

Chair:
Councillor George Meehan

Deputy Chair:
Councillor Lorna Reith

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report covers matters considered by the Executive at our meeting on 20 February 2007. 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

Organisational Development and Performance

2. THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE – DECEMBER 2006

- 2.1 We considered a report which set out the routine financial and performance monitoring for December 2006 in the balanced scorecard format. In summary the balanced scorecard showed that for the excellent service perspective 75% of indicators were on target or close to the end of year target at the end of December. For 25 of the 36 (69%) customer focus measures, including the latest resident's survey results, performance targets were being met or close to being met. For financial health 24 of the 33 measures traffic lighted achieved amber or green status meaning for 73% 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 14 of the 17 (82%) measures, performance was at or close to expected levels. Overall 74% of indicators were achieving or close to achieving target. In addition 74% of indicators had maintained or improved performance since the end of last year. The scorecard appendix we considered also 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.
- 2.2 With regard to finance and in summary, based on the December position, the revenue budget showed a £0.1m underspend. 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.

2.3 Under the Constitution, certain virements were key decisions. Key decisions were:

- 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.

Period	Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Description
9	Environment	Cap	125		Additional TFL grant mainly for Principal Road renewal at High Road N22 (£100k).
9	Environment	Cap	60		Emergency works at Ashley Road Depot funded from capital receipts
9	All	Rev*	343		Approved additional NRF projects to mitigate the risk of potential underspend in the 2006/07 NRF programme.
9	Chief Executives	Rev	20		Transfer of Members Services underspend to IT.
9	Chief Executives	Cap	21		Allocation of balance of Muswell Hill receipt (HERS) (£16k) and other external contribution (£5k) to Green Lanes project

3. PROGRAMME HIGHLIGHT REPORT – DECEMBER 2006

- 3.1 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.
- 3.2 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 December 2006.
- 3.3 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 December had been –
- Primary Schools – the concerns surrounding the current programme and finances had been considered in detail and the updated position presented within the overall capital programme for the Council. The programme was part of the financial planning report approved by us on 23 January and reported to the Council on 5 February 2007.

- Children's Centres – the 2005-06 phase 1 overspend would be contained within the overall 2006-07 Children and Young People's Service Capital Programme. Phase 2 was being further considered in the light of experience from Phase 1 and an updated revised detailed programme for Phase 2 would be produced before the start of the 2007-08 financial year.
- Procurement – this project had a target of £2m of savings, equally split over 2005/06 and 2006/07. Only £0.2m was achieved in 2005/06 with the remaining £0.8m rolled into 2006/07 to create a revised 2006/07 figure of £1.8m. Of this, £0.8m was forecast to be achieved by the end of the current year. Approval to re-phase the remaining £1m across 2007/08 & 2008/09 had been given in the 2007/08 budget process with a review of further potential projects underway jointly with directorates via the Procurement Stream Board. The revised target was now significantly more likely to be achieved.

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

Children and Young People

4. BIG LOTTERY FUND CHILDREN'S PLAY PROGRAMME – PORTFOLIO OF PROJECTS FOR THE HARINGEY BID

- 4.1 We considered a report which advised us that the Children Act 2004 recognised that the enjoyment of recreation, including play, was one of the key Every Child Matters outcomes for children. In November 2005 following on from the Act, the Big Lottery Fund (BLF) announced details of a new Children's Play programme which was subsequently launched in March 2006. The BLF's Children's Play programme required that the Council develop a portfolio of projects that focused on areas of greatest need and contributed to the Council's ability to deliver the five portfolio outcomes and the overall outcomes detailed within the Haringey Play Strategy. All local authorities were required to produce a play strategy and an audit of play provision. Haringey's Play Strategy (which had been developed with a range of stakeholders) accompanied the report.
- 4.2 The BLF would assess play strategies using the *Play England – Planning for Play Guidance* on the development and implementation of a local play strategy and portfolios would be assessed using the BLF Guidance. Play England advised that both the play strategy and the portfolio would be given equal weighting and that local authorities would be required to submit detailed information for each project to be included in the portfolio and a rationale for how it related to the Play Strategy.
- 4.3 We noted that the BLF Children's Play Programme had four funding rounds in July 2006, November 2006, March 2007 or September 2007. We also noted that Play England who had been commissioned by the BLF to support the Children's Play Programme had provided informal feedback from BLF that none of the 19 portfolios submitted in July 2006 had been accepted. In the second round (November 2006) 40 portfolios had been submitted and as at the time of our meeting only five have been approved. Our officers had taken account of the feedback on these and subsequent bids in an effort to ensure that our bid was successful. The BLF has made it known that Authorities who submitted

in September 2007 would not be allowed the additional “pausing” time given to those who submitted to the three previous deadline dates. “Pausing” time was the additional time given to Authorities to provide clarification, if needed, on their Bid portfolio.

- 4.4 We were advised that seventeen applications had been received to the Haringey BLF portfolio in the initial round with a total value of twice the amount of grant. Post tender negotiations aimed to refine the bids to ensure viable and sustainable outcomes and the success of the Strategy and the BLF Play Portfolio had been undertaken. These bids had been further evaluated against the criteria and the evaluation panel had focussed on a range of projects that covered the full of breadth of the Haringey portfolio outcomes. While it was possible for organisations to bid for a project that was predominantly revenue based, a cap of £100,000 had been placed on organisations wishing to do so. It was recognised that projects aimed at providing greater play opportunities for children with disabilities would require revenue funding but the Council would not pay revenue costs once BLF funds had ceased and it was made clear as part of the process that bidders had to set out how they intended to fund their project once BLF funds came to an end. This would also be set out in the contracts for the successful bidders.
- 4.5 Guidance received required that the Council developed a portfolio of projects that focused on:
- Areas of greatest need;
 - Contribution to the Council’s ability to deliver the five portfolio outcomes; and
 - The overall outcomes detailed within the Haringey Play Strategy.

We were also advised that it was a requirement of the BLF that the Play Strategy demonstrated that it had the support of key departments within the Local Authority as well as the support from the Voluntary and Community Sector.

- 4.6 We report that we agreed the list of short-listed providers shown below compiled in accordance with the Council’s Contract Standings Orders open tendering process. Together these met the full range of outcomes within the Haringey Play Strategy as expected by BLF -

- Haringey Play Association – Somerford Grove Adventure Playground
- Markfield - A service to disabled children and their siblings (The project's services are open to disabled and non disabled children).
- Parks Service – Markfield Park
- Parks Service – Lordship Recreation Ground
- Parks Service – Chestnuts Park
- Parks Service – Priory Park
- Ludotek, Toy Library
- Haringey Youth Service

	(£)
Total Programme Cost	702,884
Total Programme Management Costs	78,098
Total BLF Programme Cost	780,982

5. POST COMPULSORY DISCRETIONARY AWARDS

- 5.1 The Council will be aware that since 1999 and in accordance with the Mandatory Award Regulations for ordinary residence in the UK and the grant and fee rates, it has been our general policy not to offer any new discretionary awards in respect of both the cost of fees and maintenance grants. No new Post Compulsory Discretionary Awards have been offered since 1998/99 financial year. On this basis no budgetary provision has been made for Post Compulsory Discretionary Awards.
- 5.2 However, potential students were eligible to apply if there were exceptional circumstances and we considered a report which advised us that the amounts that had been awarded in the past ranged from approximately £1,200 - £1,300 per student per year. In any one year only 2 – 3 students applied. Awards were given by application and consideration would be given to applicants' financial background, depending on the income of the household and the extent to which the student could secure funding from other sources.
- 5.3 We noted that the discretionary awards system had been established to assist students to gain second degrees, for which little or no other funding was available but that the situation had now changed and there were a range of other funding that students might access. Having also noted that the Council was required to publish their decision as widely as possible we report that we approved a determination not to take up the power to grant Post Compulsory Discretionary Awards in 2007/08 financial year. We also agreed that the Notice of the Determination be published on the Council's website and that the College of North East London, Haringey Adult Learning Service and the Sixth Form Centre, be informed accordingly. We further agreed that, in future, authority to agree the Notice of Determination be delegated to the Director of the Children and Young People's Service in consultation with the Executive Member for Children and Young People.

Enterprise and Regeneration

6. GLS SITE - LEGAL AGREEMENT WITH THE OWNERS FOR GROWTH AREA FUNDING

- 6.1 We considered a report that advised us that the Council had successfully bid for £2.502m for the GLS site from the Growth Area Fund (GAF) Round 2. The grant was to be used to:
- Provide direct pedestrian and vehicular access through an improved and refurbished bridge under Ferry Lane, which was a busy road to the south of the site for the existing communities from the Ferry Lane Estate into the Hale Village development;
 - Construct a seamless pedestrian concourse from the current road level into the site;
 - Remove the existing underground air raid shelters;
 - Carry out enabling works which provided for potential bridge links across the railway to the west and across the River Lea to the east; and
 - Un-culvert a watercourse to provide an enhanced setting and element of open space and a Sustainable Urban Drainage System which would contribute to enhancing the setting and open space provision within the Lee Valley Regional Park, within which this culvert laid.

- 6.2 We were advised that although the grant was from the Central Government, the Council was acting as administrator as with the other GAF projects and that a funding agreement for this grant had been entered into with the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) in July 2006. However, as the site was in private ownership it was necessary for the Council to enter into a legal agreement with the owners to release the money as the works progressed. The legal agreement would protect the Council's position should a situation arise where the money had to be clawed back or suspended by the DCLG.
- 6.3 We were also advised that the agreement would be drafted to reiterate the conditions stipulated in the GAF Funding Agreement which had been signed by the Council with DCLG. It would also emphasise the Council's position regarding issues around potential claw back and suspension of funds. The general principles within the agreement would be as follows:
- It would have the same time limit as the DCLG agreement for consistency;
 - It would deal specifically with the development and works associated with the grant itself;
 - It would deal with systems for dispute resolution;
 - It would make reference to the DCLG agreement where applicable including, for example, the milestones agreed in the DCLG agreement.
- 6.4 Having noted that a signed legal agreement between the Council and the owners of the GLS site (Ferryboat Properties Ltd) was required to ensure the Council's legal and financial positions regarding the funds were secure and that the proposed agreement was the most effective way of securing the Council's position, we report that we authorised the preparation and signing of a funding agreement with Ferryboat Properties Ltd for a total GAF grant sum of £2,502,000.

Housing

7. RENT AND TENANTS SERVICE CHARGE INCREASES 2007/08

- 7.1 We considered a report which sought our approval to the rent and service charge increases for tenants for 2007/08. The Council will be aware that we had been complying with the Government's Rent Restructuring policy since it was introduced in 2003/04. This required rents to converge on "Formula" rents by 2011 and included caps and limits to moderate "Formula" rents and to constrain individual increases in any one year. Last year, the Government applied a new 'ceiling' of 5% on the average rent increase, the effects of which on local authority's income were compensated for in Subsidy. Due to the low inflation rate last year (2.7%) the Council's increase was below this level and so the 'ceiling' did not come into effect.
- 7.2 We were informed that in calculating the 2007 increase, the September 2007 RPI of 3.6% (and formulae set out in the Housing Subsidy Determination) meant that the "Formula" rent increase was significantly higher than last year which resulted, after the application of the same caps and limits of last year, in a calculated average increase of

6.2% for 2007, assuming a 5% increase for Hostels. The 5% ceiling would therefore come into effect.

- 7.3 Within the average increase of 6.2% (£3.735 million), there was a large range of rent increases (and decreases) on individual properties as a result of the application of the rent restructuring formula. The Council had discretion over how to reduce the average increase by 1.2% down to the ceiling, although the Government's expectations were that the spirit of rent restructuring should be observed. Further constraints were that the application should not be "unreasonable", and that the application should not be such as to be disproportionately loaded onto Housing Benefit. The reduction of 1.2% represented some £610,000 in rent income regardless of the method used to contain the increase to 5%.
- 7.4 With the agreement of the Council, Homes for Haringey consulted tenants on the options available to contain the overall rent increase to 5%. The consultation response agreed with the preferred option of the Council that an average increase of 5% should be applied by setting a maximum increase of £3.60 per dwelling. The proposed rent and service charge increase were incorporated within the Housing Revenue Account budget approved by the Council on 5 February 2007. The increases were assumed in the balanced budget position reported and it was noted that the capping regime had resulted in a shortfall of potential rental income of £610,000.
- 7.5 We report that we approved the average rent increase of 5% with a maximum increase per property of £3.60 and the tenant service charge increases as set out below –
- Due to the low take up of garages the rents for these were not increased.
 - All general service charges be increased in line with the higher cost of running the services. The general level of pay and price inflation on these services in 2007/08 was 2.9% and these charges were increased by this percentage.
 - For lighting and heating, the increases were based upon prices negotiated by Corporate Procurement and the allowance of a further anticipated increase of 10% in September 2007. The weighted average annual increase in 2007/08 was 16.46% for gas related charges and 14.8% for electricity related service charges and lighting and heating charges were increased by these percentages

8. REGISTERED SOCIAL LANDLORD (RSL) PREFERRED PARTNERS

- 8.1 We considered a report which advised us that there were nearly 50 Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) with stock holdings in Haringey and that a third of these have developed new homes in Haringey in recent years. The Housing Corporation had a formal structure of preferred development partners to undertake the current two year grant funded programme (2006-8) and its recent consultation document on Future Investment strongly pointed to future grant funded programmes being limited to a relatively small number of preferred partners.
- 8.2 The report proposed that we could more efficiently direct our resources by adopting similar arrangements on delivery of new housing development by focusing on a group of preferred partners. Such a strategic approach would enable a stronger working

relationship to evolve with a smaller group of dedicated developing associations in Haringey and would provide incentives for them to improve their services as landlord and play a wider role in community initiatives in the Borough. The successful parties would devise and agree a protocol with the Council covering such issues as delivery of the development programme, promotion of positive working relations between the RSLs and the Council, performance expectations (for example in tackling local and neighbourhood problems) and ways to resolve disputes between the parties.

- 8.3 RSLs that were not selected as preferred partners would still have an important role to play as landlords in the Borough. They would not be ruled out of future development as up to 20% of the new programme each year might be set aside for special initiatives. Smaller, specialist and Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) associations or those seeking occasional development opportunities would be encouraged to channel their new housing projects through one of the selected RSLs.
- 8.4 Following a process begun by the Chief Executive's Management Board sixteen submissions had been received from RSLs which were scored individually with weightings applied in respect of development delivery (50%), landlord performance (20%), community and neighbourhood investment (20%) and organisational effectiveness (10%). Of the sixteen submissions made, six scored more than 50% of the maximum potential scores allocated against the questionnaire. A second stage in the selection process was held with Member involvement with visits being made to the RSLs with seventh and eighth place scores from Stage 1 together with two of the top six placed RSLs and informal presentations being given. Following Stage 2 it was agreed that the top six RSLs be recommended as preferred partners.
- 8.5 The six highest scores were recorded by the following:
- Circle Anglia;
 - London and Quadrant;
 - Metropolitan Housing Group;
 - Presentation;
 - Servite Houses; and
 - Family Mosaic Group.

Four of these housing associations were major volume developing housing associations in the north sub-region, one is the largest BME in London in terms of stock and current allocation, while Servite was a smaller scale developer with a positive emphasis on working in Haringey. These six RSLs were landlords for over 40% of the housing association stock in the Borough.

- 8.6 We noted that if we supported selection of the above-named RSLs, officers were satisfied that the full spectrum of housing needs could be met in ongoing new development programmes (including affordable housing for the homeless and general needs, home buy, intermediate housing, and special or supported housing) and that some of these associations had previously acted as development agents for smaller or specialist organisations in Haringey, and had active working relationships with several RSLs who were not being recommended for selection as full preferred partners in this

exercise. We also noted that a robust performance management and monitoring system would be put in place.

- 8.7 We report that we approved the six named Registered Social Landlords as the Council's preferred partners and asked that a further report be submitted to us on the protocol to be agreed with the successful partners especially in relation to performance management monitoring arrangements and including on the question of a possible probationary period.

Community Involvement

9. THE BRIDGE NDC DRAFT DELIVERY PLAN 2007/08

- 9.1 The Council will be aware that the Bridge NDC Partnership Board Partnership Board has been operating through three themes:

- Neighbourhood Services (Housing, Environment and Crime)
- Education, Employment and Enterprise and
- Health, Social Care, Sport and Leisure.

- 9.2 The Partnership Board was required to produce an annual delivery plan, which set down its plans for the coming year and to set the budget forecast for its programme to 2011. We considered a report which advised us that, for next year (2007/08) the draft Delivery Plan which set out the strategic vision of the Partnership Board for the delivery of the programme had to be submitted to Government Office for London (GOL) by 16 March 2007. We noted that at the time of our meeting the draft Plan was still at the "work in progress" stage as the Partnership Board had lately received notification of a revised funding allocation for 2007/08 and was still working through some of the revised detail with its key partners.

- 9.3 The Partnership's priorities for 2007/08 and beyond were to invest resources to meet community priorities -

- To change the face of The Bridge NDC area, which includes delivery of Wards Corner, 341-379 Seven Sisters Road and St Ann's Bridge
- To target and challenge crime and grime
- To raise local expectations for improved services
- To challenge service partners to improve service delivery
- To create and /or work with sustainable local partnerships to continue to drive high service standards after the NDC lifetime

- 9.4 These priorities would remain central to the delivery of the programme. Also, there was now an emphasis on the capital programme which provided some of the facilities underpinning good sustainable service provision including the new building for the Triangle Children's , Young People and Community Centre. The Delivery Plan 2006/07 delivered the new Children's Centre and the external, security and environmental improvements to homes and defensible space on the Suffolk Road Estate.

9.5 The Board's policy development had been influenced by the joined up working with the Council on the Haringey's Local Area Agreement and the Board was committed to assisting with the development of the four blocks of the LAA:

- Safer Stronger Communities
- Healthier Communities and Older People
- Children and Young People
- Economic Development and Enterprise

The NDC Partnership was also working to add value to the delivery of the objectives of the Haringey Community Plan.

9.6 We noted that both the Bridge New Deal for Communities draft Delivery Plan Programme for 2007/08 and the final Delivery Plan were subject to the approval of the GOL and, having also noted the Council's critical role as Accountable Body both in supporting and delivering the Bridge New Deal for Communities programme, we report that we endorsed the Bridge New Deal for Communities draft Delivery Plan Programme for 2007/08.

Environment

10. REVIEW OF POLICY AND TECHNICAL GUIDANCE FOR VEHICLE CROSSOVERS

10.1 We considered a report which proposed revised technical guidance for footway vehicular crossovers to reflect a greater emphasis on sustaining the street scene environment and which sought our approval to adopt the revised guidance for use in determining future applications for crossovers. The report also sought our approval to revised fees and charges associated with requests for the construction of crossovers. In connection with this report we also received a deputation of concerned residents who spoke in general support of the proposals contained in the report.

10.2 We noted that following an in depth review to evaluate existing policy officers were proposing modifications to current guidance notes for crossovers which reflected the Council's commitment to the Nottingham Declaration to reduce greenhouse gases by stipulating more stringent controls on crossover applications. While these controls were designed, where possible, to protect the existing 'green' street scene environment because of permitted development rights the Council could not prevent residents turning their front gardens into hard standing areas, except in Article 4 designated areas. (An Article 4 Direction gave the Council special powers under the 1995 General Development Order to restrict permitted development rights for householders).

10.3 In cases where residents were in the habit of driving illegally over the footway the Council had powers to:

- install physical barriers to prevent continued illegal use and hence prevent damage to the footway; and /or
- effect legal action.

The Council did and would continue to take enforcement action in such circumstances.

10.4 A number of new changes to the policy for crossovers and hard standing areas were proposed -

New Crossover Controls:

- In considering an application, the Council would assess the need for safe and efficient operation of an existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Applications would be refused where it was deemed that the construction of a crossover and subsequent loss of parking spaces would have a detrimental impact to on-street parking within a CPZ.
- The proposed application fee for a preliminary site visit and preparation of a cost estimate was increased from £50 to £100 to reflect the actual cost to the Council.
- The cost of installing access bars across constructed crossovers was to be retained at £60. (Access bars were only advisory and were not enforceable by law, although the Council had powers to remove vehicles parked across these bars and reported as denying access to a hard standing via a crossover.)
- The cost of amending Traffic Management Orders for a crossover in a CPZ would be recovered through a charge of £1,300.
- Construction costs would rise annually to reflect inflationary increases and supervision, administration and overhead charges would remain at 40% of construction costs.

Hardstanding Controls:

- There must be sufficient space within the boundary of the property to ensure a parked vehicle did not overhang the footway. Vehicles must be parked at 90 degrees to the carriageway and forecourts must be a minimum of 4.8m deep.
 - Where the hard standing involved removal of soft landscaped gardens within the property, the applicant must arrange to keep the hard surface to a minimum (where feasible and practical). This could be achieved by creating two paved tracks wide enough to accommodate the car wheels. However, applicants were to be strongly advised to consult with the Planning and Development section for further guidance and advice to ensure proposed works did not detract from the character of the surroundings and drainage was not compromised.
- 10.5 A list of all the conditions for both crossovers and hard standing areas was appended to the report and the Planning Department had produced a guide to householders called 'Greening Your Home' and was intending further awareness raising activities on the negative impact of front garden parking. Copies of 'Greening Your Home' were available on the Council's web site. We were advised that since the proposed criteria were more stringent than the current conditions it was anticipated that the number of crossover applications would reduce. Currently the Council received around 500 applications a year with 20% of these typically being followed through to construction.
- 10.6 With regard to the representations made to us earlier by the deputation we resolved that the policy in relation to crossovers should be reviewed again in six months time and that, in the meantime, the Executive Member for Environment meet with members of the deputation to discuss their representations further. We approved the technical standards in order to determine future applications for crossovers set out in an Appendix to the report and we agreed the new charging mechanism as set out below -

Ref No.	Item	Current Charge (£)	Proposed Charge (£)
1.	Crossover application and estimate	50	100
2.	Light duty crossovers (construction and supervision),	500	530*
3.	Medium duty crossovers (construction and supervision),	750	800*
4.	Heavy duty crossover (construction and supervision)	1200	1270*
5.	Painting of Access Bars (white lines in front of crossovers)	60	60
6.	Traffic Management Order amendments	0	300

* Denotes annual price increase to rates in the term contract to cover price increase in materials and labour.

11. REVIEW OF PARKING FEES AND CHARGES

- 11.1 We initially considered a report on this matter at our meeting on 23 January 2007 arising from which we authorised officers to commence statutory consultation under the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 on proposed changes affecting fees and parking charges policy for residents' and visitors permits, disabled drivers badges, car parks and pay and display bays as summarised in a table appended to the report. We also noted that a report on the responses to consultation together with information on any other relevant factors that we should consider would be presented to a future meeting for decision. The Director of Urban Environment was authorised to approve the Essential Permits Scheme being revised with the implementation of a new scheme in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment and Conservation.
- 11.2 However, our decision was subject to a call in under Part I3 of the Constitution and following consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee it was referred back to us for further consideration with a recommendation that the proposed consultation period for the Parking Fees and Charges be increased from three to six weeks. We were also asked to take account of concerns voiced by Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee over the consultation process, and to ensure that a revised consultation strategy was put in place.
- 11.3 Having considered the recommendation of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and noted the concerns expressed we report that we approved the proposed consultation period for the Parking Fees and Charges being increased from three to six weeks and to a revised consultation strategy.

Leader

12. ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER URGENCY PROCEDURES

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

Review of Parking Fees and Charges

Approval to correction of typographical errors in report presented to us on 23 January as follows –

- Appendix D where the charge that applied to band 2 of the emissions based charging structure in relation to second and subsequent permits per household read £50 instead of £60 as in the main body of the report.
- Page 6 of the main body of the report, bands 3 and 4 corrected to read '151 – 180 CO2 g/km and 186 CO2 g/km and over respectively'.

Council Mortgage Interest Rates – 1 April to 30 September 2007

Approval to a Statutory Declaration of the Council's Local Average Rate of Interest of 7.49% to be applied to all of the Council's variable rate mortgages with effect from 1 April 2007.

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.

Director of Corporate Resources

ICT Technical & Design Consultancy for New 6th Form Centre & Building Schools for the Future Programme - Award of Contract to ICT Technical and Design Consultancy to Cambridge Education Ltd. in the sum of £249,930.