

Chair:
Councillor Clare Kober

Deputy Chair:
Councillor Lorna Reith

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report covers matters considered by the Cabinet at our meeting on 8 February 2011. 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.

ITEM FOR DISCUSSION

Finance and Sustainability

2. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLANNING - 2011/12 TO 2013/14

- 2.1 We considered a report which provided us with a Medium Term Financial Plan covering the three years to March 2014 with a revised assessment in each of the next three years of the General Fund, Dedicated Schools Grant, Housing Revenue Account and the Capital Programme including
 - The financial resources available to the Council;
 - The cost of providing existing services; and
 - The overall level of savings that have been and still need to be identified to give a balanced, sustainable budget over the medium term financial planning period.

The report (attached at Appendix 1) also proposed a budget package for 2011/12 and later years.

- 2.2 We noted that the projected available funding for 2011/12 reported to our meeting in December 2010 required savings to be identified totalling £46.5 million to deliver a balanced budget for that financial year. However, we were informed that since that meeting additional potential funding of £2.7 million had been identified (£1.5 million increase in the Council Tax base and £1.2 million in New Homes Bonus) together with a reduction in the projected provisions required for inflation (£1.2 million less), North London Waste Authority (£1.0 million less) and pension and other costs (£0.6 million) which had brought the saving requirement down to £41 million.
- 2.3 Nevertheless, this remained an incredibly challenging requirement, representing as it does over 14% of the Council's net budget: and all to be achieved within a twelve month period. Savings of this magnitude would have profound impact on the level of service provision that could be provided to residents and local businesses and the way in which those services were delivered.

- 2.4 As the Medium Term Financial Planning indicated, the Government's current spending plans would continue to put strains on the Council's available funding, notwithstanding the new 'freedoms and flexibilities' promised through the localism agenda. The current projected savings still to be identified in 2012/13 and 2013/14 total a further £42 million and recent growth figures announced for the national economy suggested that the country was still a long way from seeing an economic recovery.
- 2.5 We also noted that this would mean that the level of demand for the Council's services, particularly from the most vulnerable in our society, would continue to increase the spending requirement whilst the available resources continued to be squeezed.
- 2.6 We were advised that the current proposed Medium Term Financial Plan reflected those risks (and to a lesser extent opportunities) that could be realistically assessed at this point in time. However, the scale of the social change that would be driven by the Government's proposals from its Spending Review would mean that the Council would need to review on at least a quarterly basis the robustness of the key planning assumptions and be prepared to adjust the Plan accordingly.
- 2.7 We report that we adopted the recommendations contained in the report which we refer to the Council for discussion and agreement noting that the final decision on the budget and Council Tax for 2011/12 would be made by the Council at the meeting on 24 February 2011.

ITEM FOR DECISION

Planning and Regeneration

3. NORTH LONDON WASTE PLAN – SUBMISSION DRAFT

- 3.1 We considered a report which advised us that the North London Waste Plan was a joint waste development plan document which was being worked on with Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney Islington and Waltham Forest and which formed a key document in each borough's Local Development Framework.
- 3.2 We noted that the Plan set out the planning framework for waste management in those boroughs for the next 15 years up to 2027. It identified sites for waste management use and set out 7 development management policies (NLWP 1-7) for determining waste planning applications.
- 3.3 The Plan formed part of each borough's Local Development Framework and had been drawn up in conformity with national planning policy and the Mayor of London's planning strategy, known as the London Plan. The Mayor of London had set an overall target for London to become self-sufficient in the management of its own waste by 2031. This meant that London would be largely dealing with its own waste instead of sending it to landfill in the counties around London. To ensure that London achieved self-sufficiency, each borough had been asked to deal with a proportion of London's total waste (the apportionment). North London boroughs had pooled their individual apportionments and had identified sufficient sites to meet this combined apportionment as their contribution to London's self sufficiency.

- 3.4 We were advised that North London covered an area of 293 square kilometres and had a population of over 1.7 million. The existing waste infrastructure was over reliant on transfer by road and rail to landfill. In order to meet self-sufficiency targets, North London required new waste management facilities. This development faced competition from other uses for sites in the context of projected growth in population and jobs and the need to preserve the natural and built environment. The Plan sought to address these key opportunities and challenges by developing a long term strategy to meet the identified future need for waste facilities.
- 3.5 We noted that the Plan covered the following waste types -
- Municipal, commercial and industrial;
 - Construction, demolition and excavation; and
 - Hazardous
- 3.6 North London had existing capacity for over 1.5 million tonnes of waste per annum. Waste was projected to rise throughout the Plan period although recent years had seen a fall in reported waste levels. In order to meet the draft replacement London Plan apportionment for Municipal Solid Waste and Commercial and Industrial, waste capacity for 1.9 million tonnes needed to be found by 2027.
- 3.7 The capacity gap in 2027 was 432,105 tonnes after taking account of planned new waste facilities and, using the latest data on plant sizes, this equated to some 8.6 hectares. Up to 11 hectares could be provided by the re-orientation of transfer stations into waste management use. However, in order to meet the longer term needs of the North London Waste Authority for the management of municipal waste until 2041, some larger sites were needed immediately and hence, to provide a flexible plan, two additional waste sites totalling 9.1 hectares had been identified, 1 site in Barnet and 1 site in Haringey.
- 3.8 The Plan made no specific allocation for land for construction and demolition waste as costs of landfill were expected to drive up on-site reuse and recycling levels. In order to achieve the Mayor's target of achieving 95% re-use and recycling on site, policy NLWP6 required waste management plans for development.
- 3.9 The Plan made no specific allocation for land for hazardous waste as the specialised nature of this waste stream made it difficult to plan for at a sub-regional level. The North London Boroughs would be working with the Mayor to understand the requirements for this specialised waste stream across the region. Policy NLWP7 stated that applications for hazardous waste facilities would be assessed against relevant planning policies.
- 3.10 To meet these future needs the Plan set out the following approach -
- POLICY NLWP1: safeguarded North London's existing waste management and waste transfer sites for future waste use, intensification and reorientation. The Plan also identified and allocated key sites for waste management in North London for the next 15 years.

- POLICY NLWP2: set out a sequential approach for the development of waste management facilities. Developers were first required to consider existing sites. Only if they could demonstrate no sites were suitable could they put forward development on a list of five new sites identified in the Plan. In exceptional circumstances, sites that had not been allocated could be put forward provided they met exacting criteria.

A key existing site for waste management in North London in the next 15 years would be Edmonton EcoPark. Two new sites were identified for waste use: Friern Barnet former Sewage Treatment Works (Pinkham Way - Haringey) and a site between Edgware Road and Geron Way (Barnet). New sites had been assessed and scored using a range of criteria, only the highest scoring sites had been identified within this Plan as they represented the most suitable sites for waste management use according to the sustainability criteria against which the sites were assessed.

- POLICY NLWP3: was a criteria based policy for the location of Household Waste Recycling Centres in areas of identified need and to otherwise improve coverage across the area.
- POLICY NLWP4: aimed to protect amenity, to prevent disturbance from new facilities and to ensure a high standard of design.
- POLICY NLWP5: stated that waste facilities would be required to contribute to decentralised energy networks to make better use of waste as a resource. To promote greater re-use and recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste.
- POLICY NLWP6 required all proposals for development schemes which exceeded specified size and unit number thresholds would require the submission of a site waste management plan.
- POLICY NLWP7: stated that applications for hazardous waste facilities would be assessed against relevant borough planning policies.

3.11 During the run up to the submission of the Plan and during the examinations by the Government appointed Planning Inspector it would be necessary to make amendments to the submission documents. Because amendments would need to be made or proposed at short notice and given the number and frequency of Cabinet and Council meetings and the lead in times for reports it would not be practical to gain approval through these bodies for the necessary amendments through the remainder of the Plan production process. Consequently, it was proposed that authority to agree any amendments be discharged under delegated powers in conjunction with the other North London boroughs.

WE RECOMMEND

1. That the North London Waste Plan be approved for publication and subsequent submission to the Government.

2. That authority to submit changes to the Plan in the run up to and during the public examination of the document in response to objectors' submissions, requests from the Planning Inspector and any emerging evidence, guidance or legal advice be delegated to the Director of Urban Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration and in conjunction with the other North London Boroughs.

ITEMS OF REPORT

Planning and Regeneration

4. SHARED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

- 4.1 The Council will be aware that we are working together with Waltham Forest Council to explore ways to provide high quality joint services. Shared services between the two boroughs could deliver services at reduced costs in a time of reduced resources. We reported to the Council on 17 January on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on developing shared services between the two authorities which we had agreed at our meeting on 21 December 2010.
- 4.2 We considered a report which set out an initial outline business case and model for a Shared Economic Development Service between Haringey and Waltham Forest and which sought approval to this initial plan and to continuing work to establish such a shared service. We noted that although Economic Development was not a service identified for Wave 1 services in the MOU there already existed through current sub-regional structures such as the North London Pledge Sustainable Employment programme and established working relationships enough synergy and common objectives to consider establishing a shared service in a faster timescale.
- 4.3 The proposal was based on current services in both boroughs following a restructure in Waltham Forest and the planned restructure of Planning, Regeneration and Economy service in Haringey. The shared service would involve reducing staffing levels from 13 (6 in each borough plus Haringey Film Officer) to a total of 9 across both boroughs. Recruitment to the new shared service would be based on a ring fenced approach for post holders in the current borough services.
- 4.4 Operational delivery of interventions and programmes of activity focussing on tackling worklessness, social inclusion and promoting youth employment initiatives in both boroughs would be transferred to a new social enterprise to be established as part of this overall approach.
- 4.5 The move to a shared service would be a phased process with:
 - Phase 1 - Development of full business case following Compatibility Analysis and Implementation and Engagement process by March 2011.
 - Phase 2 – Shared joint economic development service with joint Head of Economic Development overseeing the service and strategic commissioning with

commissioning leads for each borough and a soft split between commissioning and operational delivery by June 2011

- Phase 3 – Single strategic commissioning economic development service with operational delivery outsourced into a social enterprise established by December 2011.

4.6 Having noted that initial work indicated that savings from the shared service could total £198,842 across both boroughs additional to savings achieved by the respective restructures in each borough, we report that we approved the initial business case and model and agreed that further work consistent with the approach and processes in the agreed MOU be undertaken to establish a shared service in early 2011/12.

Enforcement and Safer Communities

5. REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN

- 5.1 The Council will be aware that the entire borough has been declared an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) under the Environment Act 1995, we considered a report that advised us that subsequent to this, an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) was required which detailed the Council's proposals and actions to work towards the Government's air quality objectives in respect of the pollutants of concern. The Council produced and published its first AQAP a number of years ago.
- 5.2 We considered a report which recommended to us for approval and subsequent publication a revised AQAP. This Plan (a copy of which has been published on the Council's web site), which had been the subject of a statutory consultation, would guide local initiatives towards the national target of reducing the level of certain pollutants in the atmosphere affecting human health.
- 5.3 We noted that the decision to update the AQAP had been taken partly as a result of the proposed publication of several significant strategic documents in relation to air quality. In addition, our original Action Plan had been published some years ago and as we had recently undertaken local air quality modelling in partnership with neighbouring boroughs, this would provide further baseline information for the new Plan.
- 5.4 We also noted that in reviewing and updating the AQAP the Council had to pay due regard to the DEFRA guidance issued by the Secretary of State under Section 88(1) of the Environment Act 1995 and the GLA and Mayor's Directions and documents. Schedule 11 of the Act required local authorities to consult on the preparation or revision of an AQAP.
- 5.5 The revised Plan was in 3 main chapters:
- Introduction with national, regional and local context
 - Haringey's Supporting Plans and Strategies
 - Haringey's Air Quality Objectives and Measures.

Having noted that that the actions proposed in the Plan centred around transport measures, non transport measures, such as biomass and industrial emissions, and awareness raising measures, we report that we approved the revised AQAP and agreed to its publication.

Adult and Community Services

6. SPORTS AND LEISURE – STRATEGIC DIRECTION

6.1 We considered a report which reviewed the current arrangements for the funding and provision of sports and leisure services in the borough and considered a range of options for future service provision and delivery. The report also outlined the reduction in the budget as a result of these proposals.

6.2 Together with our partners we faced a range of challenges and issues, including:

- The Local Government settlement and resulting £86million reduction in funding to Haringey, with £46.5 million in 2011/12.
- Pressure on public spending as a result of these Government cuts and the impact of those cuts on Council budget priorities, strategic planning and use of resources.
- The largely discretionary status of the services involved.
- The amount of investment needed in the buildings and facilities run by the Council.
- The potential impact and role of the private/voluntary/third sector in sports and leisure services.
- The needs, demands and expectations of residents.

6.3 Set against this context there were three broad options in planning for future service provision and delivery in the borough.

- Maintain direct Council management of services
- Fund external organisations to deliver services
- Withdraw from the delivery of services altogether.

6.4 We noted that the recommended course of action included elements of all three options outlined above, and had the following key ingredients with a net cost saving of £1.6 million (49%) over 3 years:

- Make further operational efficiency savings (£567,000).
- Procure and externalise the management and operation of Tottenham Green Leisure Centre, Park Road Leisure Centre and Broadwater Farm Community Centre (£500,000).
- Lease White Hart Lane Community Sports Centre and Finsbury Park Track and Gym to local sports club(s)/agency(ies) (£478,000).
- Redirecting funding to the voluntary sector for them to deliver services (£50,000).

6.5 We also noted that in delivering these changes, the Council would achieve the following outcomes:

- It would cost significantly less.
 - Operational management would largely be provided through other agencies.
 - The Council working alongside partners would achieve greater impact and better value for money.
 - Significant external investment secured for facility improvement and development.
 - The reduced funding used to support people and activities, rather than buildings.
 - More services would be delivered by volunteering and the voluntary sector.
 - There would be less financial risk for the Council from any fall in demand or the need to maintain facilities and sites.
 - It would mean smarter and targeted commissioning of prevention and intervention leisure programmes.
- 6.6 Having considered the future level and use of Council funding and the related service delivery arrangements we agreed the package of proposals outlined above and agreed to the initiation of a procurement process to externalise the management of Council owned sports and leisure facilities.
- 6.7 We also agreed to delegate authority to approve the final scope and procurement method to the Director of Adult, Culture and Community Services. We approved the establishment of a Member Steering Group to oversee delivery of the project and we also approved the related reductions to the budget, and potential re-direction of funding to the voluntary and community sector.

Children's Services

7. CHILDCARE IN HARINGEY

- 7.1 We considered a report which provided information on, and sought agreement in principle, to proposed changes to the fee structure and charges by the Council for the under fives childcare offered through our Children's Centres noting that the proposal was subject to both consultation and an equalities impact assessment.
- 7.2 The report also provided information on and sought agreement, in principle, to a proposed reduction in the levels of grant funding provided to Voluntary and Community sector childcare providers for sustainability. This option would also be the subject of consultation.
- 7.3 The report proposed the introduction of differential charges for the provision of child care in the Council's Children Centres. The proposals were based on the relative costs of service provision for different age groups, the level of service demand, current market rates for a similar service and the parent/guardians ability to pay. We noted that the proposed charging structure was not designed to increase the overall level of service income and that the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan did not include any assumptions relating to additional income from child care.
- 7.4 In terms of affordability, the report highlighted the current uncertain economic climate and the Government's on-going reforms of the benefit system, including child tax credits. This made it particularly difficult to assess the impact of the proposals on overall income levels. However, based on information on both demand and current market rates, it was

estimated that there would be a 10% reduction in usage in the short term. The proposals would come into effect from September 2011 and the net impact of the increased charges and reduction in usage was that overall income would increase marginally in 2011-12 compared with the 2010-11 projection of £2.4 million. The full year impact would be a potential increase of £200,000.

- 7.5 We also noted that given that these proposals introduced means testing to determine the level of fee payable, consideration would need to be given to the administration of such a scheme and the associated cost.
- 7.6 We report that we agreed in principle to the introduction of new fee structure for Children's Centres from September 2011 and to officers exploring the introduction of differential fee rates in 2012-13 based on ability to pay. We also agreed in principle to a reduction in the level of funding provided to voluntary and community sector providers in the context of significant reductions in Council funding after April 2011 and the impact of the Early Years Single Funding Formula.
- 7.7 We noted that a review was currently being undertaken of the provision of full-time early education places for 3 and 4 year olds and that a report would be submitted for our consideration in autumn 2011. We further agreed that authority to make the final decisions on these matters be delegated to the Cabinet Member with portfolio responsibility for Children's Services, in consultation with the Director of Children's Services, following appropriate consideration of the results of any consultation and with due regard to the Council's relevant equality duties as set out in the Equality Act 2010.

8. THE SUSTAINABILITY OF CHILDREN'S CENTRES IN HARINGEY

- 8.1 We considered a report which set out proposals for the future delivery of Children's Centre services within budget constraints whilst ensuring high quality services continue to be offered to those most in need.
- 8.2 We noted that in order to deliver this service within the challenging financial circumstances facing the Council from April 2011, consideration had been given to options for reducing spending across the whole of the early years service, whilst ensuring that the most vulnerable children could be identified at the earliest opportunity and enabled to access support through a universal offer.
- 8.3 The commissioning framework for children's centre service delivery would be focused on impact and improving outcomes for all children, but particularly those children considered to be the most vulnerable or disadvantaged. This would be achieved by
- ensuring access to children's centres services for children and their families living within our 0-30% most deprived super output areas.;
 - delivery of the offer of a 15 hour, free early education for disadvantaged 2 year olds; with additional outreach and family support for those who needed it.
 - improved access to the 15 hour free entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds and supporting the transition into these places for those children taking up the 2 year olds offer;
 - provision of targeted outreach to those least likely to engage in services;

- provision of high quality, integrated family support that engaged families and enabled the identification and intervention at an early stage;
 - partnerships and multi-agency working that reduced duplication, maximised resources and enhanced professional practice; and
 - evidence based practice and interventions that had been proven to make the biggest difference to improved outcomes for children and families.
- 8.4 The proposed approach to delivering these services was to maintain full service delivery in those Centres that provided for the most vulnerable, who were living in the most deprived areas. Central management and administration costs would be reduced wherever possible in Centres whilst maintaining a safe service. The Council would work with Centres, where appropriate, to maximise fee income, particularly in the areas of least deprivation using a sliding scale of fees. The Centres providing for the most vulnerable would be least affected by funding changes.
- 8.5 Three basic blocks of expenditure were used to support the management, delivery and monitoring and evaluation of service delivery and we considered the changes that could be made to each of these in order to deliver services within budget constraints:
- Central retained resources including management, administration and childcare places commissioned centrally;
 - Commissioned services;
 - Devolved budgets to Children's Centres.
- 8.6 Significant reductions were being made to the central management, administration and support functions and changes were proposed in the report to the way that childcare places were targeted at need. In total these services were set to reduce from a cost of around £3.5 million in 2010-11 to £1.6 million.
- 8.7 We noted that currently commissioned services include:
- Health services;
 - Grants to the voluntary sector for specific programmes of outreach work;
 - Sustainability grants to voluntary childcare groups; and
 - Targeted childcare places.
- Subject to consultation, it was proposed to reduce the level of funding for health services, grants to the voluntary sector and sustainability grants to childcare groups. It was anticipated that the increase in funding levels to the PVI childcare sector which would be delivered through the new Early Years Single Funding Formula would support the sustainability of community and voluntary childcare providers and therefore individual grants from the Early Intervention Grant would cease. In addition the targeting of childcare places centrally would enable a more cost effective solution than the current approach. Commissioned Services would reduce from a cost of £1.1 million in 2010-11 to around £0.8 million.
- 8.8 The priority for the future delivery of services through the children's centre programme would be to ensure that a number of centres could be sustained as lead centres where they served communities with high levels of need / deprivation. Thereafter if the funding strategy allowed the development of linked centres offering the more standard offer would

be supported. The formula for allocating the different elements of funding to each children's centre would be revised so that resources were targeted to the children and families who were most vulnerable and management and administration costs were reduced. The revised formula would be supported by a clear Service Level Agreement between the Council and each centre and this would set out the contribution that each centre would make to the delivery of our priorities. We were informed that in total the resources for Children's Centres provision devolved primarily through the formula would reduce from £9.1 million in 2010-11 to £4.8 million.

- 8.9 The report provided a provisional view of which centres would be considered as full service and those which, subject to finances, would be linked centres. Current analysis of the financial resources available suggested that Haringey could not maintain a network beyond the full service centres without support from other agencies or sustainable plans to maximise income. In response to a question it was confirmed that the configuration shown was provisional only and that consultation would be taking place about those arrangements.
- 8.10 We agreed that the future children's centre programme should be re-configured so that it could be delivered within the budget constraints whilst ensuring that children living in the 0-30% most deprived super-output areas were able to access the full range of children's centre services. We also agreed that officers complete the detailed work required to complete are-configuration including a commissioning strategy which set out the required service level, revised formula for the allocation of funding and a revised fee structure that maximised income and supported the maintenance of services where parents/carers were able to contribute to the cost.
- 8.11 Approval was also granted to consultations on this strategy and proposals taking place with each Children's Centre and school in the current programme in order to ensure that service delivery was protected for the most vulnerable families, resources were targeted to the areas that would be most effective and the programme was delivered within the available budget from April 2011. Further, we agreed that authority to make the final decisions on the matters outlined above be delegated to the Cabinet Member with portfolio responsibility for Children's Services, in conjunction with the Director for the Children and Young People's Service, following appropriate consideration of the results of any consultation and with due regard to the Council's relevant equality duties as set out in the Equality Act 2010.

Finance and Sustainability

9. SHAPING OUR FUTURE – CONSULTATION EXERCISE

- 9.1 We considered a report which set out the headline issues arising from a public consultation on the Council's budget. We noted that during October-December 2010 a public consultation called [Shaping our Future](#) had been carried out which asked people living, working or studying in the Borough to have their say to help us balance our budget in the face of planned cuts. Approximately 740 completed questionnaires and 1,040 comments and ideas were received.

9.2 We were informed that respondents were asked to express the relative importance to them of ten service areas by indicating their preferred level of spend per service area from the approximate £4,500 the Council currently spent per household. Most encouraging was that respondents allocated an amount broadly in line with how the Council spent its budget. Overall residents gave a clear indication that, whilst they valued the services the Council provided, they expected it to achieve efficiencies by working with others, making better use of assets, encouraging volunteering and community involvement, and finding ways of raising more income.

10. CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAMME

10.1 We considered a report which provided us with an update on the progress to date in achieving the Council's carbon reduction target of 40% from corporate buildings by 2015 and outlined the next stage of the investment strategy required to support the carbon reduction programme. The report also recommended the optimum level of investment over the next three years as part of the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan.

10.2 We noted that steady progress had been achieved in reaching the Council's Greenest Borough Strategic target of a 40% reduction in the Carbon Dioxide emissions from Council buildings by 2015. We were informed that in order to maintain this progress against the associated Carbon Management Action Plan, additional investment of up to £1.5 million in energy saving schemes would be required over the next four years.

10.3 We also noted that whilst a good return had been achieved against the £0.5 million of investments to date it would not be possible to rely on the recycling of the energy costs savings alone to fund the investment requirements within the timeline of the Action Plan. Whilst the recycling of these savings through the Sustainable Investment Fund would continue, the focus would primarily be on securing external funding. However, access to external funding in the current economic climate was limited and the Council needed to put in place fall-back sources of funding to support the investment programme. Two such sources were currently available: the reallocation of monies in the Financing Reserve to the Sustainable Investment Fund; and the use of prudential borrowing and we report that we approved the use of both sources up to a combined sum of £1.5 million in the event that alternative external funding was not available and subject to a robust business case supporting each new investment proposal.

Leader

11. THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE: DECEMBER 2010 (PERIOD 9)

11.1 We considered a report which presented on an exception basis financial and performance information for the year to December 2010, asked us to agree proposed budget virements in accordance with financial regulations.

11.2 We noted that overall performance on the monthly basket of indicators showed that of the 37 key service indicators monitored 24 had improved since 2009/10, 1 was the same and 8 were worse with no indicator possible for 4 indicators.

- 11.3 The overall revenue budget monitoring, based on the December data was showing a forecast over spend of £2.9 million, up from the £2.6 million reported last period. The change this period was due to an increase in Looked after Children (LAC) and reductions in forecasts for parking income which had been highlighted as a risk last period.
- 11.4 We noted that The Treasury Management activity in the first nine months of 2010/11 had been compliant with the Treasury Management Strategy Statement agreed in February 2010. Following the repayment of maturing debt in October, the level of cash balances dropped, and since then had remained at an average of £31 million during November and December. Investments have been made into AAA rated money market funds and an instant access account only to ensure sufficient liquidity was maintained. These accounts paid an interest rate equivalent to one month fixed term deposits, with the advantage of instant access. Due to the significant use of money market funds, the average long term credit rating of the portfolio has increased to AA+. £50 million of Council debt had matured this year and £20 million of new borrowing had been taken on 31 August as a starting point to refinancing this. Due to the significant difference between short term investment interest rates and long term borrowing rates, the Council was continuing to make use of internal cash balances, rather than taking any further new borrowing until necessary. During December the Council continued to be able to meet its obligations within the current cash balances. However, officers were monitoring the position closely, alongside the Council's treasury management advisers, including monitoring of interest rate movements to ensure that further borrowing was taken at an optimal time
- 11.5 The aggregate capital programme position for 2010/11 at Period 9 was now forecasting an under spend of £11.4 million, an increase of £1.5 million from the £9.9 million under spend reported in Period 8.
- 11.6 Financial regulations require our approval of proposed budget changes. These are shown in the above table. These changes fall into one of the following categories:
- all changes in gross expenditure and/or income budgets between business units in excess of £100,000; and
 - all changes in gross expenditure and/or income budgets within business units in excess of £100,000.
 - any virement that affects achievement of agreed policy or produces a future year's budget impact if above £100,000.

Under the Constitution, certain virements are key decisions. Key decisions are:

- for revenue, any virement which results in change in a directorate cash limit of more than £250,000; and
- for capital, any virement which results in the change of a programme area of more than £250,000.

Key decisions are highlighted by an asterisk in the table. The table below sets out the proposed changes. There are two figures shown in each line of the table. The first amount column relates to changes in the current year's budgets and the second to changes in future years' budgets (full year).

Revenue virements						
Period	Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Reason for budget changes	Description
P9	NSR/CR	Rev	105		Corrective Budget Realignment	One off contribution from Non Service Revenue with regards to costs incurred pending disposal of Hornsey Central depot
P9	NSR/UE	Rev*	2,400	2,400	Corrective Budget Realignment	Earmarked provision for Homelessness released from Non Service Revenue to Urban Environment
P9	PD	Rev*	(673)	(673)	Corrective Budget Realignment	Recruitment Advertising - Reduction of expenditure and income in line with activity levels
P9	Various	Rev*	3,903	3,903	Corrective Budget Realignment	Centralisation of Legal Budgets
P9	Various	Rev		123	Corrective Budget Realignment	Creation of permanent funding for the Out of Hours Service within Customer Services
P9	Various	Rev		162	Corrective Budget Realignment	Budget re-alignment
P9	CR	Rev*	113	274	Corrective Budget Realignment	Fraud Team moving from Benefits & Local Taxation to Audit

12. DELEGATED DECISIONS AND SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS

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

Director of Adult, Culture and Community Services

CLL – Haringey Adult Learning Service Apprenticeship Posts.

Note by the Head of Local Democracy & Member Services

HARINGEY CORE STRATEGY SUBMISSION (FINAL DRAFT)

The Cabinet reported to the Council at the meeting on 22 November 2010 that a new set of planning documents was being produced that would form the Local Development

Framework (LDF). The scope of these documents was set out in planning legislation and supporting advice (most significantly PPS12 Local Spatial Planning). The status of these documents varied in terms of their legal weight in determining planning applications. Development Plan Documents (DPDs) carried the most weight as these were subject to an Examination by the Secretary of State.

The Core Strategy was the lead document in the LDF as it set out the overall spatial vision for the borough. The process of developing the Core Strategy was lengthy, and the final stage had now been reached. The key stages undertaken to date included:

- Issues & Options consultation – February/March 2008;
- Preferred Options consultation – May/June 2009;
- Proposed Submission Core Strategy consultation – May/June 2010;
- Additional Regulation 27 consultation on focussed changes – November/December 2010.

The Council had sought to resolve as many policy differences as it could through this extensive consultation process and the timescale for the remaining stages in the Core Strategy were as follows:

- Submission to the Secretary of State – March 2011
- Examination in Public – May 2011
- Receipt of Inspector's Report – July/August 2011
- Adoption – October 2011.

The Council endorsed the suggested minor amendments to Haringey's proposed Submission Core Strategy recommended by the Cabinet. It was also reported that a revision to the Affordable Housing Policy, part of Strategic Policy (SP) 2 Housing, and changes to employment land designations had been agreed for the purpose of a further four week public consultation and on the recommendation of the Cabinet, the Council also agreed to delegate authority to approve subsequent changes to SP2 Housing, the employment land designations and other minor amendments to the Director of Urban Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration.

Head of Local Democracy and Member Services to report that the new evidence on affordable housing and a review of some of the borough's designated employment areas, a number of focussed changes were made to the Core Strategy. The key changes related to the affordable housing threshold, namely changing the threshold from five units to ten units and reviewing some of the designated employment areas. These additional changes were the subject of consultation in November/December 2010 to ensure that the Core Strategy was sound before it was submitted for Independent Examination.

An addendum report which attached Haringey's Core Strategy and supporting documents including a schedule of proposed minor amendments and further changes to housing and employment land designations (a copy of which has been published on the Council's web site at

http://harinet.haringey.gov.uk/index/housing_and_planning/planning-mainpage/policy_and_projects/local_development_framework/corestrategy.htm) has

now been produced by the Director of Urban Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration and the Council's endorsement of its submission is now sought.

RECOMMENDATION

That Haringey's Core Strategy and supporting documents including the schedule of proposed minor amendments and further changes to housing and employment land be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination by an Independent Planning Inspector.