

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY, 18TH OCTOBER, 2016, 6.30pm

PRESENT: Councillors: Claire Kober (Chair), Peray Ahmet, Jason Arthur, Eugene Ayisi, Ali Demirci, Joe Goldberg, Alan Strickland, Bernice Vanier and Elin Weston

Also in attendance: Councillors: Wright, Engert, Newton, Jogee, G Bull, Carter, M Blake.

74. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Leader referred to agenda item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting and Members noted this Information.

75. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Vanier.

76. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business to consider.

77. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

78. NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH REPRESENTATIONS

No representations were received.

79. MINUTES

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 13th of September were agreed as a correct record.

The Leader varied the agenda to enable Cabinet to consider the Deputation, received in relation to item 15, Preferred Bidder to Secure the Future of Hornsey Town Hall, and also agreed to bring forward the consideration of the open part of this procurement report, so that it immediately followed the Deputation. The Leader reminded the meeting that this decision would require Cabinet to consider exempt

information, at item 30. Therefore any discussion on item 15 would need to relate to information contained in the open part of the report.

80. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Cabinet would consider two Scrutiny reviews and the Cabinet proposed responses to the review recommendations at items 8 & 9.

81. CYCLING - SCRUTINY REVIEW AND CABINET RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS

The Leader invited Councillor Jogee to present the Scrutiny review findings on Cycling.

Cllr Jogee provided some background to the review by explaining that Cycling can often be viewed as a niche issue but it was, in many ways, a far broader debate about the sort of streets and neighbourhoods that residents want to live in. It could play a significant part in making streets clean, welcoming, safe and healthy places to live learn and work.

Cllr Jogee advised that there have been massive increases in cycling in London over recent years but there was still huge untapped potential for further increase, particularly in the suburbs. Realising this potential could mean fewer cars, less congestion, cleaner air and a more active population so the potential benefits are considerable particularly in use in economic uncertain times

Councillor Jogee welcomed the Cabinet responses to the Scrutiny Panel review recommendations with 18 of the 20 recommendation fully accepted. The review was a thorough and detailed piece of work and Cllr Jogee thanked Councillor colleagues who participated in the review as well as the Principal Scrutiny officer, Rob Mack.

The review panel had worked hard to ensure stakeholders were involved in the review and important issues were raised in the review which Cllr Jogee hoped to see progress on.

Councillor Ahmet, Cabinet Member for Environment, responded to the review findings and outlined that the Corporate Plan was explicit in setting out the Council's aspiration to become one of the most cycle friendly boroughs in London. The vast majority of recommendations made in the scrutiny review were proposed for agreement and the Cabinet Member was confident that they would assist the Council in delivering on this pledge.

Reducing private car journeys by increasing cycling rates could also play a key part in achieving improvements to air quality, noise reduction and support sustainable development.

The Cabinet Member supported and shared the Mayor of London's vision for cycling in London and was determined to play a part in making that a reality in Haringey. The Panel's work would be integral to the preparation of the Cycling and Walking Strategy

which will set out how to deliver an ambitious template for increasing cycling rates throughout the borough.

RESOLVED

To agree the responses to the recommendations.

82. COMMUNITY SAFETY IN PARKS - SCRUTINY REVIEW AND CABINET RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS

Councillor Jogee introduced the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel Review on Safety in Parks. The review was set up to address concerns about crime in parks that were raised following a couple of serious incidents. Reassuringly, the Panel found that crime levels within Haringey parks were comparatively low and that there was no evidence of any significant increase recently. Although, this did not mean that improvements were not possible and the review flagged some up.

Councillor Jogee continued to highlight three particular recommendations which were partially accepted. In relation to recommendation 5, 14 of the boroughs parks were locked at night. The panel recognised the importance of locking the parks at night through discussion with local community groups. Recommendation 7 proposed series of pilots to trial different approaches to handle bin collection, and the response to recommendation 8 was welcomed.

Councillor Ahmet responded and advised that there had also been discussion with Cllr Ayisi, Cabinet Member for Communities, on the response to the recommendations. Councillor Ahmet advised that parks were well used in the borough and crime levels remain low. The review was commended and the few partially accepted recommendations would just need some more enhancing and working through with, residents, Councillors and Friends of Parks Groups.

RESOLVED

To approve the responses to the recommendations.

83. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

The Leader advised that a Deputation request had been received from the Hornsey Town Hall Appreciation Society in relation to item 15, Preferred Bidder to Secure the Future of Hornsey Town Hall, and invited Mr Tibber, the lead spokesperson, to put forward his Deputation to Cabinet.

Mr Tibber then came forward and handed a petition to the Leader which had been collated in response to the Cabinet report proposals and, within a week, attracted over 2300 signatures. The Deputation was further requesting the Cabinet consider the petition/report from the Hornsey Town Hall Appreciation Society and defer decision making on the preferred bidder for Hornsey Town Hall for one month.

Mr Tibber focused the Deputation's presentation on challenging the recommendation based on the three key aspects where the successful bidder scored higher than the unsuccessful bidder, as set out within the report.

The Deputation contested the following:

- Whether the preferred bidder carried a lower planning risk and contended that a fresh planning application would be needed to take forward the preferred bidder's plans for a Hotel and it could not be done under a S73. Mr Tibber explained the Appreciation Society has received its own planning advice to this effect.
- That the guarantees required by the Council on the development work and ongoing operation of the building and community access would be difficult to enforce as the successful bidder was based in the Cayman Islands. Mr Tibber questioned why a bidder would offer a guarantee.
- The legality around the special purpose vehicle being set up for the project, as this is currently not in existence.

Mr Tibber continued to refer to there not being a need for a Hotel in Crouch End and further emphasised the overseas status of the bidder which he claimed went against recent mayoral announcements on tackling the sale of domestic assets to overseas investors.

The Deputation asked the Cabinet to consider the employment impact of moving 74 businesses, located in the Town Hall, and highlighted the issues currently being experienced with relocation.

The Deputation concluded by asking Cabinet to consider the impact of the decision which could incur expensive legal challenges and the proposed decision being inconsistent with the Council's Community Strategy. Mr Tibber asked Cabinet to pause and further consult on the proposals before making a decision on the future of Hornsey Town Hall.

The Leader thanked Mr Tibber for his Deputation and asked Cabinet Member colleagues to put forward their questions to the Deputation party.

Councillor Arthur, Cabinet Member for Finance and Health and a ward Councillor for Crouch End, questioned the concerns raised on planning risk, as the planning strategy put forward, within the tender submission of the unsuccessful bidder, was scored as providing a greater risk to the Council; with the preferred bidder scoring better on the planning strategy they put forward in their bid. Cllr Arthur asked for the response to be within the context of the public procurement and assessing the bids put forward.

Cllr Arthur asked the Deputation whether the petition put forward to the community fully reflected the preferred bidder's proposals as contained in the Cabinet report.

Councillor Arthur asked the Deputation to also elucidate on the community use of the current Arts centre and the value of continued Arts related uses.

The Deputation explained that the report set out that the unsuccessful bidder would require a new planning application and the report was not referencing planning risk. The Leader pointed to section 6.25 of the report which clearly set out that the planning strategy of the unsuccessful bidder held a greater planning risk.

The Deputation then referred to paragraph 2.5 which set out the advantages of the preferred bidder over the unsuccessful bidder, which included the unsuccessful bidder requiring a new planning permission and the successful bidder working within the existing planning arrangements, and they contended that this assessment was incorrect and would likely be challenged. In their experience and planning knowledge, a new planning application for the Hotel would be needed, requiring new consultation and in turn providing a higher planning risk. Even if a S73 was appropriate, it was claimed it would require consultation, therefore not correct to say the preferred bidder would work within the existing arrangements.

The Deputation party advised that the people who had signed the petition did not know very much detail and the petition had been compiled and launched as a measure to instigate a public response and allow fuller information to come forward about the Hotel plans before a decision was made on the future of the Town Hall. Particular reference had been made to the Hotel proposal which was felt would not be acceptable to the Crouch End Community and it was reasonable for the community to have more information on the plans for the Hotel before a decision was made.

The Deputation party elaborated on the popular use of the current Arts centre located within Hornsey Town Hall. They felt that this was self evident, with 74 businesses and 130 people employed in the last 18 months. Also there was increased use of Hornsey Town Hall by local groups including the Crouch End Festival. The Town Hall building interiors had attracted interest with a number of people visiting on a daily unplanned basis to appreciate the interior of the buildings and visit the Arts provisions.

In light of the Deputation's references to the second bid, the Leader questioned whether the Deputation party had a preferred bidder or were not in favour of any of the proposals put forward as part of the procurement process.

In response the Deputation party explained that they were not a political group and did not specifically support any of the bidders. They had as, a group, spoken with the interested parties to gauge their proposals and the Appreciation Society exists solely to safeguard community access and use for the building, square and the green for the community. The Deputation advised that they also want the Festival to continue, the businesses located in the building to remain, the building to be restored and then returned to being an arts centre.

A Deputation party member of the Hornsey Town Hall Appreciation Society stated to Cabinet their preference for the unsuccessful bid as it came closer to the aspirations of the community. However, this preference could also equally apply to the other bids which did not reach the final procurement round.

Councillor Strickland, Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning responded to the Deputation, acknowledging the strong community interest and

concerns for the future of the Town Hall. Councillor Strickland highlighted the background that the project had been progressing for many years and a further delay would not be of benefit. Councillor Strickland confirmed the lengthy and onerous procurement process had been completed in line with OJEU requirements and with an agreed criteria and assessment panels.

In response to the particular planning concerns expressed, it was the planning strategies of the final two bidders that had been assessed and the assessment panel included both planners from the Council and external planning advisers, and they had concluded the proposed change in use carried a lower planning risk but the unsuccessful bid proposed increased development which carried a higher planning risk. It was important to note that, within the context of the overall procurement scoring, planning only made up 5% of the score and the overall difference between the two bids, at the end of the process, was 15%.

Cllr Strickland confirmed the legal advice received sets out the preferred bidder's guarantee is enforceable. Assurance was provided that the Hotel proposition had been through a thorough assessment process, with expert Hotel industry advice sought, as part of the procurement assessment process.

The experience and expertise of FEC on Hotel provision was evident in the assessment process and was reflected in the number of Hotels they held around the world so this also provided further assurance.

Councillor Strickland responded to concerns about community use and provided a reminder of the Council's instigation of the interim use of the Town Hall as an arts centre and this was because of the Council's sustained commitment to keep the Town Hall in community use. Councillor Strickland confirmed the Council had always been very clear that the current arts centre is a temporary use of the building. The Council would continue to work with businesses and are advancing discussion with a local organisation interested in operating workspaces in the library.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning concluded by emphasising the detailed and objective procurement process undertaken which had included a whole range of stakeholders including representatives from the Hornsey Town Hall Creative Trust (on the community assessment questions) and in his view had been a fair and robust process.

The Council and local stakeholders wanted to see the continued use of the building, by the community, which was why providing community use was mandatory category and also the highest scoring question. The preferred bidder was very willing to work with the community, will be setting up a community steering group with representatives from residents, alongside providing a viable future a diverse range of uses.

84. FOR CABINET TO ENDORSE THE DECISION FOR THE COUNCIL TO ACCEPT CLG'S PROPOSAL FOR A 4 YEAR SETTLEMENT

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Health introduced the report which sought approval to submitting an Efficiency Plan [which would be the already approved MTFS

(2015/16 – 2017/18) with an additional narrative around the third and fourth year] to the CLG as part of securing a 4-year funding settlement.

Submission of the Efficiency Plan would enable the Council to access minimum funding allocations for Revenue Support Grant (RSG) up to 2019/20.

In response to Cllr Engert's question, agreed that a written response is provided on the RSG figure.

RESOLVED

That Cabinet recommend Full Council:-

1. To approve acceptance to the offer of a 4-year funding allocation for 2016/17 to 2019/20 and the submission of the existing MTFS with additional narrative for 2018/19 and 2019/20 as the Efficiency Plan to the Department of Communities and Local Government before 14th October 2016.

Reasons for decision

Accepting the offer provides some certainty for medium-term financial planning purposes

Alternative options considered

The Council could choose to not accept the 4 year deal. Whilst there is no guarantee that the 4 year deal is entirely safe given the volatility of government funding, by not accepting the Council risks the Government reducing funding in future years due to non compliance.

85. FINANCIAL BUDGET MONITORING UPDATE[AUGUST 2016 POSITION]

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Health introduced the report which set out the 2016/17 Period 5 financial position; including Revenue, Capital, Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

Cabinet noted the reduction in the overspend of £5m, since quarter 1, with improvements in the Children's Services and Adult's Services budgets together with central controls on spend which were beginning to have an impact.

In response to Councillor Engert's questions, the following information was noted:

- The £0.6m additional capital allocation for Hornsey Town Hall was not to allow new spending but to rectify the underestimated budget allocation. The additional funding was needed to pay for security and maintenance cost.

- The corporate contingencies referred to in section 6.3, were not funding released from reserves but where the cost of borrowing had been lower than anticipated, allowing the release of funds allocated for borrowing costs.
- The 0.2m increased overspend for Osborne Grove was related to a combination of issues. This included the ongoing staffing and restructure proposals that were in the process of being implemented, along with the process of finding a 'not for profit' provider which was taking longer than anticipated.

RESOLVED

1. To consider the report and the Council's 2016/17 Period 5 financial position in respect of revenue and capital expenditure;
2. To note the risks and mitigating actions, including spend controls identified in this report in the context of the Council's on-going budget management responsibilities; and
3. To approve £580k for the Hornsey Town Hall capital budget. There are sufficient funds in Capital programme to cover this cost

Reasons for decision

A strong financial management framework, including oversight by Members and senior management, is an essential part of delivering the Council's priorities and statutory duties.

Alternative options considered

This is the 2016/17 Period 5 Financial Report. As such, there are no alternative options.

86. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME (CTRS) FOR 2017/18

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Health introduced the report which set out the details of the review of Haringey's current Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) 2016/17 and the recommendations for Haringey's CTRS for 2017/18 taking into consideration the assessment of options and an Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA).

Cabinet noted that the proposal to maintain the current scheme. The Cabinet Member advised that to increase the minimum payment would cause low income residents more financial difficulties, but to also to reduce the minimum payment would have an impact on the budget.

RESOLVED

That Cabinet recommend to Full Council:

1. To note that an Equalities Impact Assessment (**Appendix E**) has been undertaken in relation to the Council Tax Reduction Scheme and that the findings of this EIA must be taken into account when making a decision regarding the Scheme for 2017/18.
2. To agree to adopt the Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2017/18 as contained in Appendix C and therefore retains the same Scheme agreed for 2013/14 and continued since.
3. Accordingly, the scheme as summarised in **Appendix A** and set out in full at **Appendix C** will continue to apply for 2017/18:
 - I. That pensioners will continue to receive support for the payment of Council Tax.
 - II. That those in receipt of certain disability benefits continue to receive support for the payment of Council Tax.
 - III. For all working age claimants, the extent of Council Tax Support available will continue to be capped at 80.2% of Council Tax liability. In other words, working age claimants will continue to receive the same level of Council Tax Support as 2013/14, this amount representing a 19.8% reduction in the level of Council Tax Support available as compared with the amount of Council Tax Benefit received in 2012/2013.
4. For Authority to be given to the Chief Operating Officer and Assistant Director of the Shared Service Centre to take all appropriate steps to implement and administer the Scheme.

Reasons for Decision

The recommendation to retain the current scheme continues to support the Government's initiative of work incentives and pays due regard to the challenging financial climate we are currently in.

In recognition of the vulnerable sectors of society, we have supportive measures in place. It is proposed that these continue into 2017/18. Maintaining the current scheme ensures that these protected claimants will not be further disadvantaged.

Although performance remains higher than originally anticipated, there remains a shortfall in collection. This coupled with the fact that the Revenue Support Grant has been reduced by over 50%, equating to over £50m, has meant that the Council has had to implement significant service reductions and efficiency savings. As a result it is not possible for the Council to expand the scheme to include protection for other groups.

Alternative Options Considered

In accordance with paragraph 5 of Schedule 1A to the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (the 1992 Act), each financial year the Council is required to consider whether to revise or replace its scheme. One option for the Council is to continue with the scheme in place for the current financial year. Another option is to revise the scheme

in some respects. The Council could choose to increase or decrease the amount of financial support available under the scheme. Options should be considered in the light of the knowledge gained during the implementation of the scheme over previous years.

The options for changing the scheme that have been considered to date have been listed below. Some of these were proposed by respondents to the consultation undertaken prior to adopting the 2013/14 scheme.

- Increase the level of financial support so all customers pay less
- Decrease the level of financial support so all customers pay more
- Absorb the full shortfall into the Council budget by providing financial support up to the level previously funded by Central Government as part of Council Tax Benefit.
- Protect certain vulnerable groups in addition to those in receipt of certain disability benefits, these include but are not limited to:
 - Households with children
 - Households with a child under one
 - Households with a child under five
 - Households with more than three children
 - Households with a lone parent
- Protect band A-C properties
- Protect claimants who are working but on low income.
- Protect claimants in receipt of Single Person's Discount
- Increase Council Tax

A breakdown of these options with accompanying financial data has been provided in **Appendix D**. Appendix D further sets out the potential advantages and disadvantages of each option.

Having regard to the detailed points set out at **Appendix D**, it is recommended that none of these options for change are taken forward. This is because:

- I. Any option which would require the Council to increase levels of support for Council Tax payments would need to be directly funded by the Council and given the competing demands on the Council's reducing budget, increasing support for Council Tax funding would require the Council to find reductions elsewhere, cut services, utilise reserves or increase Council Tax.
- II. Any option which would require the Council to increase levels of support for particular groups of people could have a disproportionate impact on some claimant groups over others.
- III. The majority of the options do not support the Central Government initiative of encouraging people back to work
- IV. The Council do not consider that it is appropriate to increase Council Tax.

It was worth noting that method of payment for Central Government grant funding allocation has also changed since the CTR Scheme was first set up. Several grants, including CTR, have been consolidated within the overall Revenue Support (Core) Grant paid, this makes the proportion allocated to each area harder to identify. This

Core grant also continues to reduce in overall terms, by 2016-17 it will have reduced by 50% equating to approximately £50m in comparison to 2013-14.

In April 2016 an independent review of Local Council Tax Support Schemes was conducted at the request of the Secretary of State. The recommendations from this are still being considered by Central Government and when a decision is made on them Haringey may need to make further changes to its scheme to reflect any new decisions. As such the previously considered option of overhauling the scheme so that Council Tax Support falls under Council Tax legislation as a discount, similar to the existing Single Person Discount, has not been taken forward.

Other London LAs have changed their schemes over the past 3 years. A full breakdown of 2016/17 schemes are provided in **Appendix B** and some summary points are shown below:

- 12 LAs have a higher contribution level than Haringey including Newham and Barking & Dagenham.
- Wandsworth and Harrow have the highest contribution level at 30% for non disabled working age claimants
- 9 protect disabled claimants – either completely or by asking them to pay less than non disabled working-age claimants including Brent, Croydon and Enfield.
- 7 fully cover the shortfall including City of London, Hammersmith & Fulham and Tower Hamlets.

Haringey is comparable with other London LAs and its scheme reflects the need to strike a fair balance between protecting the wellbeing of our residents and recognising the challenging financial situation we are in.

87. SHARED DIGITAL SERVICE - APPROVAL FOR CLOUD PROCUREMENT

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources introduced the report which provided an example of the way the Shared ICT Service will operate and be governed.

The first initiative of the Shared Service would be to renew data centre provision across the three boroughs through the procurement of a single, joint cloud-based service. The decision on this procurement was delegated to the Shared Service Joint Committee and the attached report outlined the approach being taken.

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources also took the opportunity to thank the Head of Digital Services and ICT for her continued work over the past year in bringing together the shared ICT service with Camden and Islington and wished her well in her new role at OneSource.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

Reason for decisions

Not required as a noting report.

Alternative options

Not required as a noting report.

88. RECOMMENDATION OF A PREFERRED BIDDER TO SECURE THE FUTURE OF HORNSEY TOWN HALL

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning introduced the report which set out the tendering process which had been undertaken to select a bidder that would be able to provide a financial and sustainable future for Hornsey Town Hall.

The Cabinet Member continued to provide some context for the decision going forward, with a reminder of activity undertaken by the Council and local stakeholders, including the Hornsey Town Hall Creative Trust, over the last 10 years, and reiterated the Council's commitment to community access which required the highest scoring category in the process. He referred to the Mountview proposals, which had disappointingly not eventually proved financially viable.

The Cabinet Member emphasised that a solution for Hornsey Town Hall had to be commercially viable. He drew attention to the lengthy, detailed and robust procurement process which he had politically overseen and had been completed effectively, in line, with procurement requirements. Given the high running costs of the building and high restoration costs, the preferred bidder provided a balanced solution, maintaining community access. Therefore agreement was sought from Cabinet for the Far East Consortium International Ltd ("FEC"), the highest scoring bidder, to be appointed as the preferred bidder for HTH.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning referred to section 2.5 of the report, which had briefly tried to summarise the report and was not the basis of the recommendation to Cabinet. Instead section 6.25 clearly sets out that following an assessment of the planning strategy of the bidders, the preferred bidder put forward a proposal with lower planning risk. The Cabinet Member re-iterated that the advice of independent planning advisers had been sought when making this decision.

The Leader also reminded the meeting of some of the background to Hornsey Town Hall, in particular the Planning Committee meeting decisions in July 2010, where the main objections had been concerned with the scale of the residential development, including concerns on daylight as well as other considerations which arise from having large residential areas.

The Leader invited questions firstly from non Cabinet Members and the following information was provided in response to questions/concerns:

- Cabinet were making a decision on the procurement process which was triggered in 2015 and not on the parameters of the existing planning consent

given by Committee in 2010. The number of affordable units had been set at 4 units due to the high cost of restoring the building.

- There was no information to hand on the exact square metres for use for the Hotel. However the preferred bidder was keen to have a presence in and around the Town Hall to answer detailed questions from residents and discuss detailed plans as they are developed with the community.
- The Leader referred to the Cabinet report in 2009 where residential development was seen as an enabler to refurbish the building. Knight and Frank advice on affordable housing was 70% private and 30% affordable. However, in 2010 when going to planning committee and while working with Creative Trust on a community solution, it became clear that there would need to more private housing with 123 units and only 4 would be affordable. This was accepted because the planning gain was the community and cultural offer and restoration of the building rather than affordable housing provisions and even with this reduced level of affordable housing there was still a funding gap. Then in 2011 Mountview proposed using the capital receipt from the residential development to refurbish the building but even with the residential enabler there was still not a viable scheme.
- Change in the housing market – although house values had gone up, so had construction costs and further building deterioration had also occurred to the Town Hall building during this time which also needed to be considered. The Cabinet procurement decision was working to the Planning permission given in 2010 and this was still a ‘live’ planning permission.
- The heritage aspects would be restored, including the committee rooms. It was further clarified that it was the previous car park space at the back of the building being used for the housing development.
- Finance issues raised by the MP for Wood Green and Hornsey, Catherine West had been discussed with Council lawyers and the Chief Operating officer. The Cabinet Member was assured that the due diligence process had been conducted including financial advisers and they were reported no concerns about the preferred bidder. The bidder’s intention was to set up special purpose vehicle which will be UK based.
- In relation to boutique Hotel, no presumption had been made for the building use. The Council had always been clear that they could not make promises on what uses could be taken forward in the Town Hall and this was based on the project objectives, set out in paragraph 1 of the report, agreed by Cabinet in 2015, including community use. It was important to note that this was a building in constant need of funding due to its age and maintenance requirements and there was a recognised need for a part commercial solution. The experience of the preferred bidders in the Hotel industry provided assurance that this was a viable solution to take forward.
- The Leader provided a reminder of the Creative Trust Plans from 2008 which would have succeeded if the car park was the basis to fund the restoration of

the building and despite working hard for a solution the finance viability could not be met.

- Public access was guaranteed to the Square and the Green, which currently have limited budgets available for their upkeep and the community wanted to see more investment to further improve use which the bidder was happy to do. There are no plans for significant development in these areas.
- There had been detailed Planning discussions regarding the bids therefore not a need to speak with external planning organisations to seek advice.
- Emphasised that the planning strategies submitted by the bidders were assessed and one of these strategies was judged to have risk.
- Although the London political context had changed, the Town Hall's continued maintenance and restoration needs have not altered over the years and this financial aspect has not changed so the need to restore the building and enable meaningful community use is still needed and the decision had to be seen in this context. If a new application including increased affordable housing was put forward by the preferred bidder they would have further financial liability.
- TA costs - important to emphasise, the reason for lower level of affordable housing was to enable the restoration of the building. If TA was placed on the site, this would bring additional cost.
- Important to secure the future of the Town Hall which will be bound by a lease and a contract. It was also a positive consideration to have attracted this overseas investment in the borough.
- The Cabinet cannot take a view on the nationality of the bidders and will be mainly concerned with ensuring the procurement process was robust.

The Leader sought Cabinet Member comments and questions who responded as follows:

- The Hotel would be in a good place to activate the space at the front of the building,
- It's been over 10 years since the Hornsey Town Hall Creative Trust started the community solution and then brought through Mountview solution which was disappointingly not financially viable.
- Important to bring the building back into full use and protect the footfall into the area and not delay the decision.
- Accessible public square part of the procurement objectives. There will be public access to the Hall and Square and this has always been a priority and these areas need to have additional investment which the bidder has promised to do.

- It was made very clear that Haringey is not against overseas investment in the borough and this investment should be viewed as a positive thing.
- Preferred bidder keen to involve the community in the square issue, and on community access, when the building opens. There will be a substantive community working group to oversee the community access to the building. Clear commitment in writing on this community steering group.
- The preferred was bidder keen to engage with residents on their proposals. If the Cabinet agreed the preferred bidder, they would create a community steering group once the building is open.
- Cabinet Member for Finance and Health - provided a reminder of the current financial context and reiterated that the Council does not have the financial capacity to bring the building up to standard and continue maintenance. Cllr Arthur acknowledged that the community: wants access to the Town Hall building and square, cherishes its arts activity, want to have some role in its ongoing development of the town Hall and have a stake in the building. The Cabinet Member felt that the proposal meets the requirements of the community as it delivers what people care about i.e. arts centre, access to building and improved square built into contract and the Council will look at how the existing businesses can be relocated. Cabinet will continue to work with the community and preferred bidder to release information and share information on the Arts centre and what will happen to the businesses.

The Leader referred to the petition which did not mention the mixed use nature of the scheme.

The Cabinet considered the recommendations in the exempt part of the meeting.

The Leader clarified that the recommended bidder be referred to as Far East Consortium International Ltd.

Cabinet unanimously RESOLVED

To agree to the selection of Far East Consortium International Ltd as the preferred bidder for the HTH site (shown edged red on the plan included in Appendix A) based on the scoring set out in Appendix E and to enter into a Development Agreement for the HTH site with either Far East Consortium International Ltd or a special purpose vehicle set up by Far East Consortium International Ltd and the grant of long leases with such appropriate tenants as agreed with FEC based on the main terms set out in paragraph 6.27 of this report; and that delegated authority be given to the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development after consultation with the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance to agree the final terms of the Development Agreement, long leases and all associated legal agreements.

Reasons for Decision

The Cabinet decision in April 2011 declared the site surplus to the Council's requirements and agreed the principle for a partner to enter into a 125 year lease to operate the building, with the Council retaining the freehold.

The Listed building is on English Heritage's Buildings At Risk Register therefore a solution is required to undertake restoration work to the building and the Council does not have funding available to undertake these works itself.

Options Appraisal work identified that one developer for both the HTH site and building is a preferred approach as it secures both the restoration works and a long term operator for the building and is likely to bring the building back into use at the earliest opportunity. In addition to this a Developer would expect to have control over the works in the town hall as residential units cannot be occupied until essential heritage works have completed in the town hall because of the existing planning condition which links the two elements.

A public sector procurement of this scale must legally be governed by the public procurement regulations; therefore an OJEU process had to be carried out to secure a future for the dilapidating building. Professional advisors and the Council's Legal & Procurement team advised that an OJEU compliant Competitive Dialogue process is the best way to achieve this outcome and this has been undertaken in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 (as amended) ("Regulations").

To ensure the town hall building remains open and in use in the long term a partner, with a long term sustainable business plan needs to be appointed.

A timely decision on the future approach to the HTH project is required in order to engage with and exchange contracts with the bidder while they have a strong appetite to progress with the project, avoid further deterioration to the listed building, remove the ongoing liability of the building to the Council at the earliest opportunity and address the longstanding frustrations of the local community at the timeframe for securing a sustainable future for the Town Hall.

Alternative options considered

The alternative options that had been considered for the Hornsey Town Hall project can be defined as follows:

- Option A - Do nothing: Without taking any action to secure a future use and developer/operator for the Town Hall the building condition will continue to deteriorate. The Council remains responsible for the ongoing liability for the building and any use of the building by the local community will be limited.
- Option B - Conditional land sale: The Council could sell the HTH site via a conditional land sale agreement, however the Council would have limited control in this option to enable and enforce community access and use.
- Option C - Freehold sale of the site: Sale of the site without retaining any interest would mean the Council is unable to secure community access and use as there are no lease mechanisms to enable this. The Council was not prepared to pursue an option that did not guarantee community

access or provide the Council with enough control to ensure that Hornsey Town Hall can support community cohesion and economic dynamism in Crouch End.

- Option D - Dispose of land at the rear and use receipt to refurbish the building: In this scenario it is not expected that the land sale receipt would fully cover all the costs to refurbish and fit out the building for use, the Council's on-going liability for running costs and maintenance is not removed and a sustainable operator and future use is not secured for the Town Hall.

89. ADOPTION OF HOUSING STRATEGY [2017- 2222]

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning introduced Haringey's Housing Strategy, following completion of a second stage of consultation for agreement and referral to full Council for adoption.

Although there was an existing Housing Strategy in place, the Cabinet Member felt it important to revise the strategy in response to a changed legislative and market environment and to set out clearly what the Council was trying to achieve for housing in the borough with a vision and priorities. Also, at the same time, having flexibility in the strategy to respond to nationally changing housing environment.

The Cabinet Member outlined the importance of housing: in building strong and successful communities, its impact on health, in childhood, in old age, and for influencing life chances.

The Cabinet Member set out the 4 housing priorities/objectives being followed which also underpinned the proceeding housing Cabinet reports on the agenda concerned with Housing supply, Temporary accommodation, Housing investment and intermediate housing. This included:

- A step change in new homes being built – there was an evident need to build more homes as there was shortage of all types of housing and all types of tenure as set out in the report due to previous government policies limiting the new build of homes. There was a need to serve people on low income left behind in the open market.
- Improve support and help to prevent homelessness. The number of preventions had gone up through working with Home for Haringey but there was more to do.
- Quality of housing for all residents includes working with providers in the borough to improve the quality of homes, being tougher on the design of the private homes, pushing up the quality of homes in the private rented sector.
- Delivering wider community benefits such as more jobs and apprenticeships.

The Cabinet Member referred to the engagement with residents and homelessness residents when developing the strategy and spoke of the challenges being put forward

to housing providers through the housing strategy discussions, generating new ideas to come forward, and demonstrating the Leadership value of the strategy.

In response to Councillor Engert's questions:

- Tougher action was being taken forward on bringing empty private homes into use with more home owners coming forward to find solutions for these homes.
- The AD for Regeneration provided examples of where flexible finance options had been taken forward to increase the numbers of affordable housing. At Hornsey depot where a change in the pricing of the Council land was taken forward to facilitate a higher number of affordable homes, also work with a Development Vehicle in which the Council takes an equity stake and brings in partners – High Road West was an example of this
- All tenure of homes retro fitted - The grant from government to promote and provide funding for retrofit in private homes was ending and had had a good take up. Future zero carbon requirements for new homes will allow Councils to collect money from developers to meet this environmental requirement and allow a source of future funding for retrofitting home in the borough.

RESOLVED

1. To note and consider the feedback from and the response to the second stage consultation conducted on Haringey's Housing Strategy, set out in appendix 1.
2. To note the comments and resolutions of Regulatory Committee, set out in appendix 4.
3. To recommend the revised and final version of Haringey's Housing Strategy, attached as appendix 2 to this report, having considered the revised and final version of the Equalities Impact Assessment, attached as appendix 3, for adoption by Council.

Reasons for Decision

Regulatory Committee was required to provide informal recommendations to Cabinet and Full Council about the draft Housing Strategy.

Cabinet was required to recommend that Council adopt the draft Housing Strategy.

A decision was required from Council formally to adopt Haringey's Housing Strategy, taking into account any recommendations from both Regulatory Committee and Cabinet.

Each body must consider the consultation responses, the changed national and local housing landscape and the updated Equalities Impact Assessment.

Alternative Options Considered

The Council already had a Housing Strategy in place covering the period 2009 – 2019, so it would be possible to continue with the current strategy. However, at its meeting in October 2014, the Cabinet rejected this approach given the scale of changes to housing policy since 2009. The scale of these changes has increased further since the general election in May 2015 and the introduction of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. The case for a new strategy is, therefore, now more compelling.

Council could also consider carrying out a simple review and refresh of the 2009 – 2019 strategy. However, the extent of the changes since 2009 is such that this would not enable the Council to adequately meet the challenges it faces.

Alternatively, the Council could rescind the housing strategy altogether and move forward without one as there is no statutory requirement for a local authority to produce a housing strategy. However, having a strategy is considered both best practice and necessary to articulate how the Council will meet the housing challenges and deliver its housing objectives and priorities with its partners.

The final strategy represents recommended policy choices that aim to achieve the Council's priorities. Alternative options were discounted where they:

- Would not have been consistent with the general tenor of consultation feedback;
- Did not comply with current and forthcoming government legislation;
- Would have represented policy choices that are unachievable given known and likely constraints.

90. HOUSING SUPPLY PLAN AND TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION PLACEMENTS POLICY

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning introduced the report which sought approval to the housing supply plan and temporary accommodation placements policy.

The Cabinet Member referred to the aspect of the report that deals with Temporary Accommodation placements. The increased housing market pressure and benefit changes had made it difficult for the Council to afford to place people in the borough at a price they can afford. The priority was to keep people in the borough, in particular the most vulnerable, and the report explained how families will be prioritised according to their circumstances.

The Cabinet Member drew attention to the support package for families being relocated which was summarised in the report. He had asked Council officers to meet with other Councils that had already been locating families outside of London, to complete this package. Furthermore, the consultation on this proposed package had been undertaken with people directly affected in Temporary Accommodation and people likely to be affected by this policy.

In response to Cllr Engert's questions:

- The 31 new Council homes were more expensive than initially envisaged as they were placed on small sites, and subject to increased construction inflation, in turn leading to a higher running cost. Agreed a written response is provided to Councillor Engert on the cost of the 31 homes.
- Paragraph 8.6 indicated that £281k would fund 250 AST's. This was an invest to save proposal which, in the longer term, would yield more results in terms of preventing homelessness and reducing the need for expensive TA.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the Housing Supply Plan set out in appendix 1. Cabinet notes that the Plan requires regular updating and delegate's authority to the Director of Regeneration, Planning & Development to maintain a current and comprehensive plan in line with prevailing conditions and requirements.
2. To note the consultation feedback and the revised Equalities Impact Assessment for the Temporary Accommodation Placements Policy, attached as appendix 2 and appendix 3 respectively.
3. To approve the Temporary Accommodation Placements Policy, attached as appendix 4.
4. To approve the support package for households placed outside London set out in paragraph 6.25, which has been finalised following consultation, and notes the budget implications set out in paragraphs 6.28-6.29.

Reason for decisions

A decision is necessary for the Council to establish and maintain a current and comprehensive plan for all forms of housing supply in the borough, in order that housing need can be identified and supply initiatives formulated for all forms of permanent and temporary accommodation required meeting that housing need (recommendation 3.1).

It is necessary for the Council to take into account the results of consultation and the revised Equalities Impact Assessment in considering approval of the Temporary Accommodation Placements Policy (recommendation 3.2).

Having consulted on the Temporary Accommodation Placements Policy and considered the revised Equalities Impact Assessment, a decision on approval of the policy is required in order that it can be adopted and implemented (recommendation 3.3) and that officers are able to demonstrate a clear rationale, agreed eligibility criteria for suitable placements and due consideration of the support required.

Households that may be placed out of London will require assistance and support and a decision is necessary to put appropriate arrangements in place and ensure budgetary provision (recommendation 3.4).

Alternative options considered

All feasible options to improve supply and meet demand have been considered in the preparation of the Housing Supply Plan.

The procurement and allocation of temporary accommodation has become increasingly difficult within the Haringey and London market. Alternative options to meet demand are not available to the Council within current budget provisions and the allocation of any additional funding would detrimentally affect the provision of other Council services.

The Council could choose not to adopt a placement policy for temporary accommodation. However, officers must be able to demonstrate a clear rationale, eligibility criteria for suitable placements and consideration of support packages in order to comply with current case law and be clear and transparent about its placement activity.

91. STOCK INVESTMENT AND ESTATE RENEWAL POLICY

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning introduced the report which set out a new local standard for homes, following the expiry of the decent homes standard. The report proposed a more asset based management strategy where the Council can sell more expensive stock to build more affordable housing stock.

In response to questions from Cllr Engert the following information was noted:

- Impractical to agree each high value Council housing sale at Cabinet and this would be completed through officer delegation with the governance details of this process to be clarified and discussed at a future scrutiny meeting.
- Expectation that the development vehicle will not 'cherry pick' more financially viable easy sites and operate according to a variety of sites, if impossible and not viable to develop a site then cannot enforce this but there is a pre – agreed portfolio of sites to limit this situation and the Council will have an equal stake on the development vehicle board and can also safeguard against this type of situation.
- The Council had objected to the selling of high value homes but were required to follow this government policy. The Cabinet Member clarified that the Council can only sell a property when void and this will not be easy to implement but there will be a set criteria followed as set out in the report
- Cllr Strickland provided a reminder that the 40% target of affordable housing was subject to viability and the two schemes mentioned in Tottenham were part of a regeneration, development and restoration and renewal scheme including community facilities which causes higher cost and means difficulties in meeting the 40% target. The Council will always continue to push for 40% affordable housing but there was a need to be honest in the report that the cost of developments makes it difficult to meet this target.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the adoption of a new standard for investment in the Council's stock, as set out in paragraphs 6.13 – 6.18 and appendix 1.
2. To approve the principle of active asset management that will be detailed in the Council's new Asset Management Delivery Plan, to ensure that the best stock is retained and invested in and assets are appraised for possible disposal when necessary using a Stock Options Appraisal process as illustrated in appendix 2.
3. To agree that the receipts from the sale of Housing Revenue Account (HRA) assets will be ring fenced to the HRA and applied to payment of the required levy and to funding the two for one replacement programme or other approved new supply initiatives.
4. To delegate authority to approve the detailed Asset Management Plan and investment programme, and any variations to it, to the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development after consultation with the Lead Member for Housing and the Chief Operating Officer;
5. To note the programme of continuous engagement with residents described in paragraphs 6.23 – 6.24, to ensure that tenants and leaseholders are aware of the new standard of investment and the choices that need to be made in relation to the maintenance and investment in the housing stock;
6. To note the progress made to date on the previous Estate Renewal strategy and agrees the proposed principles for estate renewal in this report at paragraph 6.31 and appendix 3.
7. To note that the need for disposals of Council homes will require regular decisions by the Leader and Lead Members, which would formerly be undertaken by Cabinet.

Reasons for decision

The recommendation to approve a new approach to stock investment is required to reflect the new environment since the ending of the Decent Homes programme. It also reflects the reduced resource position that all local authorities find themselves in, since the introduction of the 1% rent reduction in April 2016 and the forthcoming requirement to pay a levy to Central Government reflecting higher value properties.

The recommendation to approve the active asset management programme and a continuous Stock Options Appraisal process is necessary to prepare for the forthcoming requirement to pay a levy reflecting higher value properties which become empty during the course of each year.

Recommendation 3.3 is required to ensure that members are informed of the use to which any receipts from the sale of HRA assets will be applied.

This report sets out the high level approach to the principles of investment in the housing stock. These principles will be applied to the stock and programmes of work developed in a more detailed Asset Management Plan. It is proposed that this more detailed Asset Management Plan be approved by the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development in consultation with the Lead Member for Housing and the Chief Operating Officer. (Recommendation 3.4).

The reason for the recommendation to adopt an engagement approach (3.5) is to ensure that tenants and leaseholders are well informed about the financial position of the HRA and the resources available for investment in the housing stock, and are engaged as far as possible in the planning and prioritisation necessary to ensure that their homes are maintained within available resources.

Recommendations 3.6 seeks approval for the next steps in our Estate Renewal Strategy, which is updated since it was first adopted in November 2013 to reflect the lessons learnt from the experience of consulting with, and delivering specific projects. It sets out the principles for Estate Renewal in the future and the next steps for delivery.

The reason for the recommendation that Members note the process of disposal of Council housing assets will be undertaken by the Leader and Lead members in the future is to ensure that Members are aware that disposals of Council assets, where in relation to the HRA and the requirement to fund the compulsory levy, will not in the future normally be approved by Cabinet.

Alternative options considered

An alternative approach to stock investment is to continue with a programme of works as set out in the Decent Homes standard, to the remaining stock which has not yet achieved Decent Homes. However, this option is unaffordable, and the Council would not be able to carry out basic maintenance of its stock, if it did not adopt a more affordable approach.

The alternative approach to the decisions on the way forward for the Estate Renewal progress report (appendix 2) and the medium and larger size estates is not to make any decision on these estates or make decisions on only those which are going forward for further option appraisal work at this stage. This was rejected, as there has been consultation and information provided to the tenants, and they will want to know what the future is for their homes, and their estates. Whilst not all decisions can be made on all estates now, it will be helpful to those tenants and leaseholders living on those estates to have as much information as is currently available, so that they can plan their lives with the best possible information.

92. HOUSING ALLOCATIONS SCHEME, TENANCY STRATEGY AND HOMELESSNESS DELIVERY PLAN

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning introduced the report which set out the potential changes that will be consulted upon, in three policy and delivery areas - the Housing Allocations Policy, the Tenancy Strategy and the

Homelessness Delivery Plan. These changes were necessary to support achievement of the new Housing Strategy or to comply with changes in legislation.

RESOLVED

To authorise public consultation with residents, partners and stakeholders on:

1. The proposed changes to the Council's Housing Allocations Scheme set out in appendix 1.
2. The proposed changes to the Council's Tenancy Strategy set out in appendix 2.
3. The new Homelessness Strategy and Delivery Plan set out in appendix 3.

Reasons for decision

A decision is required to ensure that the Council complies with its obligations to consult about changes in housing services. There is a legal requirement that before making major changes to its Allocations Scheme the Council consults private registered providers of social housing and registered providers with whom we have nominations rights. It is also good practice to consult residents.

There is a statutory duty to consult the Greater London Authority (GLA) and registered providers operating in the borough on its Tenancy Strategy; and again, it is considered best practice to consult more widely and the Council has done so previously.

The Homelessness Act 2002 requires local authorities to carry out a homelessness review of their area and from that information publish a homelessness strategy. The Council published its last 5 year Homelessness Strategy in 2012, as a multi-agency document delivered with partners. The Council wishes to consult widely on a new homelessness plan and the views of our partners and all stakeholders are critical in developing this. A decision is required to ensure that the Council properly engages with partners and stakeholders in tackling homelessness in the borough.

Alternative options considered

An alternative approach to the Allocations Policy would be to make no further changes to the Policy, which was last reviewed in 2014 (changes arising from that review were adopted in September 2015). There is some merit in this approach as changing the Allocations Policy is an extensive exercise, and should be undertaken only when there is a need to make amendments as a result of legislation, policy change or case law. However, there are a number of environmental and legal factors driving the need for change, such as the reducing supply of housing; and the need to ensure that those most unable to solve their housing problems in the open market are supported. It has therefore been decided to bring forward these changes which should assist the Council achieve its objectives of ensuring that those most in need receive assistance, and that those most able to find alternative housing to social housing, are assisted to do so. It is also important that the Allocations Policy supports the Council's current and changing policy objectives, as reflected in the new Housing Strategy.

There is no alternative to consulting on a new Tenancy Strategy. The legislation contained within the Housing and Planning Act 2016 means that the current Tenancy Strategy will no longer be effective when the legislation comes into force, as lifetime tenancies will be abolished. If the Council does not adopt a new tenancy strategy, then new tenancies will become five year tenancies by default, and tenants will not be sufficiently aware of the change in their status, and the need to review their tenancies during the period of the tenancy. The Council will also not have a legally compliant Tenancy Strategy.

It is a statutory obligation to have a Homelessness Strategy and to consult with those likely to be affected by it. Not having a Homelessness Strategy would render the Council ineffective in setting out its strategic approach to tackling homelessness, working in partnership would be more difficult without a clear agreed direction and the allocation of resources would be more difficult to justify.

93. INTERMEDIATE HOUSING POLICY

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning introduced the report which sought approval to consult on how the Council will allocate homes for the intermediate range of income groups. The report also set out some operational requirements that need to be considered in order that the policy, when approved, to be delivered effectively.

RESOLVED

To approve the draft Intermediate Housing Allocations Policy, set out at Appendix 2, for consultation prior to formal adoption in 2017.

Reasons for decision

Currently, the Council has no policy for allocating Intermediate housing, either for sale or for rent. Intermediate housing is becoming an increasingly important part of the housing offer, and this is emphasised in our new Housing Strategy. As the housing market becomes ever more difficult for households on a range of incomes to access, it is important that the Council takes all possible steps to influence the intermediate market to make sure it is really meeting the needs of Haringey residents.

The Council also wants to influence future provision, based on its analysis of the needs of Haringey residents, and this will be better targeted with more specific knowledge of the housing needs of households in the median range of incomes in the borough.

Finally, the Council is proposing to consult of a new Housing Allocations Policy which may limit those able to register, to people on lower income levels. It is important that the Council has an alternative offer to make to those who will no longer be able to access the Register for Social Housing. A new Intermediate Housing Allocations Policy is therefore required, in order to make it clear to applicants and partners, how intermediate housing in the borough is allocated.

Alternative options considered

The option was considered, of taking no proactive steps, and leaving Intermediate Housing to be allocated by external providers, as now. This was rejected, first because the new Housing Strategy makes it clear that Intermediate Housing will play an increasingly important part of the housing provision in the borough, and the Council needs to be sure that local Haringey residents benefit from it.

Secondly, there is a strategic imperative set out in the Housing Strategy, to meet the housing needs of households with a range of incomes who cannot meet their needs in the open housing market. The Council also needs its own Intermediate Housing Policy because it is building new shared ownership units itself, and they need to be allocated in line with a published policy to ensure that there is a transparent and fair process to allocate these homes. This policy is important as it has the potential to enable social housing tenants to purchase homes, releasing units in the social housing sector, where households have incomes that enable them to access home ownership on a shared ownership basis.

94. ADMISSION TO SCHOOLS - PROPOSED ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2018/19

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced the report which proposed a 6 week statutory consultation on school admission arrangements for 2018/19. The Cabinet Member advised Cabinet Member colleagues that these were largely a continuation of the current arrangements.

RESOLVED

1. To agree to consult on the proposed admission arrangements, including in year arrangements, for 2018/19;
2. To agree to consult on the proposed IYFAP which, if agreed by a Member Lead signing in January 2017, would be used from 1 March 2017;
3. To agree the co-ordinated scheme for 2018/19 as set out in Appendices 2 and 3 of this report, and that the scheme can be published on the Haringey website on 1 January 2017
4. To note that consultation on the proposed admission arrangements is scheduled to take place between 27 October 2016 and 8 December 2016;
5. To note that following the consultation, a report will be prepared summarising the representations received from the consultation and a decision on the final admission arrangements and the In Year Fair Access Protocol will be taken by Lead Member signing in January 2017.

Reasons for decision

This report and the consultation that will flow from it if the report's recommendations are agreed will ensure that our proposed admission arrangements for 2018/19 are consulted upon and the co-ordinated scheme is set in accordance with the mandatory provisions of the School Admissions Code 2014.

We consult on our admission arrangements annually irrespective of whether or not there is a proposed change to the arrangements¹. This is to ensure transparency and openness on the contents of our arrangements and to allow parents, carers and other stakeholders who might not previously been interested in admission arrangements (perhaps because they didn't have a child of school age) to make a representation which can then be considered as part of the determination of the arrangements.

Alternative options considered

We are required by the School Admissions Code 2014 (Para 1.42 – 1.45 of the Code) to carry out any consultation on our admission arrangements between 1 October and 31 January each year for a minimum period of six weeks. We are not proposing any changes to the proposed admission arrangements for the year 2018/19 apart from a small number of minor technical changes which include a) that the required number of primary heads needed to sit on Primary IYFAP shall be no less than 3, and that all year 6 in-year applications will be offered through Primary IYFAP once the October PLASC of the same year has taken place (first Thursday of October). However, as set out in Para 4.2 above, we consult annually on our arrangements irrespective of whether we are proposing any changes, to allow transparency and openness in the process.

95. PROPOSED CONSULTATION ON AN ADJUSTMENT TO THE PANS OF THE BOROUGH'S COMMUNITY SECONDARY SCHOOLS TO MOVE THEM TO PANS DIVISIBLE BY 30, REPLACING THE CURRENT PANS THAT ARE DIVISIBLE BY 27

The Cabinet Member for Children and families introduced the report which was proposing, for consultation, a move to bigger class sizes of 30 for secondary schools, to meet the emerging school funding formula criteria for 2018/19 and which would allow the Council to provide additional school places, limiting expensive capital cost in the future.

RESOLVED

1. To note the twofold reasons for seeking to carry out consultation on the adjustment of the PANs of the Council's community secondary schools:
 - 1.1) Preventing the Council's secondary community schools from suffering a financial disadvantage when the new National Schools Funding Formula (NFF) – based on secondary school intakes of class sizes of 30 – is implemented; and
 - 1.2) Enabling the Council's community secondary schools to provide additional year 7 places to accommodate a projected increase in pupil place demand

¹ The Schools Admission Code 2014 (Para 1.42) sets out that when changes are proposed to admission arrangements, all admission authorities **must** consult on their admission arrangements (including any supplementary information form) that will apply for admission applications the following school year. Where the admission arrangements have not changed from the previous year there is no requirement to consult, subject to the requirement that admission authorities **must** consult on their admission arrangements at least once every 7 years, even if there have been no changes during that period.

between 2018 and 2025 without the need for the expansion of any single (or more) secondary school(s).

2. To agree to consultation being carried out between November and December 2016 on proposed adjustments to the Council's community secondary school PANs, as set out in paragraph 4.1, to take effect from admission year 2018/2019, which would help ensure that the Council's community secondary schools can maximise financial conditions by securing classes of 30 to reflect the broad national picture. Such a move also allows provision of further additional year 7 places which will address the projected deficit of year 7 places from 2018 as set out by current projections and illustrated in the graph at Figure 1 to this report.

Reasons for decision

This report recommends the commencement of consultation (November 2016) on adjustments to the PANs of the Council's community secondary schools. Table 1 below sets out the current and proposed PAN for each community secondary school.

Name of school	Current PAN	Proposed PAN
Gladesmore Community School	243	270
Highgate Wood School	243	270
Hornsey School for Girls	162	150
Northumberland Park Community School	210	240
Park View School	216	240

Table 1: Current and proposed PANs for Haringey's secondary community schools

These proposed adjustments are primarily a response to an emerging national funding formula that will mean that local adjustments historically made to allow our secondary schools to operate based on class sizes of 27 will be removed, and further that the NFF will be based on secondary school intakes of class sizes of 30 putting the Council's secondary schools at a funding disadvantage.

This consultation will allow us to gather views from key stakeholders on whether we should proceed with this move. Schools other than community schools will also be invited to set out their views although these schools (free schools, academies and foundation schools) will be considering their own positions in relation to the NFF and the impact for them if they remain at PANs wholly divisible by 27.

In addition to the financial imperative for community secondary schools of a move to class sizes of 30, such a change would also allow us to increase the number of year 7 places without the need for costly capital expansion works at one or more secondary schools. This would meet the need for additional year 7 places to address rising cohorts from 2018.

The **risk of not** moving our secondary schools to class sizes broadly based on 30 is the financial impact of a national funding formula for which no local adjustment to

address this smaller class size can be made. Without this change we would also need to consider how to provide additional year 7 places to meet rising demand from larger primary cohorts that have already begun moving into the secondary phase. Any expansion works would not only need significant capital costs, but further would result in additional classes of 27 in one or more of our secondary schools which would exacerbate the issue for those school(s) that are expanded of operating with class sizes of 27.

The **risk of moving** our PANs to those proposed, which are wholly divisible by 30 and which are broadly seen everywhere across London, England and Wales is the potential concern of school staff about the resultant increased workload (e.g. planning for and marking work for a class of 30 instead of 27) and possible strike or other action as a result of that objection.

A further report to Cabinet in April 2017 will set out the results of the consultation and make a final recommendation on whether or not to proceed with adjustments to PANs.

Alternative options considered

No alternative options have been considered at this stage. This report seeks to proceed to consultation with stakeholders to gather views on adjustments to PANs which will support financial viability for our schools once a NFF is introduced.

Cabinet will consider a further report in April 2017 which will allow a final decision based on the outcomes of the consultation and all other material considerations.

96. LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN ANNUAL SPENDING SUBMISSION 2017/18

The Cabinet Member for Environment introduced the report which set out the bid for money, annually, to deliver projects in their local implementation plan. Cabinet noted that this was an interim submission, while awaiting the Mayors transport strategy which will likely take a year to produce.

The Council had commenced the preparation of a new Transport Strategy and this will be supported by a Cycling and Walking strategy and a Parking Plan but will be minded to what the Mayors transport strategy will produce. The LIP will also be targeting additional resource for road user strategies.

In response to Cllr Engert's question:

Often deprivation was a component in disproportionate number of pedestrian and child injuries on roads in the borough compared to other boroughs. Agreed details of the collision map are provided in writing and details on how the injuries will be reduced.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the Annual Spending Submission for 2017/18 as set out in Appendix 2 of this report.

2. To note the progress to date on delivering against our LIP and Corporate Plan targets.

Reasons for decision

The LIP submission provides a major source of funding to deliver transport projects and programmes.

Alternative options considered

The Annual Spending Submission supports our approved LIP covering 2011 to 2031. It is, therefore, not considered necessary to consider other options.

97. APPOINTMENT OF A SOCIAL SUPERMARKET PROVIDER

The Cabinet Member for Economic development, social inclusion and sustainability introduced the report which sought approval to award a Concession Contract to the Community Shop C.I.C. (Community Interest Company) to operate a Social Supermarket facility at the Eric Allin Centre on Northumberland Park for a period of up to 10 years.

The Cabinet Member outlined that social supermarkets have been recognised by the GLA as a positive way of supporting those on low incomes, tackling poor diet and overcoming health inequalities, through the provision of surplus stock being sold at heavily subsidised prices. The structured support and development programme sitting alongside membership aligned with the socio-economic aims of our regeneration programme in Northumberland Park by assisting members to improve their economic and social wellbeing.

In response to a local resident's questions asked outside of the meeting:

1. The address for the social supermarket will remain the same (i.e. 'Northumberland Park Social Supermarket', Eric Allin Centre, and Kenneth Robbins House] and keep the reference to Eric Allin, a recognised popular Tottenham community figure.
2. Social supermarket governance expected to involve community members fully both formally (whether through something like a steering group, community forum or as board members) and informally (through presentations to the three Residents Associations etc).
3. The social supermarket was located in the very east of the Northumberland Park ward. It had a membership limit of 750 members at any one time which was a considerable number but due to the levels of deprivation in Northumberland Park can unfortunately be filled very easily by residents of Northumberland Park alone. The impact of the improvements a social supermarket can bring are magnified if it affects a large number of people within the same community, this is particularly true of Northumberland Park where unemployment and low wages are particularly prevalent within the relatively small area of the Northumberland Park estate. Therefore, if it was

extended to residents of White Hart Lane (or Bruce Grove) ward its impact could be somewhat watered down. To some extent this is a pilot and the Council will see the impact it has. If it is as successful as then there may be scope to extend outwards to other wards or introduce something similar that can be equally beneficial to residents of those wards.

RESOLVED

1. In accordance with CSO 9.06.1(d), to approve the award of a Concession Contract to Community Shop C.I.C., for an initial period of 5 years with options to extend for further periods of 3 and 2 years, to set up and operate a Social Supermarket at the Eric Allin Centre in Northumberland Park;
2. To approve a budget for this project of £185,000 as an addition to the capital programme, financed by £85,000 from the Council's Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and £100,000 of grant funding allocated to the Council by the Greater London Authority (GLA) for this project;
3. To approve provision in the Concession Contract for a payment to Community Shop C.I.C. towards the capital costs of setting up of the Social Supermarket during 2016/17, including building refurbishment and shop fit out works, of a total of £185,000;
4. To note that Community Shop C.I.C. will be required to fund any establishment costs beyond the payment set out in paragraph 3.1(ii);
5. To approve the grant to Community Shop C.I.C. of a Community Lease for the Eric Allin Centre at a rent of £8,000 per annum;
6. That the approvals above [1 – 5] were conditional on the Council finalising a funding agreement with the GLA for this project, which has been agreed in principle.

Reasons for decision

The social supermarket will help to demonstrate to residents of the Northumberland Park estate that the Council is genuinely committed to socio-economic improvements alongside physical regeneration and housing growth. It is a model which enables residents in Northumberland Park who are in receipt of some form of means tested benefit to enter into a six month membership scheme (open to 750 households at any one time). Membership of the social supermarket will include enrolment into a 'success programme' which will help members benefit from the employment and business opportunities that are arising in Northumberland Park both now and through the longer term delivery of the regeneration programme.

In addition, the social supermarket will highlight the benefits of healthy cooking and eating through the provision of cheap healthy groceries and a subsidised canteen serving healthy food. The aim is that through sustained exposure to such dietary and cooking methods, members will be encouraged to switch to making healthier diet

choices and help address the health inequalities which currently plague Northumberland Park.

The Eric Allin Centre, occupying half of the ground floor of Kenneth Robbins House on the Northumberland Park estate, was identified as the most suitable location. Prior to 2010 it was a dilapidated community centre in need of significant renovation. It was converted into a showroom and office for the decent homes programme and, with the exception of short term projects like Volunteer It Yourself, has remained empty since the programme ended. Project 2020 opened next door after the Eric Allin Centre ceased to be used as a community centre and many of the previous tenants moved there or found alternative premises. The Council has also provided a Community Hub nearby at 163 Park Lane as part of the regeneration programme. As a result the social supermarket will provide an additional community benefit alongside more traditional community spaces.

Alternative options considered

Do Nothing

The Council could choose not to open a social supermarket, leaving the Eric Allin Centre to remain as an underused building offering very little benefit to the existing community. This option was discounted as it would result in a missed opportunity to provide a service that will benefit a large proportion of residents in the Northumberland Park area. Beyond the initial capital contribution, there is no ongoing financial commitment by the Council and the scheme is in line with the Council's regeneration priorities and is supported (and part funded by) the GLA.

Negotiate exclusively with Community Shop without a tender process Community Shop is the only widely known supplier with the capability of providing the wide range of services associated with a social supermarket. It was not known if other suppliers would wish to extend the range of services they offered or other suppliers would form consortiums to offer the range of services associated with the social supermarket. In the absence of specific market intelligence, it was decided not to enter into exclusive negotiations with Community Shop for the provision of the Social Supermarket.

Preferred option

It was agreed to run a transparent procurement process by issuing an OJEU Notice and competing the opportunity applying EC Treaty principles to identify any potential suppliers that may wish to provide the social supermarket. This approach has provided an opportunity for other respondents to participate if they could offer the range of services for the Social Supermarket. While there was a time impact it demonstrates a commitment to open competition and securing "best value" for the public funding being offered.

98. OFFICE ACCOMMODATION STRATEGY

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources introduced the report which proposed relocating the Council office towards the Clarendon Road/ Coburg Road area, to release prime accommodation for redevelopment and to encourage a significant footfall to walk away from the High Street, creating depth to the currently narrow retail strip and meeting regeneration objectives for Wood Green.

Cabinet noted that existing accommodation is deteriorating, expensive to run and no longer fit for purpose. No one building was of sufficient size to accommodate the requirements of the Council in the future. The existing office sites were included in the Haringey Development Vehicle. In order to enable that development to take place the buildings will need to be vacated. Moving to a single new building would create an opportunity to save on the Council's revenue costs, reduce the amount of space the Council occupies and its Carbon footprint.

In response to Councillor Engert's questions it was noted:

- Cross Rail 2 update – public consultation on November 17th in the borough ,by that time council will have knowledge on a preferred route , and there are more positive soundings about a north/ west branch of the route.
- In relation to the £10m allocation to the new Council building, given the Council's commitment to Wood Green regeneration, having a stake in the regeneration in wood green, though significant landholding is required to support regeneration and the same strategy that has been followed in Tottenham.
- Current staff numbers were 2703.

RESOLVED

1. To note that a bid for £425,000 from the Transformation Fund has been submitted to Resources Priority Board in order to appoint a Programme Team to deliver the Future Ways of Working programme to complete the business case over the remainder of 2016/17. The business case will be brought back to Cabinet with a five year plan for the delivery of the programme;
2. That the head leasehold interest in the sites set out in Part B of this report be acquired by the Council. A budget of up to £10m is approved to acquire both head leases from the Council's site acquisition fund. That the final price and heads of terms for both sites be delegated to the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development in consultation with the Section 151 officer and Lead member for Corporate Resources;
3. That if the headlesses cannot be acquired, then in the alternative, a joint venture be agreed with the head lesses in order to procure the building of both sites or either site within the same budget as in (b), and the heads of terms of the joint venture be delegated to the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development in consultation with the Section 151 officer and the Lead member for Corporate Resources.
4. That the sites identified in Part B of this report be included as a site for the HDV and become part of the Competitive Dialogue process and to note that the details of the delivery of the new office development will be reported at a future Cabinet.
5. That the S151 officer be delegated responsibility to re -profile the budget for the Site Acquisition Fund as necessary to deliver the programme of acquisitions.

Reasons for decision

The financial, economic, social and technical environment in which the Council now operates requires the implementation of further efficiencies in the way the Council works.

The Future Ways of Working programme will support the delivery of the Corporate Plan and the Council of the Future, providing a skilled, agile workforce, aligned to the Council's values.

The existing Council accommodation is costly and no longer fit for purpose and does not support the future requirements of the Council.

The current office buildings in Station Road, River Park House and the Civic Centre are prime regeneration sites as identified in the Investment Framework and subsequently included in the Haringey Development Vehicle.

In order to meet the future requirements of the Council and the regeneration of Wood Green, the Council requires a new office building to be procured to house the Council's future staff requirement so that the current accommodation can be vacated for redevelopment.

A site options appraisal has identified two potential sites which are Council owned as set out in Part B of this report. Both are subject to head leases one of which will need to be acquired to enable development.

Both sites should be acquired on the basis that they are both significant strategic sites which the Council would control and provide an opportunity to promote a new employment based development as well as the Council's office accommodation requirement as part of the Place making strategy in Wood Green.

Alternative options considered

The continued funding cuts imposed by Central Government, provides us with no alternative other than to implement a significant transformation programme to enable services to deliver the Corporate Plan and Priorities. The programme will need to deliver significant cultural change to increase the flexibility and agility of staff, improve their capabilities and skills and ultimately embed a culture where staff are committed to delivering customer expectations and provide an excellent service.

A number of options have been considered for the future accommodation requirements, the first being the refurbishment of River Park House and Alexandra House as a future central office for the Council. This option was reviewed when the Council was seeking to purchase the Alexandra House freehold, the Council were outbid in this purchase and we currently remain as a tenant. The rental of potentially up to £1m pa or an attempt to again purchase the freehold is considered not to be financially viable. River Park House is not big enough as a sole office and therefore the site would gain greater benefits as a regeneration site within the HDV.

Redevelopment of the existing Civic Centre site was assessed, but the building is considered to have reached the end of its useful life as accommodation for Council services. The Investment Framework does not support an office development in this area and it would not aid the regeneration of the High Street.

The final option is to build a new office development. The Area Action Plan, January 2016 Cabinet Report suggested the Council offices be developed in the Clarendon Road/ Coburg Road area in order to create a footfall flowing through a green link towards Alexandra Palace Park and therefore start to add depth to the narrow High Street. Two current freehold sites considered in this area are set out in Part B of this report.

We considered splitting front office (civic centre, library, customer services) and back office (staff accommodation) between the High Street and the Clarendon Road area. However, the footfall created by visitors to the Council office and use of the new east/west link will increase regeneration potential for the area and increase the likelihood of adding depth to the High Street through an increased commercial offering. In addition, the current Library site would be made available for development with all services located to one building in Coburg Road.

It is proposed that both site options are pursued allowing the Council to control to provide both the new accommodation as well as ensure suitable employment space is retained in the area.

99. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES

RESOLVED

To note the minutes of the following:

- Leader's Signing 4th October 2016
- Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee – 4th July 2016

100. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS

RESOLVED

- To note the delegated decisions taken by Directors in September.

101. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

102. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED:

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as the items below contain exempt information, as defined under paragraph, 3 and 5 Part 1, schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

103. RECOMMENDATION OF A PREFERRED BIDDER TO SECURE THE FUTURE OF HORNSEY TOWN HALL

As per item 88.

104. OFFICE ACCOMMODATION STRATEGY

As per item 98.

105. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

None