound basis, defensible on appeal, to implement the approved development plan policies, to inform development management decisions, and to provide general guidance for residents and developers.

## **Children's Services**

### **8. SAFEGUARDING PLAN**

- 8.1 We considered a report which presented the refreshed Safeguarding Plan for Haringey, as approved by Children's Trust on 24 June 2010 and we noted that the Plan set out the programme of activity to enable safeguarding of children and young people within Haringey to be recognised as being amongst the best by December 2011.
- 8.2 We noted that the refreshed JAR Action Plan formed the Safeguarding Plan for Haringey. Following delivery of the first phase of actions within the Safeguarding Plan and the feedback from Ofsted, the Plan had been refreshed to take forward improvements over the period to December 2011, enabling the Partnership to be amongst the best at safeguarding children and young people by 2012. The Plan continued to incorporate key findings from the serious case reviews (SCRs) and initial learning where these were yet to be completed.
- 8.3 We also noted that the progress reported was limited in part due to the recentness with which the Plan had been approved. The changes being introduced by the new Government and the budget issues were creating additional pressures that would be reflected within the next refresh of the Plan for approval in December. At this stage any learning from the unannounced inspection would also be included.
- 8.4 We report that we noted the progress on the delivery of the refreshed Safeguarding Plan ahead of its consideration by the Towards Excellence in Children's Services Board.

### **9. ADMISSION TO SCHOOLS – PROPOSED ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2012/13**

- 9.1 We considered a report which presented for endorsement the proposed arrangements proposed arrangements for admission to community nursery classes, primary, junior and secondary schools and to St Aidan's Voluntary Controlled School for the 2012/13 academic year. The report also presented proposed arrangements for admission to sixth form study at Alexandra Park School, the Highgate/Hornsey Sixth Form Consortium and the Haringey Sixth Form Centre for the 2012/13 academic year.
- 9.2 We were informed that Section 89 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, as amended by the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and associated Regulations required admission authorities to consult on their admission arrangements at least every three years and in any year in which variations were being considered. Co-ordinated schemes had to be formulated every year.
- 9.3 We noted that the wording and style of the admission arrangements had been simplified. Information had been included to clarify how we would deal with tie break situations and applications from families with twins or other multiple births.
- 9.4 We also noted that the Children and Young People's Service had a duty to monitor the compliance of arrangements from its own admitting authority schools. As such advice would be provided to Governing Bodies who were the admission authorities for other maintained primary and secondary schools in Haringey. However, these "own admission authorities" were responsible for their own consultation process and their determination. All determined arrangements would be published on the Council's website for access by the public. The new arrangements would then come into effect from the September 2012 intake.
- 9.5 We report that we agreed the proposed admission arrangements for all community nursery classes, primary and secondary schools and St Aidan's Voluntary Controlled Primary for formal consultation beginning on 1 November 2010 and we also agreed the proposed admission arrangements for students starting sixth form for formal consultation beginning on the same date.

**10. ANNUAL REPORT 2009-10 STATUTORY CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE COMPLAINTS**

- 10.1 We considered a report which advised us that under the Children Act 1989 and the Children Act Representations Procedure a report on complaints made under the Children Act had to be prepared each year, presented to a committee of the local authority and made available as a public document.
- 10.2 We noted that the report covered complaints made about social services provided under the Act such as the delivery of services, care and supervision, social work court reports, adoption and decision making. Complaints might be made by children and young people, their parents or those with parental responsibility, foster carers, special guardians and prospective adopters. The report outlined the three stages of the Children Act complaints process. It covered
- the numbers and types of complaints;

- the outcomes of complaints and stage of the process reached;
- the timescales they were completed in;
- a summary of the data available on complainants, such as age, gender and ethnicity;
- learning or service improvements that have taken place following a complaint;
- information about expenditure;
- information about advocacy services provided under the regulations.

10.3 We also noted that information about complaints made to the Children and Young People's Service and dealt with under the Council's corporate procedures was included in the Annual Report on Customer Feedback and Members Enquiries which appears elsewhere in this report. We considered that the increase in the number of people making complaints under the Children Act procedures reflected the work that had gone into publicising the complaints procedure. The fact that only 1% of cases go on to stage 2 of the complaints procedure indicated that the Service was dealing well in investigating and resolving matters to the satisfaction of the complainant.

## **Adult and Community Services**

### **11. ADULT SERVICES STATUTORY ANNUAL COMPLAINTS REPORT**

- 11.1 We considered a report on the statutory complaints procedure for Adult Services for the year 2009/10 which made appropriate recommendations to improve complaint handling and performance and which sought our formal approval for the Adult Services Annual Complaints Report for 2009/10.
- 11.2 We noted the performance and key achievements in the reporting year 2009/10 and that 99% of the statutory complaints received for Adult Services were completed within timescale against a target set at 95%. This 1% drop from 100% completion within timescale was attributed to just one response being submitted late. We also noted that to avoid this in future, and to ensure 100% completion within timescale in future the Assistant Director for Adult Services and Commissioning had asked for Complaints and Members' Enquiries to be completed within 24/48 hours where possible. Adult Services had also received a number of compliments and WOW Awards which was evidence of good customer care practice.

### **12. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF BREAST SCREENING SERVICES IN HARINGEY**

- 12.1 We considered a reference from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and noted that in June 2009 it had commissioned a review of the uptake of breast screening services in Haringey. The review sought to assess how the uptake of breast screening services could be improved in the Borough.
- 12.2 We also noted that as part of the review process the Panel had heard evidence from local commissioners and service providers as well as from specialist screening

agencies. The Panel had also consulted local women who had used the breast screening service and it had visited the local breast screening service.

- 12.3 An analysis of the evidence received had identified a number of interplaying factors which might influence a woman's decision to take up an invitation for breast screening. These were
- structural issues– the development of screening lists, call and recall system
  - operational issues – location of clinics, appointment times, out of hours services
  - socio-demographic issues – age, ethnicity, social deprivation
  - attitudinal – personal anxiety, perceptions of importance or relevance.
- 12.4 The Panel had highlighted a number of areas where it was possible to identify a number of interventions which might help improve the uptake of breast screening services in Haringey and had made a number of recommendations in three key areas:
- improved accessibility of breast screening clinics
  - greater involvement of primary care in the breast screening process
  - the need to develop more localised public health information and awareness for breast cancer.
- 12.5 We noted the Review and we expressed our appreciation and thanks to the Panel for their work. We also noted that in accordance with Part Four Section G Paragraph 1.3 (viii) of the Constitution as the review related to an NHS matter it was presented to us for information only. NHS Haringey (service commissioners) and North London Breast Screening Service (service providers) had been consulted on the conclusions and recommendations contained within the Review.

## **Finance and Sustainability**

- 13. ANNUAL REPORT 2009-10 ON THE HANDLING OF CUSTOMER FEEDBACK (COMPLAINTS, COMPLIMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS) AND MEMBERS' ENQUIRIES**
- 13.1 We considered a report which detailed the Council's performance, key achievements and developments in 2009-10 in relation to customer feedback and Members' enquiries. It also included a summary of the complaints about the Council received and considered by the Local Government Ombudsman, and the key points raised in his annual review.
- 13.2 We noted that the annual report provided information for the financial year 2009-10 about the key features and statistics of the Council's handling of
- Complaints, WOW! nominations and other compliments, and suggestions under the corporate feedback procedure,
  - Complaints made to the Local Government Ombudsman, and
  - Members' enquiries under the corporate members' enquiries procedure.
- 13.4 We also noted that there were separate statutory procedures for the handling of social care complaints for both adults, and children and young people and that Adults, Culture and Community Services, and the Children and Young People's Service had produced separate annual reports for these two complaint categories which are included elsewhere

in our report. However, any Ombudsman complaints made in these categories were dealt with in the corporate report.

- 13.5 The report did not deal with matters that were the responsibility of Homes for Haringey, except for stage 3 complaints which were dealt with by the Council's Feedback and Information Team, and Ombudsman complaints as the Ombudsman considered the Council to be responsible for matters that it had delegated to other bodies.
- 13.6 We were informed that key achievements in the year had included the following:
- improved percentage of stage 1 responses on time (up 1% to 91%)
  - a 28% reduction in Ombudsman findings of fault, and a 26% reduction in the number of complaint decisions
  - improved average response times to stage 1 and 2 complaints
  - a 2.1% fall in escalation of complaints from stage 1 to stage 2, and an overall fall in escalation across all 3 stages of 1.7%
  - favourable Audit Commission comments on the complaints procedure and learning from complaints process in a Housing inspection report
  - receiving one WOW nomination for good customer service for every 1.2 complaints, compared with one for every 1.4 complaints the previous year
  - Ombudsman annual review refers to our 'excellent response times'
  - winning Best Local Authority and Best Healthcare categories (and Best Team by Homes for Haringey), plus a further four finalists, in the first national WOW! Awards in 2009
  - 23% increase in WOW nominations from customers, and a 19% increase in certificates awarded to staff by the WOW organisation.
- 13.7 We received the report and in so doing we were pleased to note the significant improvements in relation to Ombudsman complaints and the improved response times for stage one enquires and the increase in the number of WOW award nominations. However, areas remained where further work was required including responding to Members' enquiries and responding to stage two complaints within target times.

#### **14. FORMULA GRANT DISTRIBUTION CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

- 14.1 We considered a report which informed us of the potential financial implications arising from the Formula Grant Distribution Consultation Paper and set out a proposed response to the Paper which had been issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) on 28 July. The Consultation Paper was important and required comprehensive analysis and interpretation as it would form the basis of Formula Grant distribution over the next few financial years (at least 2011-12) following the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review in October 2010.
- 14.2 The proposed response to the Consultation Paper provided a review of the financial implications for the Council of the new proposals contained in the Formula Grant Distribution Consultation and commented on these. Positive exemplifications were provided for the majority of areas with the exception of Area Cost Adjustment. The options exemplified to date in respect of Concessionary Fares provided a positive

outcome for Haringey. Generally, the response supported the options which had the most beneficial financial impact for Haringey and maximised grant for the Council.

- 14.3 The response also made a case for charging current proposals in respect of the Area Cost Adjustment, particularly in view of the research and analysis we had undertaken and the proposals jointly agreed with Newham and Barking & Dagenham that would have significantly reduced the disparity in labour cost factors across London. This was particularly relevant given that the original brief given to the Settlement Working Group to 'look at options for small changes to the geography in areas that contained local authorities with large variations in their local wage costs' as London was highlighted very clearly as an area of worst fit. We would continue to urge the Government to review their proposals in respect of the ACA and reconsider the case made by us to be considered as an inner London borough for the purposes of the ACA calculations.
- 14.4 A summary of the broad financial impact for the Council based on the changes and exemplifications provided in the Consultation Paper were tabulated and these indicated that there might be overall financial benefit from the proposed changes assuming that all of the options selected in the table were implemented. This excluded the impact of concessionary fares as not all of the possible options being considered had been exemplified.
- 14.5 We report that authority to approve the final submission of the Council's consultation response to the Department for Communities and Local Government by the deadline of 6 October 2010 was delegated to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Sustainability.

## **15. HARINGEY COUNCIL PROCUREMENT STRATEGY 2010-13**

- 15.1 We considered a report on the outcome and achievements of the 2006-2009 Procurement Strategy and recommended a new Strategy for 2010-2013.
- 15.2 We noted that the Strategy set out a vision for excellence in procurement and how it would support the delivery of Council priorities, including the requirement to deliver significant and sustainable cost reductions in support of the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The document outlined what had been achieved against the 2006-2009 Strategy and identified key themes and actions for Procurement from 2010-2013 to support Haringey's priorities as set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy. The Strategy covered all procurement activities across the Council.
- 15.3 We also noted that within the key outcomes for the 2010-2013 Strategy a number of key objectives have been identified. The Strategy would be delivered through individual business units in their business plans. Progress against the Strategy and Category Sourcing Plans would be will be monitored centrally and progress reported through the business planning review framework. The Strategy would be a live document that might be updated to ensure that it could meet the challenges of the next three years and beyond and support the setting up of a commissioning based approach to service delivery.
- 15.4 The Strategy had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee prior to our meeting and we considered their recommendations together with suggested responses.

We report that approved the Haringey Procurement Strategy for 2010-13 amended as appropriate to take account of the suggested responses to the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

## **16. DISPOSAL OF COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES**

- 16.1 We considered a report which sought our authority for the disposal of the Council's commercial properties on Lymington Avenue, Wood Green, N22 together with the adjoining residential assets along Noel Park Road for regenerative development and to realise capital receipts from these under-utilised assets. The report also sought our authority for the proposed redevelopment and future disposal of the Council's freehold commercial property interests at Gourley Place, Seven Sisters Road, Tottenham, N15 to achieve regeneration outcomes for the borough and realise capital receipts from this opportunity site.
- 16.2 We noted that the sites offered redevelopment and regeneration opportunities and their disposal would stimulate regeneration and generate a significant capital receipt which could be re-directed towards achieving the Council priorities. Consideration had been given to the retention of these sites but this was not recommended. In the case of Lymington Avenue (Site A) consideration had been given to the development of community and public service facilities but it had been confirmed that there were no specific financially viable proposals. In the case of Gourley Place, as an alternative to the proposed collaboration agreement, the option of a joint venture with the 'special purchaser' had been considered. However, this would require an upfront investment by the Council and at this stage this was seen as speculative and high risk. It was also likely to require a lengthy and complex process and was not recommended.
- 16.3 We report that we authorised the Head of Corporate Property Services to dispose of Sites A and B - Lymington Avenue, Wood Green, N22, on terms to be agreed in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Sustainability. We also agreed that the Council enter into a collaboration agreement with the special purchaser to work together for the evaluation, master planning and comprehensive regeneration of land at Seven Sisters Road, Gourley Place and Durnford Street. We noted that the commercial income budget within property services would be reduced down by £89,500 as part of the 2011/12 budget planning process to reflect the loss of these properties and that the lost income within the Housing Revenue Account budget of £32,500 would also be addressed as part of the 2011/12 budget planning process.

## **17. DISPOSAL OF 78 SHEPHERD'S HILL AND 226 STAPLETON HALL ROAD N4**

- 17.1 We considered a report which sought our authority for the disposal of the Council's freehold interest in 78 Shepherd's Hill N6 and 226 Stapleton Hall Road N4 for regenerative redevelopment and to realise capital receipts from these vacant properties that required considerable investment to bring to decent homes standards.
- 17.2 We noted that the Council's Strategic & Community Housing Service managed 19 hostel units and, in line with the Government's target to halve the number of households living in temporary accommodation by 2010, surplus properties had been identified that would

help to reduce the number of households in temporary accommodation. Two such properties were 78 Shepherd's Hill N6 which was located in the west of the Borough, east of Highgate Station in a predominantly residential location. We were informed that the property was an imposing 3-storey 1930s detached house set back from the road in an elevated position. The property was surrounded by a six storey purpose built block of flats, a 1930s traditional built semi detached three storey house and a low rise purpose built block of flats. It had been used as a single person's hostel but was currently vacant as it required extensive refurbishment to bring it up to a Decent Homes Standard.

- 17.3 The second property, 226 Stapleton Hall Rd N4 was located within a predominantly residential area and was within easy reach of local Hoppa Service and Harringay British Rail Station. It had been used as a hostel for single persons awaiting temporary and/or permanent accommodation but was currently vacant as it was not fit for occupation. The property which was set out as five bed sits each with their own separate kitchen and bathroom facilities required extensive refurbishment to bring the property up to a Decent Homes Standard.
- 17.4 We were informed that these properties are likely to attract considerable interest from private individuals wishing to refurbish them for their own family home. Due to their size there was also likely to be interest from investors for conversions into a small number of apartments. However, as the size of the proposed scheme was unlikely to be viable for a scheme that an RSL could develop there was unlikely to be any interest from this sector unless the properties could be acquired below market value. Corporate Property would contact the list of preferred Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) informing them in advance of the marketing exercise.
- 17.5 We report that we authorised the Head of Corporate Property Services be to dispose of 78 Shepherd's Hill N6 and 226 Stapleton Hall Road N4 on the open market on terms to be agreed in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Sustainability.

## **Leader**

### **18. THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE**

- 18.1 We considered a report which presented, on an exception basis, performance information for the year to July 2010, sought our agreement to budget virements in accordance with financial regulations and to other action necessary in order to address the in year budget reductions imposed by the Government.
- 18.2 We noted that of the 37 key service indicators monitored 25 had improved since 2009/10, 3 were roughly the same, 5 were worse with no comparison possible for 4 indicators. Some areas where targets were being met or where there had been an improvement were:
- Continued good performance on adult social care clients receiving self directed support.

- Progress on children's social care assessments is being made whilst keeping the quality on an improvement trajectory. The recent Ofsted unannounced inspection found performance management arrangements and case auditing to be a strength.
- Call centre telephone answering indicators continue to show improvement over time and the target was exceeded in August.
- There has been a 13.6% reduction in acquisitive crime compared with the same period last year.
- Recycling and cleanliness targets continue to be exceeded.

18.3 However, there were also areas where targets were not being met and these included:

- Performance on the timely completion of core assessments for children's social care has reduced over the past few months and they remain below average. The recent Ofsted unannounced inspection found that assessments are undertaken in a timely and focused manner under clear management direction.
- 15.7% of looked after children have had 3 or more placements, higher than average although performance on placements lasting 2 years or more is slightly better than average for London.
- The average time for processing new benefit claims and change events remains comparatively high at 28 days. The service remains dedicated to ensure that demonstrable month on month improvement continues, through the implementation of the action plan.
- Average re-let times for local authority dwellings increased in August to 46 days significantly higher than the target of 25 days.
- Households in temporary accommodation continue to reduce but not at the targeted level.

18.4 With regard to financial information, we were advised that the overall general fund revenue budget monitoring, based on the August data, showed an over spend of £8.5 million a decrease of £0.7 million over last period. We noted that in response to the significant over spend being reported, the Chief Executive and Section 151 Officer had taken action in July to mitigate against the forecast pressures. These included a Council wide recruitment freeze; severe limitations on spend approvals; suspension of the use of purchase cards and the creation of Directorate level contingencies created from top – slicing supplies and services budgets. The impact of these measures was beginning to show as illustrated by the £0.7 million reduction in the year-end forecast. Pressure must continue on cost containment as the underlying causes of the forecast over spend – high demand in Children & Young People's Service and changes to Housing Benefit Subsidy – had not significantly reduced. A new schedule of fixed rates for agency staff had been introduced this period aiming to standardise rates paid for each job type. It was forecast that this should deliver real savings by the end of the financial year.

18.4 We noted that the Council's Treasury Management activity in the first four months of 2010/11 had been compliant with the Treasury Management Strategy Statement agreed in February 2010. We also noted that the cash balances in the first four months of 2010-11 were sufficient to cover the Council's outgoings so it had not been necessary to

borrow. £10 million of long term borrowing had matured at the beginning of July and had been repaid. A further £40 million of long term borrowing matured during October and would be repaid so the Council would need to borrow during 2010-11.

18.5 The aggregate capital programme position for 2010-11 was forecasting an under spend of £1 million compared to £4.9 million under spend at the end of the last period.

18.6 We report that we agreed as follows -

- To note the report and the progress being made against the Council's priorities;
- To require Directors to take necessary action to bring current year spending to within their approved budget;
- To agree the budget changes (virements) in the table below –

<b>Revenue Virements</b>						
<b>Period</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Key</b>	<b>Amount current year (£'000)</b>	<b>Full year Amount (£'000)</b>	<b>Reason for budget changes</b>	<b>Description</b>
P4	ACCS	Rev	158	158	Corrective 2010/11 budget realignment	Increase income and expenditure budgets to align NHS funded equipment to projected outturn.
P4	ACCS	Rev*	252	252	Corrective 2010/11 budget realignment	Create income and expenditure budget for Surveyors posts funded by Homes for Haringey.
P5	ACCS	Rev*	518	518	Corrective 2010/11 budget realignment	Budget realignment within Sports & Leisure
P2	UE	Rev*	2,395	2,395	Corrective 2010/11 budget realignment	Budget amended to set income budgets within Planning to realistic levels in current economic climate. Along with amendments to Economic Regeneration budget to reflect expected 2010-11 work-plan
P4	UE	Rev	140		2010/11 Grant Allocation	Allocation of grant from London Development Agency for "North London Sub Regional Engagement Programme"
P4	UE	Rev	160		2010/11 Grant Allocation	Create budget for "Cashable Savings Delivery Project" funded by Capital Ambition
P4	UE	Rev	190	190	Planned budget adjustment	Budget for 4 staff relating to merger of Economic Regen and Planning
P4	UE	Rev*	439		2010/11 Grant Allocation	All of TFL budgets originally allocated to capital programme - however a number of TFL projects are of a revenue nature therefore budget virement loaded to reflect TFL revenue nature schemes into revenue plan. These schemes will be funded by TFL grant therefore nil net effect

P4	UE	Rev*	1,879		2010/11 Grant Allocation	Allocation of grant from London Development Agency for "Sub-Regional Sustained Employment Pilot Project"
P1	CYP	Rev*	1,831	1,831	Corrective 2010/11 Budget Realignment.	Movement of budgets within CYPs to reflect service plans.
P3	CYP	Rev	230	230	Corrective 2010/11 Budget Realignment.	Movement of budgets within CYPs to reflect service plans.
P2	CR	Rev	149		2010/11 Grant Allocation	London Energy Project grant allocation
P3	CE	Rev	212		2010/11 Grant Allocation	Grant allocation for the May 2010 General Election
P3	NSR	Rev*	2914	2914	Corrective 2010/11 budget realignment	Realignment of treasury income and expenditure budgets to reflect actual activity levels
P4	CR	Rev	110		2010/11 Grant Allocation	Additional Housing and Council Tax Benefit subsidy for 2010/11
P4	CR/UE	Rev	119		2010/11 Grant Allocation	2010/11 Migration Impact Fund allocation
P4	PD	Rev	140		2010/11 Grant Allocation	Allocation of Skills for Care Grant
P4	Various	Rev*	1563	1563	Corrective 2010/11 budget realignment	Annual adjustment to depreciation charges to reflect prior year spend.
P4	PP	Rev*	364		Planned budget adjustment	Planned allocation of budget for Haringey Forward programme costs
P4	Various	Rev*	39826		2010/11 Grant Allocation	Allocation of 2010/11 ABG grant
P4	CR/PP	Rev*	1641		Corrective 2010/11 budget realignment	Alignment of budget within Property and Improvement and Performance
P4	CR	Rev*	795	795	Planned budget saving	Planned saving from Accommodation Strategy
P4	PP	Rev*	1041		2010/11 Grant Allocation	Allocation of 2010/11 Youth Justice Board Grant
P5	Various	Rev*	4049	4013	Planned budget realignments	Consolidation of print and design budgets proposed by the recent Haringey Forward Programme MarComs review.
P5	CR/NS R	Rev	176	176	Planned budget adjustment	Planned re-allocation of corporate procurement saving target
P5	PP/NS R	Rev	140	228	Planned use of reserves	Planned temporary draw down from reserves to fund the Haringey Efficiency and Savings Programme
P5	PP/NS R	Rev	500	500	Planned budget adjustment	Budget contribution from NSR as part funding of the Haringey Efficiency and Savings Programme.
<b>Capital Virements</b>						

Period	Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Reason for budget changes	Description
P3	UE	Cap*	1,767		New budgets approved for financial year 2010-11	These are 2 new capital schemes within the HRA capital programme. One is for £267k in energy conservation works funded from new grant money approved. The other is for £1.5m for fire precaution works (mainly at Broadwater Farm) and will be funded by a direct contribution from the HRA which was approved as part of the HRA medium term financial strategy 2010/11
P5	CR	Cap*	3,230		Revision to planned funding source	The recent review of the original 2010/11 capital programme has highlighted the need to switch the funding of the 2010/11 accommodation strategy capital expenditure from reserves to borrowing due to the timing of earmarked disposals.
P4	UE	Cap	125		Grant allocation to be utilised in 2010/11	London Development Agency grant funding for London Homes Energy Efficiency Programme Demonstration Project
P4	UE	Cap*	(115)		Corrective budget realignment	Delay in Procurement contract - Major Repairs Allowance funding
P4	UE	Cap*	(700)		Corrective budget realignment	Tender analysis delayed by having to resolve qualifications made by tenderer to be funded from the Major Repairs Allowance (MRA) and Supported Capital Expenditure (SCE R)
P4	UE	Cap*	815		Corrective budget realignment	Digital TV work - to be funded from the Major Repairs Allowance (MRA) and Supported Capital Expenditure (SCE R)
P4	UE	Cap*	267		2010/11 grant allocation	Grant funding agreement for Social Housing Energy Savings Programme (SHESP) for cavity wall insulations.
P4	UE	Cap*	1,500		Corrective budget realignment	Fire protection works - funding agreed to come from HRA balances
P4	UE	Cap*	(3,000)		Corrective budget realignment	Re-phasing of Decent Homes allocation. Adjustment to original 2010/11 HRA budget.

**19. URGENT ACTIONS TAKEN IN CONSULTATION WITH CABINET MEMBERS**

- 19.1 We were informed of the following actions taken by a Director under urgency powers following consultation with a Cabinet Member -

**Director of Children & Young People's Service**

Expansion of Rhodes Avenue Primary School from 2 to 3 Form Entry – Approval to the amendment of the decision of the Procurement Committee (vide Minute PROC. 23 – 2010/11) by correcting the name of the building contractor to whom the building contract for the Rhodes Avenue Primary School Expansion Project was awarded.

(N.B. This decision was taken under the Special Urgency procedure the use of which was endorsed by the Chair of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee).