

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

Councillors *Adje (Chair), *Lister (Vice-Chair), *Canver, *Diakides, *Hillman, *Meehan, *Milner, *Reith, *Sulaiman and *Wynne

* Present

Also Present: Councillors Jean Brown, Dawson, Hare and Williams

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
TEX192	<p>MINUTES (Agenda Item 4):</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2006 be approved and signed.</p>	HMS
TEX193	<p>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS (Agenda Item 5)</p> <p>a. <u>Haringey Allotments Forum</u></p> <p>We received a deputation from the Haringey Allotments Forum, the spokesperson of whom addressed our meeting and welcomed the Executive Response to the Scrutiny Review of Haringey's Allotment Service Delivery as proposed in the report of the Director of Environmental Services which appeared at item 11 on the agenda and which supported most of the recommendations contained in the Review. However, the Forum was concerned that the Review Panel's recommendation that a dedicated allotments officer be appointed was not supported at the present time. The Forum also expressed disquiet about a number of the other proposals contained in the report, in particular –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Their unanimous opposition to the intended rent increases for plots; • The accuracy of the rent comparison data set out in paragraph 7.6 of the report ; • Their strong support for the appointment by the Council of a dedicated allotments officer; and • The adequacy of the level of services provided at certain allotment sites; <p>It was the view of the deputation that rents paid should be held in a reserved allotments budget with spending priorities decided in consultation with the Forum. Before work was carried out at allotment sites there should be consultation with site associations to avoid money being spent on unwanted or inadequate works.</p> <p>The deputation referred to the absence of statistics on the equality implications of the proposed rent increases and suggested that women, ethnic minorities and pensioners who tended to have lower than average</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

incomes and consequently would be disproportionately affected by the proposed rent increases. Whilst the intended extra increase for current plot holders who lived outside the Borough was also opposed it was accepted that it might be acceptable for future such plot holders.

The Executive Member for Environment and Conservation responded and emphasised the importance of distinguishing between the Council's scrutiny process and its budget process. By the time the Scrutiny Review had been endorsed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in January the pre-business plan review and budget planning process had already been well advanced and the salary for a dedicated Allotments Officer had not been included in the business plan for 2006/07. However, it would be considered in the pre-business plan review for 2007/08 where it would be considered alongside other service needs. The other issues raised by the deputation could be the subject of further consideration and discussion following the forthcoming municipal elections in May and the intended rent increases in October 2006.

Having answered questions put to them by Members the deputation withdrew. Our Chair thanked the deputation for their attendance and indicated that the representations they had made would be considered as part of our deliberations on this matter (see Minute TEX 199 below).

b. Caribbean Senior Citizens Association

We received a deputation from the Caribbean Senior Citizens Association, the spokesperson of whom, Ken Walcott, addressed our meeting and expressed concern about the threatened closure of the Welbourne Centre where the Caribbean Citizens Association had been based for more than 25 years. The Centre was a hugely popular resource for the local ethnic community and was used by over 12,000 people annually as well as by groups for a variety of events including wedding receptions, and funeral breakfasts to kid's clubs, lunch clubs and meetings.

He commented that in 2004 the Association's tenancy had been revoked since which time they had been without security of tenure but had continued to make full and prompt payments of rent which was charged at the market rate. The Council was now threatening to close the Centre which would strike a deadly blow to Tottenham's black community which, without the Welbourne Centre, would have nowhere to go.

The Association had offered to buy the building from the Council at full market value and fund the badly needed repairs but despite numerous meetings with both Council officers and Members no conclusion had been reached. He suggested that the Association's offer would provide a win/win solution saving local taxpayers thousands of pounds in refurbishment costs and keeping alive a valuable community resource.

Members responded and we were advised that at a meeting with the Executive Member for Community Involvement it had been explained that the Council did not wish to sell the Centre but rather to refurbish it

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

and following that meeting a response had been sent to the Association. The Council had indicated that it wished for the provision of services at the Centre to continue and, in noting the deputation's view that the welfare of the Centre's users was paramount, Members expressed the hope that the Association would be willing to enter into further discussions about the future use of the Centre on terms more satisfactory to them and for the use of the wider community.

Having answered questions put to them by Members the deputation withdrew. Our Chair thanked the deputation for their attendance and indicated the Council's willingness to work towards an amicable solution to the issues raised.

c. Automerc Service Ltd.

We received a deputation from Automerc Service Ltd, the spokesperson of whom, Ivan Huzar, addressed our meeting and expressed concern about the loss of employment in Hornsey which would result if the Council were to sell its freehold interest in Pembroke Works. Also, the ensuing consequences for the businesses located there as well as the long term detrimental effect on the Hornsey area should the Council grant planning permission to redevelop this exceptional commercial facility into housing. He also outlined difficulties his and other businesses on the site had been experiencing recently and sought clarification if the Council, as freeholder could offer any assistance.

We noted that the Pembroke Works site was the subject of a planning application which was to be heard by the Planning Applications Sub-Committee on 27 March. Any decision on the disposal of the Council's freehold interest would only be taken following consideration of that application. In any event, it was the wish of the Council to support small businesses to operate and to create job opportunities for the people of the Borough and Council officers and Members would be prepared to meet with the businesses at Pembroke Works about who this could best be done including by the use of enforcement powers as appropriate.

Having answered questions put to them by Members the deputation withdrew. Our Chair thanked the deputation for their attendance and indicated the Council's willingness to work with them in the future.

d. Tottenham Hotspur Supporters' Trust

We received a deputation from Tottenham Hotspur Supporters' Trust, the spokesperson of whom, Bernie Kingsley, addressed our meeting and expressed concern about the detail of the report of the Director of Environmental Services on the Spurs Match Day CPZ proposals which appeared at item 13 on the agenda. The essence of the Trust's representations was that a number of matters in the report were misleading including the manner of consultation and the nature of objections to the proposals. In summary, the Trust wished to make the following points:

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation had not been properly carried out with the most significant (in number) group of persons <u>affected</u> by the proposals, i.e. Tottenham Hotspur supporters. Indeed, the timing of the street notices was clearly arranged so as to avoid supporters being notified during the statutory consultation period. • The ‘non-statutory consultation’ carried out in March/April 2005 was unscientific and irrelevant. • Contrary to the claim made at point 8.3, there was no attempt to seek the view of THST during the statutory period as required by law, even though the Trust had given a view. • The ‘rules’ of the proposed scheme, in terms of time span, had been changed since the consultation and it was wholly unacceptable to write this off as a ‘minor change’. • The ‘rules’ had also been changed in terms of provision of free permits to local traders; the report acknowledged they had effectively been ‘bought off’. • The report misrepresented some of the substantive objections made by the Trust and other THFC supporters and materially failed to provide adequate answers to others. These objections had been set out in more detail in a letter to the Council’s Head of Highways. • Although perhaps minor in itself, it was worth noting that the report repeatedly mis-spelt the name of Tottenham Hotspur Football Club, one of the Borough’s most long-standing, prestigious and wealth generating organisations. This hardly suggested the compilers of the report had any real regard for the significance of THFC and its thousands of supporters to the prosperity of Haringey. <p>Having answered questions put to them by Members the deputation withdrew. Our Chair thanked the deputation for their attendance and indicated that the representations they had made would be considered as part of our deliberations on this matter (see Minute TEX 201 below).</p>	
<p>TEX194</p>	<p>MATTERS IF ANY REFERRED BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</p> <p><u>Scrutiny Review of Intermediate Care</u> (Agenda Item 6 (a))</p> <p>We received a presentation on the Scrutiny Review of Intermediate Care which had been endorsed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their meeting on 13 March 2006. Having thanked Councillor Jean Brown as Chair and Councillors Adamou and Hoban the other members of the Scrutiny Panel for their Review we</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

	<p>Patel.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That approval be granted to the Executive Response to the Scrutiny Review of Reducing Re-offending by Young People as set out in the Appendix to the interleaved report. 2. That it be noted that in order to ensure the recommendations were implemented by the Youth Offending Partnership Board progress would be reported at regular intervals to the Safer Communities Executive Panel and the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Board. 	ACE-A
<p>TEX198</p>	<p>SCRUTINY REVIEW OF NEIGHBOURHOOD WARDENS (Report of the Director of Environmental Services – Agenda Item 10):</p> <p>Arising from our consideration of paragraph 9.3 of the report we noted that the membership of the Scrutiny Review Panel had comprised Councillors Dawson (Chair), Aitken, Dobbie and Q. Prescott and we asked that thanks for their work be placed on record.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of the Neighbourhood Wardens service be noted. 2. That approval be granted to the detailed responses to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of the Neighbourhood Warden Service set out in Appendix A to the interleaved report. 3. That the bid to the Better Places Partnership for continuance of funding to support enforcement capability of Street Wardens be endorsed. 	<p>D.Env</p> <p>D.Env</p>
<p>TEX199</p>	<p>EXECUTIVE RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY REVIEW OF HARINGEY'S ALLOTMENT SERVICE DELIVERY (Report of the Director of Environmental Services – Agenda Item 11):</p> <p>We noted that a number of issues had already been considered in response to the representations made earlier by the Haringey Allotments Forum but in connection with the appointment of a dedicated allotments officer it was important to emphasise the difference between the Council's scrutiny process as opposed to it's budget setting process.</p> <p>With regard to the other issues of concern raised by the Forum, the Executive Member for Environment and Conservation indicated that there would be an opportunity for further discussions to take place between the municipal elections in May and the allotment rent increases scheduled for October 2006.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

	<p>That the Executive response to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of Haringey's Allotment Delivery Service, as set out in Section 7 of the interleaved report be approved.</p>	D.Env
TEX200	<p>RECLAIMING LORDSHIP RECREATION GROUND (Report of the Director of Environmental Services – Agenda Item 12):</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That, subject to confirmation of external funding, approval be granted to the direction, content and proposed investment packages for the regeneration project for Lordship Recreation Ground as set out in the interleaved report.</p>	D.Env
TEX201	<p>SPURS MATCH DAY CPZ PROPOSALS - REPORT OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION (Report of the Director of Environmental Services – Agenda Item 13):</p> <p>We noted the feedback from all interested parties during the statutory consultation process for introducing a Controlled Parking Zone(CPZ) in the roads surrounding Tottenham Hotspur Football Club's stadium and the report which demonstrated that the statutory requirements for making Traffic Management Orders (TMO's) for CPZ's had been satisfied and our approval was sought to formalise the necessary TMO's for the implementation of the Spurs Match Day CPZ.</p> <p>We also noted that our approval would be subject to Enfield Council's objection being withdrawn or if consent was given to the scheme by the Greater London Authority/Mayor of London. Having regard to the forgoing and to the representations made to us earlier by the deputation from the Tottenham Hotspur Supporters' Trust we</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the feedback of the statutory consultation process and in particular, the objections received be noted. 2. That the reasons for providing parking controls as outlined in the interleaved report be agreed. 3. That approval be granted to the proposed hours and days of operation on match days of – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday to Friday 5:00pm to 8:30pm; and • Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holidays, noon to 5:30pm. 4. That Council Officers be authorised to make the Traffic Management Order (TMO) and take all the steps necessary for the introduction of match day controls in the proposed area as shown in Appendix I to the interleaved report but subject to the prior:- 	<p>D.Env</p> <p>D.Env</p> <p>D.Env</p>

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

	<p>(i) formal withdrawal of the objection from the London Borough of Enfield, or</p> <p>(ii) consent to the TMO proposal from the Greater London Authority under section 121B(3)(d) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p>	
<p>TEX202</p>	<p>CASINO PROPOSAL AT ALEXANDRA PALACE (Report of the Director of Environmental Services – Agenda Item 14):</p> <p>Our Chair agreed to accept the report as urgent business. The report was late because of the need to complete necessary consultations. The report was too urgent to await the next meeting because if an expression of interest was to be submitted it had to be made by 31 March 2006.</p> <p>We were concerned that because the selection of Firoka, as preferred developer for the Palace had only recently been announced there had been relatively little discussion of the casino proposals and that these required more detailed consideration notwithstanding the tight deadline for the submission of ‘expressions of interest’ to the Casino Advisory Panel of 31 March 2006.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the proposal to permit the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council to submit a detailed proposal for a small casino at Alexandra Palace, to the Department of Culture Media and Sport’s Casino Advisory Panel be not approved.</p>	<p>D.Env</p>
<p>TEX203.</p>	<p>REVIEW OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (Report of the Director of Environmental Services – Agenda Item 15):</p> <p>Our Chair agreed to accept the report as urgent business. The report was late because of the need to complete necessary consultations. The report was too urgent to await the next meeting because of the deadline for the submission to the Government Office for London.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the first review of the Local Development Scheme as set out at Appendix 1 to the interleaved report be approved for submission to the Government Office for London (GOL). 2. That authority to approve any changes required prior to submission be delegated to the Assistant Director Planning, Environmental Policy and Performance (PEPP) in consultation with the Executive Member for Enterprise and Regeneration. 3. That, subject to GOL confirming that they did not wish to issue a Direction under the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004, the revised Local 	<p>D.Env</p> <p>D.Env</p> <p>D.Env</p>

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

	Development Scheme be brought into immediate effect	
<p>TEX204.</p>	<p>UDP RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR'S REPORT AND PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS (Report of the Director of Environmental Services – Agenda Item 16):</p> <p>Our Chair agreed to accept the report as urgent business. The report was late because of the need to complete necessary consultations. The report was too urgent to await the next meeting because of the deadlines for public consultation to enable a decision to be taken by the Council in June 2006.</p> <p>Reference was made to concerns which had been expressed in particular in relation to the housing density figures in policy HSG8 and how they would be applied in different areas of Haringey and clarification was sought of the next stages of the process.</p> <p>We noted that, if approved, the Council's responses to the Inspector's report and proposed modifications would be published for consultation in April/May 2006. Representations made during this consultation period had to relate only to the Council's responses and modifications and not to the first or revised draft versions of the UDP. The Council then had to prepare a further statement of responses to representations received. We also noted that it was likely that by accepting the Inspector's recommendations, no new issues would be raised during this consultation period. If this proved to be the case, then the Council could proceed to adopt the Plan as modified.</p> <p>We were informed that it was intended to recommend approval of the Authority's responses and adoption of the UDP to a meeting of the Council to be held in June 2006. The Council was required give notice of its intention to adopt the plan by publishing a notice for two successive weeks at least 28 days before the intended date of adoption. Once the UDP had been adopted there was a six-week period in which any person aggrieved by the Plan and who challenged its validity could apply to the High Court under Section 287 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The grounds were limited to the Council's failure to comply with statutory procedures. Following completion of the six-week period, the validity of the plan could not be challenged in any legal proceedings.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That approval be granted to the Council's responses to the Inspector's report as set out in the Statement of Decisions and Reasons, attached as Appendix 1 to the interleaved report. 2. That approval be granted to the Proposed Modifications to the UDP as set out in Appendix 2 to the interleaved report. 3. That approval be granted to the Proposed Modifications to UDP tables, schedules and the Proposals Map, as set out in Appendix 3 to the interleaved report. 	<p>D.Env</p> <p>D.Env</p> <p>D.Env</p>

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

	<p>4. That approval be granted to the editorial changes to the UDP, as set out in Appendix 4 to the interleaved report.</p> <p>5. That the four documents referred to in resolutions 1-4 above be placed on deposit for a six week period in accordance with the statutory procedures.</p> <p>6. That authority to approve any changes required prior to public consultation and to publish a notice of the Council's intention to modify the Unitary Development Plan and to adopt the Plan as modified be delegated to the Assistant Director (PEPP) in consultation with the Executive Member for Enterprise and Regeneration.</p> <p>7. That the Council be recommended to adopt the UDP as modified.</p>	<p>D.Env</p> <p>D.Env</p> <p>D.Env</p> <p>HMS/ D.Env</p>
<p>TEX205.</p>	<p>SUB REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT PLAN (Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Strategy) – Agenda Item 17):</p> <p>It having reached 10 p.m., for the purposes of Part H.2 paragraph 1.05(b) the Executive determined that the meeting should continue.</p> <p>Our Chair agreed to accept the report as urgent business. The report was late because of the need to complete necessary consultations. The report was too urgent to await the next meeting because of the deadline for submission of the Plan to the Mayor of London.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the Sub-Regional Economic Development Plan as set out as an Appendix to the interleaved report be approved for submission to the Mayor of London.</p>	<p>ACE-S</p>
<p>TEX206.</p>	<p>THE BRIDGE NEW DEAL FOR COMMUNITIES - DRAFT DELIVERY PLAN 2006/07 AND PROGRAMME FORECAST TO 2011 (Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Access) – Agenda Item 18):</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>1. That the Bridge NDC draft Delivery Plan for 2006/07 be received and it be noted that the draft was still subject to approval by the NDC Board.</p> <p>2. That it be noted that the Delivery Plan was also still subject to formal approval by Government Office for London.</p> <p>3. That the Council's critical role as accountable body both in supporting and in delivering the Bridge NDC programme be noted.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

	<p>4. That the draft NDC Delivery Plan for 2006/07 and the Partnership Board's Programme forecast to programme end in 2011 be endorsed.</p>	ACE-A
<p>TEX207.</p>	<p>SCHOOL ADMISSIONS - RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWING CONSULTATION FOR THE 2007/8 SCHOOL YEAR (Report of the Director of the Children's Service – Agenda Item 19):</p> <p>Our Chair agreed to accept the report as urgent business. The report was late because of the need to complete necessary consultations. The report was too urgent to await the next meeting because the Council's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools had to be made by 15 April 2006.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That approval be granted to the admission arrangements for all community primary and secondary schools and St Aidan's Voluntary Controlled Primary School. 2. That approval be granted to the Qualifying Schemes for the co-ordination of arrangements for admission to reception classes in all maintained primary and secondary schools in Haringey and it be noted that, at secondary level, this entailed the Council's continued participation in the Pan-London Scheme. 3. That, as the Authority did not receive any responses to the consultation arrangements approved at our meeting on 20 December 2005 vide Minute TEX146 and circulated to all relevant parties as outlined in current Regulations, approval be granted to the proposed admission arrangements as set out in the report to that meeting. 	<p>DCS</p> <p>DCS</p> <p>DCS</p>
<p>TEX208.</p>	<p>BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE (BSF) - OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE (Report of the Director of the Children's Service – Agenda Item 20):</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the progress on the BSF programme be noted. 2. That the financial implications of participation in the BSF programme be noted. 3. That the Outline Business Case be agreed, with any final adjustments delegated to the Director of Finance and the Director of the Children's Service, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and the Executive Member for Children and Young People. 4. That the acquisition of a new school site in Haringey Heartlands 	<p>DF/ DCS</p> <p>DF/</p>

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

	as proposed in Section 12 of the interleaved report be agreed. (see Minute TEX214 below).	DCS/ D.Env
TEX209.	<p>RSL PREFERRED PARTNERING (Report of the Director of Social Services – Agenda Item 21):</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That approval be granted to the adoption of the approach of selecting Registered Social Landlord preferred partners to work with on the majority of future development schemes as outlined in the interleaved report. 2. That a further report be submitted recommending the Council's preferred partners. 	DH DH
TEX210.	<p>EXECUTIVE RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY REVIEW OF MENTAL HEALTH (Report of the Director of Social Services – Agenda Item 22):</p> <p>We noted that the recommendations in the report had been made following a thorough, wide-ranging review of aspects of mental health services in Haringey and took account of the national direction for adults social care as outlined in the recently published White Paper 'Our Health, Our Care, Our Say: A new direction in community services' and reinforced the current local development of services based within the community.</p> <p>We also noted that the Scrutiny Panel had made 26 recommendations and while the initial responses to these and subsequent recommendations for further actions were outlined in Appendix A it was proposed that the medium term recommendations be integrated into the action plan for mental health services which would be developed following the Commission for Social Care Inspection report due for publication in mid May 2006.</p> <p>We asked that our thanks be placed on record to the Members of the Scrutiny Panel, Councillors Jean Brown (Chair), Edge, Patel, Erline Prescott, Robertson and Santry.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the recommendations arising from the Scrutiny Review of Access to general Health and Early Intervention Services in Haringey – One in Four of Us be noted and welcomed. 2. That approval be granted to the detailed responses to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review set out in the Appendix to the interleaved report and to the future actions proposed. 3. That Members the Mental Health Executive be requested to oversee the implementation of the actions and incorporate 	DSS DSS

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

	<p>those outstanding into the action plan to be prepared following the Commission for Social Care Inspection report on mental health services.</p>	
TEX211.	<p>DELEGATED DECISIONS AND SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS (Report of the Chief Executive – Agenda Item 23):</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the report be noted and any necessary action be taken.</p>	
TEX212.	<p>MINUTES OF SUB-BODIES (Agenda Item 24):</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the minutes of the following bodies be noted and any necessary action approved –</p> <p>a) Children’s Services Advisory Committee – 27 February 2006 b) Building Schools for the Future Strategic Management Board – 28 February 2006 c) Procurement Committee – 28 February 2006</p>	
TEX213.	<p>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS – DEVELOPMENT OF ARCHWAY ROAD (Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Strategy) – Agenda Item 26):</p> <p>Our Chair agreed to accept the report as urgent business. The report was late because of the need to complete necessary consultations. The report was too urgent to await the next meeting because a decision on whether or not to allocate Local Authority Business Growth (LAGBI) funds to business activities was essential to the Council’s chances of securing additional resources in the next round of bidding for Local Enterprise Growth Initiative funding.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>1. That approval be granted to the ring-fencing of Local Authority Business Growth (LAGBI) funds for the development of the Archway corridor plan as outlined in the interleaved report.</p> <p>2. That the Muswell Hill Area Assembly be informed accordingly</p>	<p>ACE-S</p> <p>ACE-A</p>
TEX214.	<p>ACQUISITION OF FORMER RAIL LAND FOR A NEW SECONDARY SCHOOL ON HARINGEY HEARTLANDS (Joint Report of the Director of Finance and the Director of Environmental Services – Agenda Item 28):</p> <p>This item was the subject of a motion to exclude the press and public from the meeting as it contained exempt information relating to the business or financial affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information).</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2006**

	<p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. That approval be granted to the acquisition of the site known as the former rail sand sidings as shown hatched on the drawing appended to the interleaved report subject to contract.2. That, subject to the approval of the terms of purchase by the Head of Property Services and the Director of Finance, the Council purchase the land for £7 million.	<p>DF/ D.Env</p> <p>DF/HP</p>
<p>TEX215.</p>	<p>VOTE OF THANKS</p> <p>We placed on record our thanks to Councillor Adje and Councillor Lister for their services as Chair and Vice Chair respectively for the 2005/06 Municipal Year.</p> <p>Our Chair responded and thanked other Members of the Executive and officers for their support.</p>	

CHARLES ADJE
Chair