

Chair:  
Councillor George Meehan

Deputy Chair:  
Councillor Lorna Reith

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This report covers matters considered by the Cabinet at our meeting on 18 December 2007. 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.

## **ITEMS OF REPORT**

### **Regeneration and Enterprise**

#### **2. CENTRAL LEESIDE AREA ACTION PLAN**

- 2.1 The Council will be aware that the Central Leaside Area Action Plan (CLAPP) is a piece of joint work with Enfield Council which aims to provide an investment and improvement framework for this particular area. The process for developing an Area Action Plan (AAP) for Central Leaside was approved by the Council in January 2007 and the Plan was included in Haringey's Local Development Scheme.
- 2.2 We considered a report which sought our approval for public consultation for the draft Issues and Options report for Central Leaside for public consultation in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. The Issues and Options report represented the first public consultation stage and will be followed by a further public consultation on the preferred options and an Examination in Public.
- 2.3 The aim of the Issues and Options Paper is to raise issues that need to be tackled in the area and the set out a number of options which could offer viable solutions to the challenges facing the Central Leaside. These options will be further assessed in the light of consultation responses and in terms of their viability and sustainability. The next step will be drawing up preferred options for further consultation.
- 2.4 Internal consultation on the development of issues and options included reports to the Regeneration Stream Board and Transforming Tottenham Members Working group. A site visit was arranged for officers and Northumberland Park and Tottenham Hale Ward Members in November 2007.
- 2.4 We report that we approved the Central Leaside Area Action Plan Issues and Options report for public consultation and we also agreed that authority to make any necessary minor changes to the Issues and Options report prior to public consultation be delegated to

the Director of Urban Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Enterprise and Regeneration.

### **3. CORE STRATEGY – ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1 The Core Strategy was a strategic document which sought to co-ordinate and deliver other strategies, plans and programmes, based on the concept of spatial planning. There was no single definition of spatial planning, but it could be defined by six principles:

- Should provide a vision of how an area will develop and change
- A strategy that goes beyond land use planning
- Strengthens community involvement
- Helps to deliver other strategies and programmes
- Is flexible and responds to the need for change
- Is focused on implementation

3.2 We considered a report which sought our approval to the Core Strategy Issues and Options report for public consultation in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. The Core Strategy would replace the key policies and objectives of the Unitary Development Plan. The Issues and Options report represented the first public consultation stage and would be followed by a further two public consultation stages and an examination in public. The Core Strategy built on the Sustainable Community Strategy and the Council's key strategies and policies.

3.3 We report that we approved the Core Strategy Issues and Options report for public consultation and we also agreed that authority to make any necessary minor changes to the Issues and Options report prior to public consultation be delegated to the Director of Urban Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Enterprise and Regeneration.

### **4. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2006/07**

4.1 We considered a report which advised us that local planning authorities were required to produce an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) under Section 35 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Regulation 48 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. The AMR reported to us covered the period April 2006 to March 2007 and it was a requirement that it be submitted to the Secretary of State by 31 December 2007. The publication of the AMR was also subject to a Best Value Performance Indicator (BV 200c).

4.2 The AMR 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 the emerging Local Development Framework. It also contained a monitoring framework that identified targets and indicators, which would be used to assess the performance and effectiveness of the UDP objectives and key policies. The report also identified on-going issues of data collection and analysis.

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

## **Environment and Conservation**

### **5. INTRODUCTION OF FREE NATIONAL OFF PEAK BUS TRAVEL FOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED PEOPLE AND IMPLICATIONS FOR HARINGEY**

- 5.1 We considered a report which advised us that the Government was to introduce a national off peak free travel concession for elderly and disabled people from 1 April 2008. The key impact for Local Authorities was that there would be a statutory requirement to provide a free off peak bus concession in Greater London for all elderly and disabled people whether their sole or principal residence was in Greater London or elsewhere in England. We noted that this would have two implications for Haringey, namely that the cost of the scheme would rise and, secondly, that there was a need to bring the qualifying criteria for the disabled persons freedom pass in line with national legislation.
- 5.2 We also noted that the increased cost of the Freedom Pass scheme was as a result of the additional routes and journeys which would be covered. The Government would be giving authorities extra grant, and while the London Councils were pressing for full reimbursement of all additional costs, the extra cost and amount of grant was still unclear. Haringey currently had by far the highest number of disabled freedom passes in issue across London and it was estimated that aligning the qualifying criteria of the disabled persons freedom pass with national legislation would generate savings of approximately £100,000 annually on the concessionary travel budget.
- 5.3 All existing disabled freedom pass holders were to be asked to submit new applications which would be re-assessed over the coming months in advance of the 2008/9 re-issue ensuring that they still met the criteria. Those applications would be assessed only in line with national legislation and those not meeting the national criteria would not be issued with a disabled freedom pass for April 2008.
- 5.4 The London Councils carried out the apportionment biannually. The next apportionment was to be carried in next year and would be based on the total number of freedom passes issued between February and September 2008. The savings referred to above would, as such, be achieved in the following year in 2009/10.
- 5.5 We report that we noted the introduction of the new national bus pass and the implications arising for Haringey and we agreed to align the criteria for the disabled freedom pass to the seven categories of disabled person defined in national legislation and set out below -
- people who were blind or partially sighted
  - people who were profoundly or severely deaf
  - people without speech
  - people who had a disability, or had suffered an injury, which had left them with a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to walk
  - people who did not have arms or have a long-term loss of the use of both arms

- people who had a learning disability, defined as, a state of arrested or incomplete development of mind which included significant impairment of intelligence and social functioning
- people who, if they applied for the grant for a licence to drive a motor vehicle under Part III of the Road Traffic Act 1988, would have their application refused pursuant to Section 92 of the Act (physical fitness) otherwise than on the ground of persistent misuse of drugs or alcohol.

## **Children and Young People**

### **6. RE-ORGANISATION OF MOSELLE AND WILLIAM C. HARVEY SPECIAL SCHOOLS**

- 6.1 We considered a report which advised of the conclusion of the statutory consultation on the proposed re-organisation of Moselle and William C Harvey to all-through special schools to form one primary and one secondary special school, both to be part of Inclusive Learning Campuses.
- 6.2 The report also updated us on the progress with the project to site the secondary special school as part of the Inclusive Learning Campus at Woodside High School. We noted that a report on the project to create an Inclusive Learning Campus with a primary special school located on the site of Broadwater Farm primary school was to be brought to us in the coming year.
- 6.3 The Inclusive Learning Campuses project would set the future pattern of provision in Haringey for children and young people with the most severe and profound learning difficulties, including severe autistic spectrum disorders and the re-organisation of Moselle and William C Harvey special schools was the first of three stages to establish a primary and secondary Inclusive Learning Campus. These three stages were:
- The reorganisation of Moselle and William C Harvey Special schools into one primary and one secondary special school. The date of implementation would reflect the opening of the secondary special school to minimise disruption to the children and young people.
  - Building the secondary special school on the campus of Woodside High School, White Hart Lane, as part of the Building Schools for the Future initiative. A £26 million scheme to build and refurbish both the mainstream and special schools.
  - Building the primary special school on the campus of Broadwater Farm Primary school, Moria Close. The cost of this scheme was currently estimated at around £14 million.
- 6.4 The re-organisation of Moselle and William C Harvey special schools involved a set of 'prescribed alterations' to establish a primary and secondary special school. The prescribed alterations were:
- a change of age range each school caters for with one becoming a primary special and the other becoming a secondary special school;

- a change in the admission criteria of children/young people, widening the range of special educational needs for which each school could cater. Allowing both schools to admit pupils with an Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD), Severe Learning Difficulties (SLD) or Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties (PMLD);
- a change in the number of pupils for which each school could cater, to reflect the primary special school accommodating 100 pupils and the secondary special school accommodating 120 pupils. This was an increase of 34 places.

6.5 The number of places available for children and young people in Haringey who had severe and complex learning difficulties would be increased as a result of this proposal, thus reducing our dependency on out of borough places which took children away from their home environment and reduced unnecessary expenditure. The current total of 241 places available would increase to 275. These special school places would be added to by the development of two inclusive provisions attached to two secondary schools, the new secondary school in Heartlands and Alexandra Park Secondary School, for young people with Autism.

6.6 We report that we approved the proposed re-organisation of Moselle and William C. Harvey Special Schools as outlined above.

## **7. REVIEW OF HARINGEY COUNCIL'S SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA AND SCHEME FOR FINANCING SCHOOLS**

7.1 We considered a report which advised us that the School Finance (England) Regulations 2006 required local authorities to consult with their Schools Forums on any proposed changes to their Scheme for Financing Schools or Schools Funding Formula. The report set out the outcome of the autumn term consultation with schools and the Haringey Schools Forum on proposed changes to Haringey's Schools Funding Formula and Scheme for Financing Schools to take effect from 1 April 2008. We noted that the consultation covered proposals to:

- Change the level of funding and the factors used for Additional and Special Educational Needs (AEN/SEN) allocations.
- Change the methodology for allocating funding for teachers on the upper pay scale.
- Insert a new section in Haringey's Scheme for Financing Schools on Community Facilities.
- Increase the proportion of funding for pupils taking free school meals in the primary schools meal factor.

7.2 We were informed that the most significant of these was the proposal on AEN/SEN funding. The narrowing of the gap between the achievement of pupils from deprived and non-deprived backgrounds was a major element of Government policy, as set out in the 2004 Child Poverty Review and the joint Treasury/DCSF report 'Child Poverty: Fair Funding for Schools'. An outcome of this was the requirement for all Schools Forums to review the way they targeted AEN and deprivation in their local Funding Formula. The DCSF had an expectation that funding received through the Dedicated Schools Grant for

deprivation and additional needs should be targeted at improving the achievement of those pupils with the greatest need.

- 7.3 We were also informed that the AEN/SEN Review Group set up by Haringey's Schools Forum had agreed that the methodology for distributing resources for Additional Educational Needs should be based upon the fundamental principle that those children who faced the most significant barriers to learning would require additional resources to support progress and achievement. Such children would include those who experienced social deprivation, special educational needs, or who were drawn from other vulnerable groups including children from some minority ethnic backgrounds. It was expected that these additional funds would be targeted towards additional support for more disadvantaged children and young people. We noted that there was a strong correlation between deprivation and AEN and moderate levels of SEN and it was usual for deprivation factors to be used as proxy measures in allocating funding to meet these needs. Funding for pupils with more complex SEN was usually associated with a statement of special educational needs.
- 7.4 During the current (2007-8) financial year the Council received 16% of its Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) through additional deprivation factors which equated to £21.86 million within the Individual School Budget (ISB). This funding was passed to schools in full through Haringey's school funding formula but only £11 million (8.2%) was allocated through the current deprivation factors which led the Review Group to conclude that schools with high levels of deprivation were not receiving the full benefit of deprivation funding provided through the DSG. The changes proposed in the report would address this by:
- ensuring that the additional deprivation funding received through the DSG was targeted in full by Haringey's funding formula at deprivation in schools;
  - providing a better measure of relative social need by replacing the use of the Index of Multiple Deprivation and stages of English language acquisition as indicators with eligibility for Free School Meals and targeted ethnic minority groups;
  - supporting inclusive learning;
  - ensuring transparency in the process of allocating resources;
  - ensuring that resources are distributed fairly and equitably between schools.
- 7.5 The impact of the changes proposed would be to direct 'headroom', new funding, over and above the uplifts required by the Minimum Funding Guarantee, into AEN/SEN factors rather than into the Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) as at present. This would affect the distribution of resources, redirecting new funding from schools with lower levels of deprivation to those with greater levels. All schools were protected from a fall in cash budgets, unless there were changes in other factors, such as pupil numbers, by the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG). This ensured that all schools had a minimum per pupil increase from one year to the next. The national MFG for 2008/09 to 2010/11 was 2.1%, which had been deliberately set below the rate of inflation as the Government was expecting schools to realise efficiency savings.
- 7.6 The full consultation document had been sent to Head Teachers and to Chairs of Governing Bodies in September 2007. Additionally, letters had been sent to all Governors informing them of the consultation and giving details of the web site where the

detailed consultation could be found. Three 'road shows' were also arranged to discuss the AEN/SEN proposals to which all Head Teachers and Governors were invited and meetings with parents' groups to explain the proposals were continuing.

- 7.7 During the course of our deliberations we also noted the comments of the Chief Financial Officer that the proposed changes would be implemented as quickly as the financial settlement allowed and that the continuation of funding for existing statements that fell between the current and new thresholds for as long as the children remained at their schools and the statements in force might delay the move to funding support for statemented pupils at Scale 4. Whilst welcoming the proposals we sought confirmation of how it would be ensured that these additional funds would be targeted towards additional support for more disadvantaged children and young people and we were advised that while Governing Bodies were autonomous in this respect.
- 7.8 We report that, having regard to the Chief Finance Officers comments outlined above, we approved the proposed amendments to Haringey Councils Schools Funding Formula and Scheme for Financing Schools in accordance with the recommendations agreed by the Schools Forum on 15 November 2007 and set out in the report. We also agreed that a letter be sent to all Head Teachers and Chairs of Governing Bodies of schools receiving additional funds advising them that it was the Council's expectation that the additional resources for Additional Educational Needs would be targeted entirely towards providing support for more disadvantaged children and young people.

## **7. SECONDARY SCHOOLS PRIVATE FINANCE INITIATIVE – DEED OF VARIATION**

- 8.1 The Council will be aware that implementation of the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme is a major strategic objective for the Council that will lead to the modernisation of secondary school buildings and ICT facilities as well as the building of a new secondary school in Wood Green by 2010. BSF funding had also been used to build the new sixth form centre which opened in September.
- 8.2 A Schools Private Finance Initiative (PFI) scheme was entered into in 2000 to refurbish and undertake construction projects on a number of secondary school sites. Part of the risk transference necessary in a PFI contract included the provision of a facilities management services (including utility costs, day-to-day facilities services, routine repairs and maintenance and longer term lifecycle repairs) for a period of 25 years to be provided through HSSL by Jarvis Accommodation Services (JAS).
- 8.3 We considered a report which was the subject of a motion to exclude the press and public and which advised us that in order to implement the new refurbishment and construction Programme for Building Better Schools during the period 2007 and 2011, the Council needed to negotiate a Deed of Variation to the current PFI agreement with Haringey Secondary Schools Ltd (HSSL) to allow the current school buildings to be handed back to the Council during the period of the construction work and then passed back to HSSL on completion. (HSSL was the company to which the Council was contracted for the period of the PFI. They sub-contract the facilities management services to JAS and owned the equity and debt which was used to fund the original construction works under the PFI deal).

- 8.4 Further to the circulated report we received a verbal update from officers on the negotiations to try to resolve the issues arising from implementing the BSF programme with the operation of the current Schools Private Finance Initiative. We also noted that the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had agreed that the decision in respect of this matter was both reasonable in all the circumstances and that it should be treated as a matter of urgency for the purposes of Paragraph 18 of Part 4 Section H of the Constitution and that the call in procedure should not apply to the action being taken.
- 8.5 We report that we agreed that, subject to the notification from the Department of Children, Schools and Families of the temporary suspension of the obligation of Haringey Schools Services Limited to provide facilities management services to those schools currently within the Secondary Schools Private Finance Initiative from 1 January 2008 and of the noting of the intention to transfer employees from Jarvis Accommodation Services Ltd into the Council's employment from that date under TUPE regulations, the Leader in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People and the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be authorised to take any necessary action to ensure the continued delivery of the Facility Management Service in schools and the successful delivery of the Building Schools for the Future programme.

## **Resources**

### **9. FINANCIAL PLANNING 2008/09 – 2010/11**

- 9.1 In the report from our meeting on 20 November which appears earlier on the agenda for this meeting we report on our consideration of the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007 (CSR07) announced on 9 October 2007 by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Pre-Budget Report and on other national issues in relation to the Council's financial and business planning process.
- 9.2 The Council will be aware that the existing budget plans for the three year period 2008/09 to 2010/11 result in a budget gap of £15.2 million. This assumed the achievement of the pre-agreed savings proposals of £16.4 million. The previous planning assumption for council tax was an increase of 3.0% in each of the three years although noting that the Council might wish to reconsider this assumption in due course. A prudent assumption was taken on grant settlement for planning purposes at zero % in each of the three years.
- 9.3 We have now considered a report which provided an update following the draft settlement from Government in terms of -
- 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.

The report was supported by three appendices which dealt with -



- the gross budget trail;
- the resource shortfall through the financial planning process; and
- the draft position for children's services and the dedicated schools grant.

9.4 We were informed that the revised position for the general fund at the existing planned level of council tax increase was a budget gap of £6.95 million in 2008/09 and a budget gap of £7.74 million over the planning period. We were also informed that the final proposals for revenue and capital budgets would come forward in the new year following the conclusion of the scrutiny and consultation process.

9.5 We report that we noted the draft local government settlement and agreed the budget changes and variations proposed. We also noted the overall resource shortfall, prior to our final budget package and the position in respect of council tax, the children's services budget, the HRA budget and the capital programme.

## **10. ASSISTANCE TO ALEXANDRA PALACE AND PARK AND ALEXANDRA PALACE TRADING LTD.**

10.1 The Council will be aware that Alexandra Palace Trading Limited (APTL) is the wholly owned trading subsidiary of the Council as trustee of Alexandra Park & Palace. We considered a report which was subject to a motion to exclude the press and public which asked us to consider granting urgent financial assistance and staff support to Alexandra Palace Trading Ltd. in view of the company's trading position.

10.2 We noted that the Alexandra Park and Palace Board had considered these requests and other related matters and had agreed them subject to the financial support being available from the Council. We also noted that the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had agreed that the decision in respect of this matter was both reasonable in all the circumstances and that it should be treated as a matter of urgency for the purposes of Paragraph 18 of Part 4 Section H of the Constitution and that the call in procedure should not apply to the action being taken.

10.3 We report that having been advised that according to advice from specialist Counsel, the Promotion of Well-being powers in Sections 2-4 of the Local Government Act 2000 were available to the Council in its capacity as local authority notwithstanding any limitations that might prevent the Council in its capacity as a charity trustee from giving financial assistance to APTL. Counsel having also advised that neither the ability to minimise tax on trading profits at the Palace through having a separate trading subsidiary, nor any reputational damage to the Council (as distinct from the Palace as a venue) were legally relevant considerations when Cabinet Members considered whether to exercise the Well-being powers, we agreed to provide conditional support to the Trust.

## **11. DISPOSAL OF HRA DWELLINGS AND LAND**

11.1 The Council will be aware that the Head of Corporate Property Services is required to sell Council property and land that is not suitable for retention in order to produce usable capital receipts required for the Council Budgetary requirements. In the past properties have been approved for disposal either by the Cabinet or by delegation on an individual

basis. We considered a report which was subject to a motion excluding the press and public which advised us that the number of disposals has increased and there was a need for a decision to consolidate these proposed disposals.

- 11.2 The report sought to collate all larger disposals expected from December 2007 to 2009/2010 into one report and to meet the Council's budgetary requirements. This would allow a programmed approach to disposals to be taken and the effect of disposals on the overall borough resources and needs to be seen which previously had not been possible. However, we noted that there might also be further non urgent or minor disposals that would need to be dealt with by delegation or individual Cabinet reports as necessary, but at this time it was not possible to quantify their value or timescale for disposal.
- 11.3 The properties considered not suitable for retention were listed in order of priority for disposal and for clarity. We were also asked to note that in future a more stringent audit trail and procedure on the disposal of HRA land to Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) would be adopted. This had become necessary following recent case law and amendment to the guidance notes on disposal under the General Consents. The amendment would particularly affect disposals under Section 32 of the Housing Act 1985 where covenants were imposed for affordable housing or nominations to affordable housing. We noted that any proposal involving development or a material change of use would require planning permission. Planning applications submitted would be assessed taking into account the Council's planning policies contained in the Unitary Development Plan and associated Supplementary Planning Guidance, and would be judged on their individual planning merits.
- 11.4 We report that we authorised the disposal of the following surplus properties on the terms proposed in the report -

Archway Heights, 16-20 Archway Road;  
Morvan House, 6 North Hill, N6;  
The Narrow Boat Public House and three shops at 146 to 153 Reedham Road N17;  
Aneurin Bevan House, Tredegar Road, N11;  
1-13 Herbert Road N15;  
2 Maidstone Road N11;  
Circle Thirty Three – short life properties;  
Garages - Waverley Road N17; and  
19 Crescent Road N8.

We also approved the adoption of the revised procedures for the disposal of sites to the preferred Registered Social Landlord partners.

## **12. DISPOSAL OF DERELICT LAND AT THE REAR OF MUSWELL HILL LIBRARY**

- 12.1 We considered a report which advised us that design proposals for the Muswell Hill library had been developed based on a two storey extension to the side and rear that provided a range of improvements and new facilities, including a small café for library users, covered delivery/parking area, buggy store and a lift to improve storage and access to the upper floors. An IT suite and a bigger area for the teen library with better access to the toy library on the first floor were also included within this design proposal.

- 12.2 We noted that based on the above design our approval was sought for the disposal of the land at the rear and the ring fencing of the receipts for the development of the library. It was recognised that the receipt would not fully fund the revised development proposals and, once the amount of receipt became known, it would be necessary to consider the extent to which the scheme was affordable. Consideration could also be given to other sources of funding including potential contributions from any future planned building maintenance budgets.
- 12.3 We report, for information, that we approved both the disposal of the Council's freehold interest in the disused land at the rear of Muswell Hill Library through sale on the open market, subject to planning permission, and to the capital receipt arising from this disposal being ring-fenced for the library refurbishment.

## **Leisure, Culture and Lifelong Learning**

### **13. MARKFIELD PARK CAFE**

- 13.1 We noted that our Procurement Committee at a special meeting held on 20 November had considered a report on the overall budget and funding for the above-mentioned project which showed a funding shortfall. The Committee had originally approved an Agreed Maximum Price (AMP) which included a contingency but the tenders returned were significantly higher than the AMP. Via value engineering, the tender sum had been reduced but remained above the AMP.
- 13.2 The Committee had been asked to agree a revised AMP and allocation of funding for the café project. Although this involved a substantial increase in cost, the building still represented value for money with each of the project elements being based on the lowest quote received from sub contractors. Based on the suggested revised total capital cost the Council would be funding 33% of the cost with 67% externally funded including, in part, through Growth Area Funds (GAF). The GAF monies had to be spent by 31 March 2008, with the Council responsible for any expenditure currently estimated to be met by GAF but not achieved by that date. A revised project programme commencing on 3 December was proposed to enable all of the GAF spend to be achieved.
- 13.3 We report that the Committee had agreed, inter alia, to a revised agreed maximum price for the contract for the construction of a café in Markfield Park to enable the tender to be accepted and the project to proceed. We also noted that the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been consulted and had agreed that the decision in respect of this matter was both reasonable in all the circumstances and that it should be treated as a matter of urgency for the purposes of Paragraph 18 of Part 4 Section H of the Constitution and that the call in procedure should not apply to the action being taken.

## **Leader**

### **14. THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE – SEPTEMBER 2007**

- 14.1 We considered the regular finance and performance report which monitored the Council's position in relation to a number of indicators that would be used to assess the Council in

the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA). Performance against these measures would determine Haringey's rating in 2008. The report also gave an indication of the level and quality of services delivered on the ground and sought our approval to a number of virements.

- 14.2 We noted that good progress continued to be made across all the priorities with 89.5% of indicators achieving green or amber status as at October 2007. In particular, we continued to make good progress on promoting independent living (93%, 14 indicators green or amber), encouraging lifetime well-being (100% or 14 indicators green or amber) and delivering excellent services 92% or 48 indicators green or amber). In summary, the balanced scorecard showed that for service delivery 89% of indicators were on target or close to the end of year target as at October 2007. For 13 of the 15 (87%) customer focus measures, performance targets were being met or close to being met. For financial health 27 of the 28 traffic lighted measures achieved green or amber status, meaning for 96% of traffic lighted indicators performance levels were achieving target or being maintained at an acceptable level. Our organisational development /capacity indicators showed that for 6 of the 8 (75%) measures, performance was meeting or close to expectation. In addition 86% of indicators had maintained or improved performance since the end of last year.
- 14.3 In terms of budget monitoring, the overall revenue budget monitoring, based on the October position, showed a forecast net overspend of £0.1 million. There were a number of budget pressures relating to Asylum and Adult Social Care, which were partly offset by an earmarked reserve for asylum and additional treasury investment income.
- 14.4 The aggregate capital projected position in 2007/08 was projected to under spend by £10.1million. This was made up of £4.5 million in Children and Young People (BSF), £3.7 million Housing, £1.5 million in Corporate Resources and £0.4 million in Adult, Community and Culture and were mainly profiling issues.
- 14.5 The DSG element of the overall Children and Young People's Service budget was projected to under spend by £0.4 million and this was in respect of the Network Family support budget that would be the subject of a carry forward request to meet the summer term 2008 commitments.
- 14.6 In relation to the HRA, the net current revenue projection was a surplus of £0.5 million against the approved budget mostly relating to one off income. This latest forecast position had been reported by Homes for Haringey to their Board in November 2007.
- 14.7 Financial regulations require that proposed budget changes be approved by the Cabinet and these are shown in the table below. These changes fall into one of two categories:
- budget virements, where it is proposed that budget provision be transferred between one service budget and another. Explanations are provided where this is the case;
  - Increases or decreases in budget, generally where notification has been received in-year of a change in the level of external funding such as grants or supplementary credit approval.
- 14.8 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.

14.9 The following table sets out the proposed changes. Each entry in the table refers to a detailed entry in the appendices, which show the budgets that are proposed to change. There are two figures shown in each line of the table and the detailed sheets. The first amount column relates to changes in the current year's budgets and the second to changes in future years' budgets (full year). Differences between the two occur when, for example, the budget variation required relates to an immediate but not ongoing need or where the variation takes effect for a part of the current year but will be in effect for the whole of future years.

Proposed virements are set out in the following table:

Period	Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Description
7	ACC	Cap	75		Update budget to include London Marathon Trust Funding
7	UE	Cap	(156)		To correct Stoneleigh Road UCCG budget, LBH Funding c/fwd in error
7	ACC	Rev	104		Funding for AD - Commissioning & Strategy within ACCS
7	CE, PPPC	Rev	60	108	Staffing budget transfer
7	CR, PPPC	Rev	83	83	Transfer of DPA staff from IT to Perf/Policy
7	CR, UE	Rev	39	39	Return of R&M for Automatic Public Conveniences
7	PP	Rev	53		LAA PPG Robbery & Domestic Violence reductions
7	POD, CR	Rev	24		Interim HR Advisor
7	UE	Rev*	315	-	Transfer of resources between Housing ring fenced and non ring fenced budgets to meet extra costs of inspection.
7	UE	Cap	126		Reinstatement of Bruce Grove THI LBH capital receipts funding
7	UE	Cap	(219)		TFL funding for LCN+
7	UE	Cap*	400		Spine Road - funding contribution from National Grid
7	UE	Cap	164		Alexandra Palace gate entrance upgrade funded from HLF
7	UE	Cap	135		Section 106 funding for Street lighting
7	C&YP	Cap*	336		2006/07 carry forward for grant - Computers for Pupils

<b>Period</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Key</b>	<b>Amount current year (£'000)</b>	<b>Full year Amount (£'000)</b>	<b>Description</b>
7	C&YP	Cap*	(4,258)		Re-phasing of BSF project budget
7	NSR, ACC, C&YP	Rev*	1,000		Transfer of Asylum contingency to services

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

15.1 We were informed of the following significant decisions taken by Directors under delegated powers -

### **Director of Adult, Culture & Community Services**

Haringey Extended Schools and Community Football Project – In consultation with the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Culture and Lifelong Learning approving a waiver of Contract Standing Orders for the extended schools football service contract with Tottenham Hotspur Foundation.

Leases for Laundry Equipment – Approval to enter in to leases.

Consultancy (Specialist) Services – Approval to waiver of Contract Standing Orders and the award of 2 one off projects.

### **Director of the Children and Young People's Service**

Woodside High School Temporary Exam Accommodation - Approval to the award of contract under Contract Standing Order 11.02 in the sum of £90,981.38.

Big Lottery Fund Children's Play Programme - Approval to the award of contracts under Contract Standing Order 11.02 in the total sum of £780,982 to various providers.

Childcare Commissioning Provision of New or Additional Childcare Places - Approval to the award of contracts under Contract Standing Order 11.02 in the total sum of £116,500 to various providers.