

Chair:  
Councillor George Meehan

Deputy Chair:  
Councillor Lorna Reith

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 We reported to the Council on 8 January on three matters for decision which we considered at our meeting on 19 December 2006. We now report for information on other items considered at that meeting. For ease of reference the Report is divided into the Executive portfolios.
- 1.2 We trust that this Report will be helpful to Members in their representative role and facilitate a fruitful dialogue between the Executive and all groups of Councillors. These reports are a welcome opportunity for the Executive on a regular basis to present the priorities and achievements of the Executive to Council colleagues for consideration and comment. The Executive values and encourages the input of fellow members.

## **ITEMS OF REPORT**

### **Finance**

#### **2. FINANCIAL PLANNING 2007/08 – 2010/11**

- 2.1 We reported to the Council on 8 January on the key financial planning issues which faced the Council and proposed a process for detailed consideration of four year budget options. The Council will recall that the existing budget plans for the four year period 2007/08 to 2010/11 would result in a budget gap of £13.6 million, with assumed council tax increases of 2.5% in each of the four years. This also assumed existing planned savings of £8.2m were achieved.
- 2.2 We considered a report which provided an update following the draft settlement from Government and was in seven sections:
  - government support
  - budget changes and variations
  - savings and investment options
  - council tax
  - children's services budget (dedicated schools grant)
  - housing revenue account budget
  - capital programme.
- 2.3 The report was supported by three appendices which set out the gross budget trail; tracked the resource shortfall through the financial planning process; and set out the draft position for children's services and the dedicated schools grant.
- 2.4 We noted the draft local government settlement and the overall resource shortfall, prior to our final budget package which is the subject of a separate report to the Council and we approved budget changes and variations which were proposed to us. In addition we

also noted issues in respect of the council tax, the children's services budget, the Housing Revenue Account budget and the capital programme.

## **Organisational Development and Performance**

### **3. THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE – OCTOBER 2006**

- 3.1 We considered a report which set out the routine financial and performance monitoring for October 2006 in the balanced scorecard format. In summary, the balanced scorecard showed that for the excellent service perspective 68% of indicators were on target or close to the end of year target at the end of October. For 25 of the 36 (69%) customer focus measures, performance targets were being met or close to being met. For financial health 25 of the 32 measures traffic lighted achieved amber or green status meaning for 78% of indicators performance levels were achieving target or being maintained at an acceptable level. Our organisational development /capacity indicators including staff survey results showed that for 17 of the 18 (94%) measures, performance was at or close to expected levels. Overall 73% of indicators were achieving or close to achieving target. In addition 73% of indicators had maintained or improved performance since the end of last year.
- 3.2 We noted that the scorecard appendix also now included some estimated top quartile data (All England) so that progress could be assessed not only against the targets we set but in terms of how we compared with others and how close we were to attaining what we ultimately were aiming to achieve. With regard to finance and in summary, based on the October position, the revenue budget showed a balanced position.
- 3.3 We were advised that Financial Regulations required proposed budget changes be subject to our approval. We approved those shown in the table below which fell into one of two categories:
- budget virements, where it was proposed that budget provision be transferred between one service budget and another. Explanations were provided where this was the case;
  - Increases or decreases in budget, generally where notification had been received in-year of a change in the level of external funding such as grants or supplementary credit approval.
- 3.4 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.

<b>Period</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Key</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Full year</b>	<b>Description</b>
---------------	----------------	------------	---------------	------------------	--------------------

			<b>current year (£'000)</b>	<b>Amount (£'000)</b>	
7	Children	Rev	173		Inclusion of agreed asylum grant allocations and spend within the Leaving Care Team.
7	Children, Social Services	Rev	115	172	Transfer of salaries for the Children & Families Contract team.
7	Social Services	Cap*	1,300		Additional budget to reduce the adaptations backlog that is funded from capital receipts and was approved by Executive on 12 September.
7	Children, Social Services	Rev	80		Children & Families contribution towards the cost of E. Care Business Support Team.
7	Children	Rev*	322		Contribution to offset pressure on the SEN budget due to placements of children with autism.
7	Chief Executives	Rev*	200	200	Transfer of Bernie Grant Centre Budget from OD&L to Chief Executive's budget.
7	Chief Executives	Rev	20	20	Adjustment of voluntary sector recharge to the Greek Cypriot Womens Centre.
7	Chief Executives	Rev*	471	471	BSC/ASB grant is no longer receivable in the Strategy budget.
7	Chief Executives	Rev	169		Inclusion of SSCF Community Empowerment Networks spend that is funded from grant by GOL.
7	Chief Executives	Cap*	259		Reduced HERS 2 and 3 funding following mid year appraisal.
7	Chief Executives	Cap	54		Reduced THI funding for Bruce Grove following mid year appraisal.
7	Chief Executives	Rev	34		Additional grant funding from GOL for domestic violence re Haringey Hearthstone nightline.
7	Chief Executives	Rev	30		Additional grant funding from the London Development Agency for the ULVP Research & Management project.
7	Chief Executives	Rev	5	8	Reversal of virement from Legal to Customer Services as Customer Services are not going to be dealing with Citizenship Ceremonies questions and booking appointments.
7	Chief Executives, Housing	Rev	37	55	Transfer of budget from Home Connections to Customer Services to pay for services to be provided.
7	All	Rev	135		Reallocation of some NRF budgets to reflect over and under spends.
7	Chief Executives	Rev	30		Transfer of budget from member Services to IT.
7	Chief Executives, Finance	Rev	161		Reallocation of some NRF Well Being budgets.

7	Environment	Cap*	389		Additional TFL funding re school travel plans
7	Environment	Cap	81		£51k Section 278 funding re Lordship Lane Health Centre and additional TFL funding re Travel awareness (£30k).
7	Environment	Rev	54		Additional HLF related spend re Finsbury Park that is funded from income generated from activities in the park.
7	Environment	Rev*	931	931	Revisions to Highways budgets within approved cash limit to reflect current structure and activity.
7	Environment	Cap	35		TFL funded scheme for Wood green Station access development.
7	Environment	Cap*	300		Reduced GAF funding re Hornsey Mortuary relocation to reflect current spend profile.
7	Environment	Rev*	1,684	1,684	Budget adjustment to reflect the recycling contract coming back in house.
7	Chief Executives	Rev	17	17	Transfer of non Members Allowances elements back to Members Services.

#### **4. PROGRAMME HIGHLIGHT REPORT – OCTOBER 2006**

- 4.1 The Council will be aware that the programme is the vehicle for the delivery of corporately significant projects and projects that are key political priorities. It underpinned the Council's corporate planning process, ensuring that the projects undertaken reflected and helped to deliver Community Strategy and corporate priorities.
- 4.2 The report provided an opportunity to monitor, challenge and support the Council's key projects to ensure that they finished on time, to budget and deliver the outcomes for the community. We considered a report which provided details of all the Council's corporately significant projects, covering the period up to the end of October 2006.
- 4.3 We were informed that a key driver in developing the programme structure had been to improve financial oversight of the Council's key corporate projects. Accordingly, projects were required to report detailed financial information in their project highlight reports each month. In receiving the report we noted that the key areas of financial concern as at the end of October had been –
- Primary Schools –Concerns about the current programme and finances would be addressed as part of the overall capital programme for the Council. This would be reported to us in January 2007.
  - Children's Centres – detailed work was underway to identify how the 2005-06 overspend would be contained within 2006-07 and to ensure the detailed spending plan for delivery of the new centres could be funded within the available budget.
  - Procurement – this project had a target of £2m of savings, equally split over 2005/06 and 2006/07. Only £1.2m had been identified with projects implemented,

so there would be a shortfall of £0.8 million against the target in 2006/07. A review of further potential projects was underway jointly with all departments.

**N.B.** These highlight reports reflected the position of some of the Council's corporately significant projects as at 31 October 2006 and might have changed in the meantime.

## **Health and Social Services**

### **5. ADULT SOCIAL CARE ANNUAL REVIEW LETTER AND STAR RATING FOR 2005/06**

- 5.1 We considered a report which advised us that the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) produced on an annual basis the Record of Performance Assessment (ROPA) for Adult Social Care commonly known as the annual review letter. We were informed that the ROPA outlined the authority's strengths and weaknesses and provided the evidence on how CSCI had reached their judgement for that authorities star rating.
- 5.2 We were informed that analysis of the ROPA indicated that the primary reason for the drop in Haringey's Adult Social Care Star Rating related to poor performance in relation to a few key performance indicators that measured both customer care and quality of service provision. The summary of areas for improvement outlined in the report provided a more detailed profile of the weaknesses that lead to this judgement. We were also informed that CSCI star rating was based on a scale of zero to three stars and that the ratings aimed to improve public information about the current performance of services and the capacity for improvement.
- 5.3 We report that we noted the annual review monitoring letter and that the Council had moved from two stars in 2004/05 to one in 2005/06. We also noted a summary of improvements achieved by the Council as well as a summary of areas for improvement both of which are detailed below -

#### Summary of Improvements Achieved

- A clear strength for Haringey was the development and production of relevant commissioning strategies that were based on relevant local data around the needs of the local community.
- The Council was effective at engaging local communities, service users and carers in forming these strategies and involving them in service improvements.
- The financial position of the Council had now been aligned to that of comparator authorities and finished the year with a balanced budget. It was positive that the Council reviewed and re-allocated expenditure to reflect national and local priorities.
- The Council had a well developed equalities strategy, which underpinned fair access to care services. This was followed up with some good examples of outcomes given around improved access to and provision of services to targeted BME groups who had been underrepresented in those areas.
- Work around adaptations and delivery of equipment had been highlighted a number of times as an area demonstrating good improvement. As this was an outcome of using the best value techniques it reflected that the Council could identify poor performance and take appropriate action to turn this around.

- The Council continued to support high numbers of adults with physical disabilities and older people to live at home, with consistent achievement in these client groups.

#### Summary of Areas for Improvement

- Older people were waiting too long for an assessment of their needs – waiting times needed to be reduced.
- Although the reviews conducted were compliant, with Fair Access to Care guidance, performance in this area had declined notably.
- 70% of Statement of need were issued to service users which was well below the London average.
- We needed to generally reduce the number of service users placed permanently in residential/nursing care - with a particular focus on learning disabilities.
- Work on improving the number of adults with learning disabilities and mental health problems to live at home should be a priority for 2006/07.
- The level of services for carers was well below the comparator average which was something we needed to tackle.
- We needed to reduce the number of patients experiencing delays in being discharged from hospital who require social care services.
- We were out of time for the Electronic Social Care Record but needed to compile with the outstanding targets as quickly as possible.
- Unit Costs needed to be stabilised and preferably brought in line with our comparator authorities.

## Housing

### **6. HOMES FOR HARINGEY QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT**

- 6.1 The Council will be aware that Homes for Haringey Arms Length Management Organisation (ALMO), was launched in April 2006. An ALMO is a company set up by the Council to manage, maintain and improve its housing stock. Local authorities who have pursued this option can secure additional capital funding if the new arms-length body has received a 'good' rating i.e., 2 stars, from the Audit Commission's Housing Inspectorate.
- 6.2 The Council retains the status of landlord and tenants remain secure tenants of the authority. The Council are therefore required to closely monitor the activities of the ALMO to ensure contract compliance, adherence to regulations and guidance of good practice, and the delivery of services that when inspected will secure at least 2 stars rating. Homes for Haringey's performance is formally monitored by way of monthly and quarterly meetings.
- 6.3 We considered a report which provided us with an update of the progress made in relation to key targets and objectives and which summarised main issues discussed at the quarterly performance monitoring meeting held in November 2006. We noted that Homes for Haringey had seen some improvements in performance and were confident that recent progress and ongoing intervention would deliver the planned outcomes in the Delivery Plan. We will continue to monitor performance closely through the monthly and quarterly performance meetings in addition to which the Leader of the Council and the

Executive Member for Housing will be sent regular performance reports and areas of concerns fed back through the performance meetings. The quarterly meetings will continue to be the forum to discuss any areas of concern.

## **Enterprise and Regeneration**

### **7. UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT**

- 7.1 The Council will be aware that the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (UDP) which was adopted in July 2006 deals with development and use of land in Haringey, and contains information on the Council's policies and proposals. The UDP Review was developed under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan)(England) Regulations 1999 and it was subject to three statutory public consultation stages and a public inquiry. The UDP inquiry ran from April to September 2005 and the Council received the Inspector's report in January 2006. In response to the Inspector's report, we approved modifications to the UDP in March 2006.
- 7.2 The revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) was then submitted to the Government Office for London. The LDS is a three-year project plan, which sets out a programme for replacing the UDP policies with Local Development Documents. The Annual Monitoring Report monitored progress on the LDS. For 2005/06, the key milestones of which were the commencement of the UDP inquiry and the modifications stage. The first Annual Monitoring Report for 2004/05 was submitted to the Government Office for London in December 2005 and presented available statistical data relating to Haringey's emerging UDP policies and information on the Council's development control performance.
- 7.3 We considered a report which took forward many of the indicators used in the first report and addressed more core indicators as identified by the Government. We noted that it included some significant effects indicators which assessed the significant social, environmental and economic effects of policies and that these indicators were linked to objectives for the sustainability appraisal of Local Development Documents. We also noted that a full set of sustainability objectives and indicators would be developed for the Local Development Framework.
- 7.4 The Annual Monitoring Report submitted covered the period April 2005 to March 2006 and had to be submitted to the Secretary of State by 31 December 2006. The publication of the Annual Monitoring Report was also subject to a Best Value Performance Indicator (BV 200c). We were informed that the Government was also intending to allocate Planning Delivery Grant for 2007/08 to authorities that demonstrated performance in housing delivery, plan-making and sustainable development as identified by core indicators in the Annual Monitoring Report.
- 7.5 The Annual Monitoring Report was used for information purposes to assess the performance and effectiveness of planning policies. It presented available statistical data relating to the planning policies in Haringey's adopted Unitary Development Plan and emerging Local Development Framework. It contained a monitoring framework that identified targets and indicators, which would be used to assess the performance and effectiveness of Unitary Development Plan objectives and key policies. The Report also identified ongoing issues of data collection and analysis.

- 7.6 We report, for information, that we approved the Annual Monitoring Report for submission to the Government Office for London.

## **8. FURTHER ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN**

- 8.1 We considered a report which advised us the London Plan was adopted in February 2004 and set the strategic spatial development priorities and policies for London until 2016 as well as underpinning much of the work of the Greater London Authority. The Mayor of London had a legal duty to keep the London Plan under review and up-to-date as well as to ensure that the Mayor's strategies were consistent with each other. In December 2005, the Mayor published a Statement of Intent which set out the scope of the further alterations to the Plan. A public consultation version of the draft alterations was produced in September 2006, which was accompanied by a sustainability appraisal report. The public consultation period ran until 22 December 2006. The Examination in Public and the Panel's report was timetabled for Summer 2007 and it was intended that the altered London Plan would be published in early 2008.
- 8.2 In October 2005, the Mayor published for public consultation early draft alterations to the London Plan on housing supply, waste and minerals. These matters had been subject to an Examination in Public and the Panel Report was published in September 2006. The early alterations would come into effect from April 2007 and were included in the further alterations version of the Plan. The Mayor's responses to the Panel's report had been included in the Further Alterations. However, they remained subject to final approval and the receipt of no direction from the Secretary of State. In many cases, the Panel's recommendations had resulted in further alterations. In December 2005, the Mayor of London published a Statement of Intent on the review of the London Plan. The Statement set out the scope of the alterations to the London Plan.
- 8.3 We noted that the draft Further Alterations to the London Plan constituted a first review of the Mayor's London Plan, which was adopted in February 2004. They include previously published Early Alterations which related to housing supply, waste and minerals. The aims and objectives of the original London Plan remained largely unchanged and the further alterations focus on themes identified in a Statement of Intent published in December 2005. We also noted that the draft Further Alterations extended the timeframe of the original Plan from 2016 to 2025/6 and focussed on strengthening some of the key policy areas which had developed since the publication of the original London Plan, including climate change, London's geography and its suburbs.
- 8.4 The draft further alterations were accompanied by a sustainability appraisal report, a scenario testing report and an equalities impact assessment. The draft Further Alterations had been published for public consultation and the closing date for comments was 22 December 2006. The London Plan now formed part of Haringey's statutory development plan and its spatial strategy, growth assumptions and targets would shape Haringey's Local Development Framework, which was required to be in general conformity with the London Plan. Therefore, it was important that the Council commented on the alterations and scrutinised the evidence and growth assumptions. The further alterations and supporting evidence would be debated at a Examination in Public and the Council would



have the opportunity to provide further representations to support its submitted comments.

- 8.5 The draft Further Alterations were generally welcomed, particularly the focus on climate change and London's suburbs. However, there were some key concerns regarding the sustainability of the plan to 2026 and the interrelationship between housing and employment growth and transport, community and utility infrastructure, the deliverability of affordable, energy efficient homes, particularly family housing and whether alterations gave sufficient attention to outer London boroughs like Haringey. There were also sub-regional issues, particularly waste apportionment and a new sub-regional structure which would require further discussion with sub-regional borough partnerships and a coordinated response for the Examination in Public.
- 8.6 We report that we agreed a response to the draft Further Alterations to the London Plan and authorised their submission to the Mayor of London.

## **Community Involvement**

### **9. LIBRARIES, ARCHIVES AND MUSEUM SERVICE - RESTRUCTURE**

- 9.1 We considered a report which advised us that the current structure of the Libraries, Archives & Museum Service was established in 2001 and reflected the need for professional qualifications and expertise within the service. However, since then, the Service had developed extensively. The increased use of technology had enabled the Service to streamline and centralise processes and procedures associated with the selection, acquisition, cataloguing and processing of stock had been minimised, with much of the work being undertaken by suppliers rather than in-house personnel. The reservation process had been re-engineered to take full advantage of our automated library management system and one member of staff was now responsible for document delivery from external sources, rather than staff in each branch.
- 9.2 Automation had improved the circulation system relating to the issuing and renewal of stock and the automated telephone system now catered for the renewal of approximately 75,000 loans each year while the self-issue and returns system took in the region of 70% of issues, so reducing the requirement for "counter" staff undertaking transactions on the issue desk. Services to children and young people represented a significant part of our service delivery but these services were not fully co-ordinated as the current Principal Librarian for Children Services did not have line management responsibility for the children's staff in Libraries. Enquiry and reference work had also altered with improvements in information technology and paper-based reference works were now being replaced by e-resources, eliminating the tedious and time-consuming task of updating.
- 9.3 We noted that the restructure of the Service proposed reflected the centralisation of support services, the ability of automation to reduce the need for staff to carry out routine duties, the need to place greater emphasis on helping the customer to obtain the best from the services available and the need for local accountability. The proposed structure reduced the number of staff devoted to backroom activities, with a corresponding increase in staff available to offer customer facing services. It also strengthened the role

of library managers and tasked them with the role of performance management and achieving targets for their particular library. We also noted that the proposals were designed to achieve a savings target of approx £200,000 from financial year 2007/8 onwards.

- 9.4 Accompanying the report were comments from UNISON on the restructure proposals and we also received a deputation from that trade union concerning the proposals. Having noted that consultation would be ongoing with the staff group early in the New Year to discuss and achieve the new structure and savings target of £200,000, we report that we agreed the proposed structure as a basis for formal consultation with affected staff and we delegated to the Assistant Chief Executive (Access) or Director of Adults, Culture and Community Services, in consultation with the Executive Member for Community Involvement, authority to agree the structure following consultation with staff.

## **Children and Young People**

### **10. DELIVERING EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES IN HARINGEY: MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF THE CHILDCARE ACT, 2006**

- 10.1 We considered a report which advised us that the Childcare Act 2006 had introduced new statutory duties for local authorities. The emphasis was on effective early childhood services for all children under 5, in particular addressing the needs of the most vulnerable young children. The report addressed the challenge of developing a children's centre service by increasing the number of children's centres from 10 to 18 by March 2008. This would enable the Council and its partners to deliver integrated early childhood services to at least 14,759 young children under 5.
- 10.2 The report proposed support for the development of a robust and sustainable early childhood service and identified 8 potential Phase II children's centres in order to deliver integrated early childhood services to 14,759 children in Haringey by March 2008.
- 10.3 We noted that from the initial expressions of interest (24) and early feasibility studies, 8 centres were recommended which would meet the overall target of 18 for March 2008. The proposal would bring the total number of centres in place by March 2008 to: 4 in the West Network; 5 in the North Network; 9 in the South Network. These centres would enable Haringey to reach the DfES target of 14,759 children (under 5) by 2008. Considerable consultation had taken place at a local level in all proposed areas with the engagement of governing bodies, parents and a wide range of stakeholders.
- 10.4 Two further wards with levels disadvantage would need to be addressed between 2008-2010; Fortis Green and Crouch End. Alexandra ward would also need addressing in order to reach all under 5's in Haringey. It was anticipated that there would be a Phase III development in order to move to universal provision and fulfil the Government's commitment to a children's centre in every community by 2010. However, at this stage it was not clear what additional funding would be available. We also noted that having undertaken detailed capital feasibility studies, the proposed Centres for Phase II were:

**North Children's Network** – Bounds Green Children's Centre (based at Bounds Green Primary School)

**West Children's Network** – Campsbourne Children's Centre (based at Campsbourne Primary School), Highgate Children's Centre (based at Highgate Primary School) together with a main satellite at Rokesly Infants School

**South Children's Network** – Harringay Children's Centre (based at South Haringey Infant School); Downhills Children's Centre (based at local sure start programme base working in partnership with Downhills Primary School); Seven Sisters Children's Centre (based at Seven Sisters Primary School); Earlsmead Children's Centre (based at Earlsmead Primary School); Welbourne Children's Centre (based at Welbourne Primary School).

10.5 We report for information that we approved the 8 identified children's centres for development in Phase II to meet a total of 18 centres in place for March 2008.

## **11. ADMISSIONS TO SCHOOLS – APPROVAL TO CONSULT**

- 11.1 We considered a report which advised us 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 annually on their admission arrangements for the following academic year. We noted that Haringey Education Services gave advice to governing bodies who were the admission authorities for other maintained primary and secondary schools in Haringey (i.e. voluntary aided schools and Greig City Academy). Consultation for all admission authorities had to be completed by 1 March 2007, and determined by 15 April 2007. The new arrangements would then come into effect from the September 2008 intake.
- 11.2 The Education Act 2002 required Local Authorities to introduce co-ordinated arrangements for admission to Year 7 for all maintained secondary schools in their area from September 2005. Haringey was part of the Pan-London System which was first introduced for the September 2005 intake and which had enjoyed considerable success for secondary school admissions in the Borough. The Pan-London System was now into its third successful year and the report recommended that these arrangements should continue for the 2008/09 school year.
- 11.3 The report included proposed admission arrangements for admission to sixth forms in Haringey community schools and the Haringey Sixth Form Centre and we were also asked to consider whether to approve the arrangements, in particular proposals from the Fortismere Governing Body for sixth form admission arrangements for the 2008/09 school year.
- 11.4 We noted that the first successful co-ordinated system of admission to reception classes had been undertaken last year and that it was recommended that similar arrangements were carried forward to the 2008/09 school year. We also noted that the Haringey Admissions Forum was due to meet on 25 January 2007 to consider these proposals and that the proposed arrangements took into consideration the requirements of the new DfES School Admissions Code currently under consultation.

- 11.5 During the course of our deliberations concern was expressed about the proposals from the Fortismere Governing Body for sixth form admission arrangements for the 2008/09 school year, and we were advised that while the Council would consult on the proposals it did not necessarily support them. There would be a press release which invited people to comment and that following the consultation the Schools Admissions Forum (SAF) would consider and advise and the matter would return to us for decision. Clarification having been sought of the proposed arrangements for admission to the Haringey Sixth Form Centre, we were advised that these matters would need to be taken away for further consideration.
- 11.6 We report that we approved the proposed admission arrangements proposed in the report for consultation for all community primary and secondary schools and St Aidan's Voluntary Controlled Primary School. We also approved the proposed admission arrangements for consultation for sixth form provision in Alexandra Park School, the Highgate/Hornsey Consortium. We delegated authority to approve the proposed arrangements for consultation for the new Sixth Form Centre to the Director of the Children and Young People's Service in consultation with the Executive Member for Children and Young People subject to clarification of the points raised at our meeting.
- 11.7 We granted approval to the proposed admission arrangements for consultation put forward by Fortismere School Governors that would change their entry arrangements to the Sixth Form from 5+ A\*- C to 5+ A\*-B grades and to the proposed consultation for Qualifying Schemes for the co-ordination of arrangements for admission to reception classes in all maintained primary and secondary schools in Haringey and in so doing noted that at secondary level, this would entail the Council's continued participation in the Pan-London Scheme.

## **Leader**

### **12. ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER URGENCY PROCEDURES**

- 12.1 We were informed of the following action taken by a Directors in consultation with an Executive Members.

Employment and Pensions Agreement – Alexandra Palace

Approval to the final version of the Employment and Pensions Agreement which was an addendum to the Master Agreement for Alexandra Palace.

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

- 13.1 We were informed of significant actions which involved expenditure of more than £50,000 taken by Directors under delegated powers.

**Assistant Chief Executive Access**

Application Approval – Projects in Tottenham & Seven Sisters Area Assembly.

Project Appraisal Services for the Bridge NDC.

Variation to the Public-I web casting contract to increase the hours available for multimedia material.