

Chair:
Councillor Charles Adje

Deputy Chair:
Councillor Harry Lister

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report covers matters considered by the Executive at our meeting on 4 October 2005. 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

Health and Social Services

2. COMMUNITY CARE STRATEGY

- 2.1 In October 2004 we agreed, in principle and subject to due process, to the disposal of Cooperscroft Residential Home with vacant possession. Our decision was informed by the market conditions which had prevailed earlier in 2004. During consultation undertaken with residents and relatives a view was expressed that if the Council did not wish to continue to directly manage the home that the option of selling it as a going concern be considered further. We have now considered a report which recommended that a marketing exercise be carried out with a view to disposal in this manner. We were informed that should a disposal on this basis take place there would be implications for the capital programme.
- 2.2 We also received a deputation from the Friends of Cooperscroft who sought assurances from us in connection with a number of concerns which they felt about the proposed marketing of the Home. In this respect we were advised that the tender process to be followed in connection with the marketing of the Home would involve, amongst other things, bids being scrutinised to ensure that they provided for a satisfactory standard of care and bidders being required to make a long term commitment to the provision of care. The numbers of staff to be transferred and the related TUPE arrangements would be the subject of further discussions.
- 2.3 We agreed, in principle to the marketing of Cooperscroft as a going concern and asked that a further report be submitted to us detailing the result of the marketing exercise. We also noted the consequential changes to the Council's capital programme.

Environment and Conservation

3. DRAFT NORTH LONDON SUB-REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

- 3.1 We considered a report which advised us that the draft Sub-Regional Framework (SRDF) had been published in July 2005 for consultation and that the consultation period ended on 28 October 2005. The SRDF would provide non-statutory guidance on the implementation of London Plan policies that affected North London. While it was not a 'mini London Plan' and did not seek to supersede or change the London Plan's policies it did identify policy areas that might need to be considered in the first review of the London Plan and in the Borough's new Local Development Frameworks. The report summarised the key issues for Haringey contained within the draft SRDF and presented suggested responses to the issues for submission to the Mayor of London.
- 3.2 We noted that by accepting the London Plan employment projection the SRDF envisaged that Haringey would not be able to provide sufficient employment opportunities for its growing population and that the Borough would have to increasingly rely on other parts of London to provide job opportunities for its residents which would increase levels of commuting to other parts of London. The implication was that North London's identity would develop as a residential dormitory, rather than as a strategic hub or gateway.
- 3.3 We considered that the relationship between employment, housing and transport needed to be re-assessed to ensure a sustainable balance between future population and economic growth. In endorsing the responses suggested in the report we agreed that we would wish to discuss these points further at a Leader's Conference on Sustainable Communities.

4. HIGHGATE HIGH STREET COMPULSORY PARKING ONE EXTENSION – REPORT OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Following our approval in January 2004 the Highgate High Street CPZ was introduced in March 2004. At the time of our approval we further agreed that the CPZ would be reviewed 6 months post implementation. A review of the zone was carried out in December 2004 (inner roads) and January 2005 (outer roads) which indicated that 74% of respondents from roads on the periphery of the CPZ were in support of being included in an extended zone. In view of the feedback received during the review and the imminent introduction of the Highgate Station CPZ, we subsequently agreed to proceed to statutory consultation for an extension to the Zone.
- 4.2 We considered a report which advised us of the feed back from all interested parties during the statutory consultation process for extending the CPZ in the roads surrounding the Highgate High Street Compulsory Parking Zone (CPZ). The report demonstrated that the statutory requirements for making Traffic Management Orders (TMO's) for CPZ's had been satisfied. As a result the report recommended that the necessary TMO's be formalised for the extension of the Highgate High Street CPZ in roads specified in the report.
- 4.3 In response to questions raised at our meeting we noted that the issue of shared use of bays by residents and businesses could be looked at, that the current proposals were for the introduction of parking controls operational for two hours only between 10 a.m. and noon on Monday to Fridays and that once approval had been granted the Council would seek to formalise the necessary Traffic Management Orders for the extension of the existing Zone.

- 4.4 We report that we noted the feedback of the Statutory Consultation process and in particular, the objections received. We agreed the reasons for providing parking controls as outlined in the report and approved the extension of the Highgate High Street Compulsory Parking Zone (CPZ) for the 2-hours, 10am to noon, on Monday to Friday recommended. We authorised Council officers to make the Traffic Management Order (TMO) and take all the steps necessary for the introduction of a CPZ in the proposed area and, subject to discussions with Camden Council who were the authority for residents on the south side of Hampstead Lane, we also granted approval to the provision of parking bays in Hampstead Lane in conjunction with a review for the existing seasonal waiting restrictions.
- 4.5 Further approvals were granted to the introduction of parking bays along Southwood Lane instead of proposed waiting restrictions where appropriate and to the inclusion of Nos. 87-109 Southwood Lane, including 1-8 Cholmeley Court, in the Highgate Station CPZ. We also agreed that residents should be informed of the Council's decision and works programme by means of a letter delivered to all properties within the consultation area.

5. DEVELOPING PROVISION FOR SKATEBOARDING

- 5.1 We considered a report which advised us that the Environment Scrutiny Panel in November 2004 had considered an initiative to develop skateboarding and other wheeled activity. A number of resolutions had been agreed including how a facility in the west of the Borough could be developed and funded. Priory Park had been identified as the preferred site.
- 5.2 The Haringey Community Strategy, through its Environmental theme, had identified the development of improved provision for children and young people as a priority for the Haringey Strategic Partnership, while declining levels of physical activity amongst the general population had been identified by Government's Chief Medical Officer as a problem of growing significance with serious consequences for both individual health and for healthcare expenditure. Advice issued by the Chief Medical Officer was for children and young people to exercise for at least 60 minutes per day undertaking physical activity at a moderate intensity level. 16% of 2-15 year olds were now classified as obese.
- 5.3 The Council's draft Sport and Physical Activity Strategy sought to enable more local residents to participate in physical activity on a regular basis and levels of participation would form part of the measurable indicators contributing towards the CPA score for cultural service provision. Within Haringey, it had become evident from the number of young people participating in skateboarding that there was significant local demand for this activity. However, a recent consultation exercise has demonstrated that any proposals approved by the Council to develop permanent provision would be opposed by a significant number of the surrounding local communities.
- 5.4 In addition to the report we also received two deputations in connection with the proposals. The first, the 'Somewhere2Skate' group addressed our meeting and spoke about the benefits of having a skate park in their local area, specifically Priory Park. The second deputation, the Friends of Priory Park group also addressed our meeting and spoke about the main points of their representations which were as follows -

- They welcomed the decision not to proceed with plans for converting part of the bowling club green to a skate park
- They wished to register a number of concerns including noise, safety of children, security at night, safety of other park users
- They wished to make suggestions as to alternative sites including the area at the front of St. Mary's School
- They supported proposals for a skate park in principle but not in Priory Park

- 5.5 We noted that following a taster skateboarding exercise in the summer of 2004 discussions had taken place in April 2005 with members of the Friends of Priory Park about options for the location of a skate park within Priory Park. We also noted that following that meeting and the publication in the local press of articles both in favour and against skate boarding, surveys had been undertaken both by the Friends group and local young people with conflicting findings.
- 5.6 We were advised of the consultation exercise that had then been carried out by the Council, the major findings of which were reported to us, that Priory Park would be the venue which would attract the greatest use and that there was general support for the proposed new provision. We were also advised that the Council's Anti-Social Behaviour Unit would support a development at Priory Park as this would alleviate the current usage of Hornsey Town Hall. Concern was expressed at our meeting that the consultation process appeared to have tapered off and that levels of concern felt by residents living within the near vicinity of Priory Park about the proposal remained high. In particular disquiet was voiced about safety and security issues especially at night as well as about the adequacy of first aid arrangements and the potential for noise problems.
- 5.7 Having considered the key issues and analysis arising from the consultation and the representations made to us earlier by the two deputations both for and against the proposals we report that we granted approval in principle to the development of a new skateboarding facility in Priory Park on the site of the basketball area incorporating the management measures outlined in the officer report. In addition we agreed that the facility be reviewed after twelve months operation and a report back be made to us including on
- The views of local residents
 - Safety/security issues particularly the locking of parks gates
 - First aid arrangements
- 5.8 We also agreed that, in conjunction with the Finsbury Park Partnership, both Islington Council and Hackney Council should be approached in order to ascertain the extent of support for a jointly funded facility in Finsbury Park and that, in the short term and pending the development of a new facility in Priory Park, measures be investigated to safeguard the front of the Hornsey Town Hall from damage by skate boarders.

Housing

6. FRAMEWORK FOR ESTABLISHING THE HARINGEY ARMS LENGTH MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION (ALMO) (APPROVAL OF FUNCTIONS)

- 6.1 The proposal to establish an arms length management organisation (ALMO) for the whole of Haringey's Council housing stock, subject to a positive ballot of tenants, was the key recommendation of the resident-led Options Appraisal Steering Group, which reported in November 2004. The Council endorsed the proposal in January 2005 and it received the backing of a majority of tenants in the ballot held in March/April 2005. The key purpose of setting up the ALMO was to obtain ALMO funding (initially estimated to be in the region of £128 million) to enable the Council to meet its duty to achieve the Decent Homes Standard for all of its housing stock by December 2010. To achieve this end the Council would need to improve on service delivery to achieve a 2 star service.
- 6.2 We considered the second in a series of reports on the framework for establishing the ALMO which also set out the decision making timetable for the ALMO bid for funding and the Section 27 application. The report sought our approval to changes to the management of Supported Housing and recommended the separation of the housing management and the support functions in Supported Housing as well as the transfer of the housing management functions and appropriate staffing resources to the Housing Service. The report also detailed how the Anti-Social Behaviour Team (ASBAT) operated and considered the advantages both of the ASBAT continuing to operate within the Council and within the ALMO.
- 6.3 We report that we approved the separation of the Housing Management and the Support functions in Supported Housing as recommended as well as the transfer of the Housing Management functions and appropriate staffing resources into the Housing Service. We also approved the delegation of the decision on the detailed staffing structure to the Directors of Housing and Social Services in consultation with the Executive Members for Housing and Health and Social Services.
- 6.4 We agreed that the Anti-Social Behaviour Team should be retained by the Council and we asked for a further report to facilitate our decision on the location of the function within the Council structure. We also agreed to the top tier structure proposed for the ALMO as outlined in the report and to the delegation to the Director of Housing in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing of the decision on the detailed structure. We noted the critical path for key decisions in implementing the ALMO as detailed in the report.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

7. GREEN PAPER "YOUTH MATTERS"

- 7.1 We considered a report on the Youth Green Paper which had been issued on 18 July with a response date for the consultation of 4 November 2005. We noted that this paper had far reaching consequences for the future of the Connexions Service and the Youth Service. It sought to consult stakeholders on the future of these services and introduce a new combined "Youth Support Service" offering information, advice, guidance and support for all young people aged 13 to 19. The proposals also set out new standards of delivery

for services to all young people and in particular for those young people deemed to be at the edge of society, and at risk of social and economic exclusion.

- 7.2 The Green Paper included a number of new funding arrangements for youth services and an important change to the way such services were commissioned. For the first time the Government had set out the provision of information, advice, guidance and support for young people as a “duty” of local authorities. This paper outlined the major details of the proposed changes to policy for the provision of Youth Services it also explained the proposed consultation process to provide an informed response by the 4 November deadline. The report contained an executive summary of the Green Paper together with an outline of the initial findings of the preliminary consultation.
- 7.3 The Green Paper heralded a new focus on services for young people and addressed many of the issues raised by local authorities concerning the co-ordination and management of the provision of activities to offer the information, advice, guidance and support that young people required. We noted from the detail of this report that Haringey’s Youth Service and the arrangements already in place for this provision within the North London Connexions Partnership placed the Borough ahead of most partnerships. These factors coupled with the Children’s Service drive to involve more stakeholders including children, young people and parents within the evaluation of services and the future planning they required, put Haringey in a strong position to lead the country in the preparation of a new Youth Support Service.
- 7.4 We also noted that Members had already been involved within the deliberations for the future of these services and that the Member’s Working Group on Youth led on these changes and in the response to the Green Paper. The Youth Service had been and continued to co-ordinate the consultation arrangements which were gathering information and comment to feed back to the Department for Education and Skills.
- 7.5 We report that we agreed to the continuation of the consultation process as outlined and to the delegation for the responsibility of agreeing to the Council’s response to the Green Paper ‘Youth Matters’ to the Director of the Children’s Service in consultation with the Member Working Group on Youth.

8. DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SIXTH FORM CENTRE AT WHITE HART LANE

- 8.1 We considered a report which advised us that the Council’s new Sixth Form Centre would be located on a site previously occupied by Middlesex University in White Hart Lane, Tottenham. The site was situated in the east of the Borough and adjacent to White Hart Lane railway station. The new sixth form centre would give 1200 students across Haringey, but mainly in the east, a world class learning facility. The new Centre was designed to be inspirational in nature and would aspire to attract both talented students and those who would not normally consider continuing their education post 16. For this reason, it would have to be seen by the young people of Haringey and the wider community as a purpose-built facility designed to maximise educational opportunities in east Haringey for the 21st century.

- 7.3 The new Centre would take into account the recommendations made by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) area - wide inspection of 2002. In particular it would raise standards by:
- building upon the improvement in standards now being achieved in east Haringey secondary schools;
 - improving retention rates post 16 in the east of the borough (and reducing NEETs) by offering an exciting environment with a much broader range of academic and vocational courses than was on offer at present within the secondary school sixth forms;
 - reducing drop out rates at 17 caused by inappropriate choices post Key Stage 4, by providing a cohesive and impartial careers and pastoral advisory service from Year 9 onwards;
 - reducing the large outflow of Haringey students to other post-16 centres by offering a rich and balanced curriculum within a stimulating and modern learning environment;
 - attracting gifted and talented students who would drive up standards and levels of attainment for all students;
 - providing a rewarding environment for students who would not normally consider education post 16 by providing access to entry level and level 1 courses;
 - promoting a twin track approach to vocational and academic qualifications with students able to switch easily between the two; and
 - acting as a community resource by being a fully extended centre.
- 7.4 We noted that the proposed start on site date for 'site set-up' was Monday 18 October 2005 in order to facilitate site security, demolition of existing buildings, site clearance and ground works prior to the award of the Stage 2 contract for the start of construction works on the 27 January 2006. A joint planning application had been submitted which comprised the Sixth Form Centre, Residential Housing and a Care Home, the latter two developments to be undertaken by Inner Circle. Discussions had taken place with Planning Officers to consider the design approach and details of the scheme. We also noted that approval of the Agreed Maximum Price (AMP) would not be made prior to receipt of planning permission and that the anticipated date for AMP was late January 2006. Purchase of the site for the 6th Form Centre had been completed on 31 August 2005.
- 7.5 We report that we approved the proposed improvement programme for 2005/6 and in so doing noted that it had two strands of work which focussed on planning for major renewal and general improvement respectively, and was informed by external standards and assessment, condition audits, surveys, and 'Friends' feedback. The total programme spend was £1.77million of which 8% (£137,000) was committed to feasibility work on 4 major renewal sites, and 92% to refurbishment works across 26 sites.
- 7.6 Having noted the tender process development we report that we resolved to award the contract for the design and construction of the new 6th Form Centre in White Hart Lane be awarded to Willmott Dixon subject to:
- The Director of the Children's Service and the Director of Finance in consultation with the Executive Member for Children and Young People and the Leader of the Council, finalising the details of the contract;

- Construction costs not exceeding £22,490,000 (including Contractor design fees) within the approved budget for the scheme of £28,570,000 (including professional fees not novated, fixed furniture and equipment and information technology).