

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 March 2008. 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**

### **Children and Young People**

#### **2. PROVISION FOR 0-19 YEAR OLDS (OUTSIDE STATUTORY SCHOOLING)**

- 2.1 We considered a report which outlined a model for 0-19 provision (outside statutory schooling) for children, young people and their families within the structure of the Children's Networks which included a number of changes to the way in which the management of the five Council-run children's centres and the Council-run play centres operated. It also informed us of the results of the consultation which had been held on this matter.
- 2.2 We noted that the approach outlined in the report aimed to build upon the early intervention and prevention strategies of the Children and Young People's Service (CYPS). This approach would join up all those services for children and young people outside statutory schooling and focus them in an integrated and co-ordinated way across each Network, thereby providing families with co-ordinated wraparound care. The approach would also enable universal services to provide low and medium targeted intervention across the 0-19s, working with children and families who did not meet the statutory thresholds for specialist services, but needed support and intervention which would, over time, reduce children and families falling into greater degrees of vulnerability.
- 2.3 We also received a deputation which addressed our meeting and expressed concern about the consultation which the Council had undertaken regarding the future of the Children's Centres at Noel Park, Woodside, Park Lane, Stonecroft and Triangle. Whilst welcoming the changes in the Council's position since the matter had last been considered at our meeting in July 2007 as reflected in the report. In particular they believed the consultation period had not been long enough.
- 2.4 Having considered the report, the concerns raised by the deputation and the response given to them by the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People who advised that the review of the five Council-run children's centres had started over six months ago and that parents and staff had been consulted during this process in particular, during the

formal consultation period. Most staff within the play service had been consulted at staff meetings and the managers of the five Council-run children's centres had been involved throughout the review. Children's centre managers had met and discussed the proposals with their staff. Following approval of the proposals contained in the report further discussions would be held with parents, staff and others on a centre by centre basis.

2.5 We report that we approved the model for 0-19 provision (outside statutory schooling) for children, young people and families within each Children's Network as outlined in the report and, in principle, the proposal for the management of three of the five Council run children's centres (Stonecroft, Park Lane, Woodside and Noel Park) to be delegated to, or delivered via a Service Level Agreement (SLA), from nearby primary schools. In the first instance for formal discussions to take place with Campsbourne, St Paul's and All Hallows and Earlham Primary Schools respectively given their locations and relationship with the centres.

2.6 Approval was also granted in principle to the proposed management of Noel Park Children's Centre being delegated to or delivered via a SLA from Noel Park Primary School and to further discussions taking place with the school and local stakeholders on the detail given that it operated on a different model to the other children's centres. We also agreed to a proposal that further local consultation on the best management model for Triangle Children's Centre be considered in partnership with Urban Environment and the NDC (or its successor body) before any final decision was taken and in this connection we noted that the following possible management models had been suggested -

- appoint a new head of an integrated Centre who would develop the facility as an inter-generational Centre providing work across the whole community and being accountable as now to the local authority;
- appoint a third party from the national or local voluntary sector to manage and develop the centre as an integrated service with current staff remaining as Haringey employees but seconded under contract to this organisation for a number of years, working in close partnership with the NDC (or its successor body) and the local community;

2.7 Finally, we approved in principle a proposal that some or all of the Council-run play centres be managed by local schools (as part of their extended schools programme) or children's centres and that formal discussions be held with those schools identified as the 'best fit' given their location and links with existing play centres

### **3. ADMISSION TO SCHOOLS DETERMINATION OF ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS**

3.1 We noted that Section 89 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 required all admission authorities to consult on the content of their admission arrangements. Regulations required that, for the school year commencing September 2009, such consultation should be completed by 1 March 2008 and the arrangements determined by 15 April 2008. We considered a report which set out the statutory framework for the admission arrangements proposed for determination, including the statutory School Admissions Code, which came into force in February 2007. These arrangements complied with the statutory framework. In particular the priority given to looked after children reflected the duty on an admission authorities to give such children the highest

priority. In addition the authority was required to have an In-Year Fair Access Protocol in place from September 2007. The proposals referred to in the report concerning the appointment of Choice Advisers reflected the new duty on the authority, under Section 86(1A) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, to provide advice and assistance to parents regarding their expression of preferences within the admission arrangements for that area.

3.2 We report that we approved the proposed admission arrangements for determination for all community primary and secondary schools and St Aidan's Voluntary Controlled Primary School and the admission arrangements for sixth form provision in Alexandra Park School, the Highgate/Hornsey Consortium and the Sixth Form Centre. We also approved the determination of the Qualifying Schemes for the co-ordination of arrangements for admission to reception classes in all maintained primary and secondary schools in Haringey. In so doing, we noted that, at secondary level, this entailed the Council's continued participation in the Pan-London Scheme.

#### **4. BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE – STRATEGY FOR CHANGE (2)**

4.1 We considered a report which advised that the Strategy for Change Part 2 (SfC2) built upon Part 1 which had set out our intention to transform the outcomes for young people (11-19) and their communities in Haringey. SfC2 would take forward our responsibility to transform secondary education, and especially to facilitate robust dialogue with Governing Bodies on implementing the Government's diversity, choice and fair access agenda. This would include plans for potential changes to the status of some schools to enable greater levels of self governance. The decision around the change of status of any school rested with the Governing Body of that school.

4.2 We noted that Haringey was well advanced in implementing aspects of its Strategy for Change as part of the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme. Industry-standard programme management systems (Managing Successful Programmes and PRINCE2 [P**RO**jects **I**N **C**ontrolled **E**nvironments]) had been used to ensure that all elements of the programme moved forward effectively. We also noted that the BSF programme had good ownership within the Council and that there was confidence that effective systems were in place to lead and manage this complex change programme and achieve our vision.

4.3 Framework agreements had been established, through EU procurement processes, for

- educational advice;
- design team partners; and
- construction partners.

A team of construction project managers was in place and cost consultants had appointed core teams to each of the Wave 2 schools. Most of the Wave 2 schools were already at RIBA Stage C and by April 2008 all would have reached stage D, at which stage contractor partners would join the design teams.

4.4 Design proposals for Wave 2 projects had been judged good overall by Partnerships for Schools (Pfs) and the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)

and one of the more advanced designs an exemplar. ICT procurement was also well advanced. Using a competitive dialogue process we had two potential Managed Services Provider (MSP) partners and final bids were to be submitted in March 2008, with a milestone to have the MSP preferred bidder in place by April 2008.

- 4.5 We noted that good progress was being made through the BSF programme and that SfC2 provided an overview of the actions that were planned to be taken to achieve the transformation we set out in our vision, supported by the construction and ICT elements of the programme. In response to concern expressed about how the Government's diversity and choice agenda would work in practice and about the need for robust dialogue with both parents and the Government on these issues in particular for stakeholders to be made aware of all of the options open to them rather than having one imposed on them, we were informed that Strategy was intended to start a dialogue with the Government which already held strong views about these matters with the outcome in terms of status being a decision for the Governors of the individual school and what was being proposed in the report was a process.

## **Regeneration and Enterprise**

### **5. LEGAL AGREEMENT WITH THE OWNERS OF THE GLS SITE FOR GROWTH AREA FUNDING**

- 5.1 The Council will be aware that on 20 February 2007 we agreed to enter into a funding agreement with Ferryboat Properties Limited the then freeholder of the GLS site. We considered a report which informed us that the ownership of the GLS site had been transferred from Ferryboat Properties Limited to Hale Village Properties LLP a special purpose vehicle set up for the purpose of redeveloping the site and which sought our authority to enter into a funding agreement with Hale Village Properties LLP instead.
- 5.2 We have entered into a Funding Agreement with the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) for Growth Area Funding (GAF) and we noted that the GAF Funding Agreement contained the conditions of the grant with which the Council must comply making the Council the accountable body. We were advised that in order to protect the Council's position and to ensure that the grant recipient complied with these grant conditions a separate funding agreement must be entered into with the grant recipient. The recipient in this case is the owner of the GLS site.
- 5.3 We report that we noted the change of ownership of the GLS site from Ferryboat Properties Ltd. to Hale Village Properties LLP and agreed to the Council entering into a funding agreement with them for a total Growth Area Funding grant of £2,502,000.

### **6. IMPLEMENTING A CHARGING REGIME FOR PRE-APPLICATION PLANNING ADVICE**

- 6.1 We considered a report which recommended a more structured approach to the way in which the Council dealt with the pre-application phase of planning applications in the Borough. The report considered two different charging regimes one for basic Pre-Application Planning Advice (PAPAs) and one for Planning Performance Agreements

(PPAs) which would introduce a project management approach to preparing Major, Strategic, and Complex Applications.

- 6.2 We noted that several local authorities including a number of our neighbours were charging for these services and the report demonstrated the advantages of doing so and recommended that we implement a charging regime benchmarked against our neighbours. We were informed that PPAs were a new concept which had been piloted by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) via the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) and the Advisory Team for Large Applications (ATLAS) and had now been put forward as an option for Local Planning Authorities to consider.
- 6.3 Officers spent much time giving pre-application advice to developers on schemes which might prove only to be speculative. The charges proposed were in line with Government recommendations which would result in developers, who benefited from the advice, paying for the service, instead of the cost of this advice falling on the general Council Tax payer. The new services would be available to any agent/developer interested in receiving advice on a proposed planning application for a development of two units or more. This would remove the average householder from the charges. Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs) would only be considered for applications of major or strategic significance to the Borough.
- 6.4 During the course of our deliberations, reference was made to discussions at meetings of the Planning Committee about this matter and about the possibility of imposing charges for retrospective planning applications. We were advised that while this was possible the majority of retrospective applications were householder applications whereas the proposed charge for this service, which was in line with Government recommendations, was primarily in respect of pre-application advice to developers.
- 6.5 We report that we approved the proposal to proceed with the implementation of a formalised service for pre-application planning advice (PAPA) and a charging regime benchmarked against neighbouring local authorities. We also approved the proposal to proceed with the implementation of Planning Performance Agreements (PPA's) and the associated charging regime based on guidance from Government. We asked that a further report be submitted to our April meeting on the question of the imposition of charges for retrospective planning applications.

## **Environment and Conservation**

### **7. HIGHWAYS ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN**

- 7.1 The Council will be aware that our highways infrastructure is by far the most valuable set of assets for which we are responsible providing a vital contribution to the prosperity of the Borough. The availability of a safe, serviceable highways network is essential to allow ready access around and through the Borough, as well as providing access for business and residents. The Borough's economic vitality depends upon highway links that are safe and fit for purpose. Efficient, effective management of this valuable asset is therefore one of the Council's key responsibilities.

- 7.2 The highways network comprises 313.5km of carriageway (roads) and 652km footways (pavements). These assets alone have been valued at approximately £224million. In addition, there are assets including street lighting, bridges, drainage, signs, street furniture, car parks, trees and amenity areas, the value of which is currently unknown but certainly runs into many millions of pounds.
- 7.3 The Highways Asset Management Plan (HAMP) sought to develop a strategic approach to managing this vital asset and used tools and techniques to enable better, more robust and accountable management of the highway infrastructure. Development of the strategic approach drew on the corporate vision of Haringey coupled with the Council's commitment to the Mayor's Transport Strategy through the production of the Local Implementation Plan. In order to achieve this, the HAMP had been developed to develop knowledge and understanding of the network in terms of what was owned (inventory), condition and treatment options. This would enable longer term programming of work and a better understanding of funding needs over time and implications on change in budgets with regards to service levels defined or expected.
- 7.5 The Highway Asset also contributed to many of the Council Priorities including:
- Greenest Borough
  - Better Haringey – cleanliness and safety
  - Customer perception
  - Regeneration
- 7.1 We report that we considered the draft Highways Asset Management Plan (HAMP) as prepared by OPUS and agreed the action plan that had been developed from it. In agreeing the draft as the first HAMP we recognised the need for much more work to be done to make it a truly meaningful document. We also noted that the HAMP was not, in itself, a Highways Asset Valuation but the plan on what to do with that asset. We also noted the status of the current asset valuation and the need for significant investment in survey work; software enhancements and ongoing staff costs in order to compile and maintain a proper asset register in order to be able to produce the current asset valuation at any time in the future.
- 7.2 Work undertaken to date on developing the HAMP indicated that substantial additional investment funding would be needed to meet the resources shortfall identified to improve highways assets so that they are fit for purpose and on-going costs to maintain them in decent condition. Different sources of funding both external and internal needed to be assessed and prioritised to meet this need including the possibility of using prudential borrowing and other funding mechanisms as appropriate to renew or improve assets. The Plan would be taken into account in formulating the annual Highways Works Programme and used as a basis for bidding for funds either through the Council's financial planning process or from external sources.
- 7.3 The Government was working towards the production of commercial-style accounts for the whole of the public sector including local authorities. The valuation of highway assets under this system would not only assess replacement value, but also assess the level and rate of depreciation - demanding a detailed knowledge of condition and maintenance plans.

- 7.4 We report that we approved the draft Highways Asset Management Plan (HAMP) as an important first stage towards Infrastructure Asset Management for local borough roads and their associated structures which would be required in the future for the Whole of Government Accounts. We also agreed that the Highways Works Programme (see following item below) be used annually to update Members on the development and implementation of the plan and, in particular, to consider the future work programme based on the principles of the HAMP and where necessary to update the HAMP.

## **8. HIGHWAYS WORKS PLAN 2008/09**

- 8.1 We considered a report on the progress of projects approved in the Highways Work Plan for 2007/8 and which sought our approval for the Highways Work Plan for 2008/9. The report also, and for a first time, sought approval in principle for the Plan for the subsequent year (2009/10) subject to capital funding being available. This set out the programme of highway and traffic schemes that would be carried out on the Borough's roads in 2008/09 as well as those proposed for 2009/10. In addition the report provided the initial draft proposals for Local Implementation Plan (LIP) submission for 2009/10. The projects were based on those proposed for 2009/10 in the LIP for 2008/9, the re-submission of projects unfunded in 2008/9 where appropriate and new initiatives the Council wanted to pursue.
- 8.2 We noted the progress on the 2007/8 Highways Works Plan and approved the 2008/09 Highways Works Plan and, where available, the 2009/10 Plan subject to financing and review in March 2009. We also approved the consultation type for each scheme within the agreed processes as set out in the Plan and we delegated to the Director of Urban Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Conservation authority to approve the final LIP APR submission for 2009/10 with Appendix 7 to the report as the basis for the submission but with further schemes added or others removed as necessary prior to submission. Approval was also granted to the inclusion of roads which could be brought forward from the 2009/10 Plan if extra funding was available or if schemes in the 2008/9 plan were delayed due to utilities work, consultation or any other unforeseen reason.

## **9. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACT 2004 AND ADOPTION OF A PERMIT SCHEME**

- 9.1 We considered a report which advised us that In July 2004 the Traffic Management Act had gained Royal Assent. The Act comprised of seven parts and accompanying schedules which were being implemented in stages. We noted that the relevant parts of the Act that had a direct impact on Highways Services were as follows -

### Part 2- Network Management Duty

Placed a statutory duty on all local authorities to expedite the movement of traffic (including pedestrians and cyclists) safely on its own network and facilitate the same on networks of neighbouring authorities and in London Transport for London. It required local authorities to appoint a Traffic Manager which the Council had done.

If it could be demonstrated that any authority was failing in its Network Management Duty the Act provided for the Secretary of State for England to appoint a Traffic Director and sets out the procedure for such intervention. The regulations also provided for the cost of intervention to be charged to the local authority and this cost was anticipated to be up to £245,000 depending upon the level of duties taken over by the Traffic Director.

The Traffic Management Act 2004 Intervention Criteria came into effect under of the Act in May 2007. This provided the guidance on what basis the Secretary of State would take enforcement action against an authority deemed to be failing in their Network Management Duty (NMD). Part of the criteria for judging an authority's performance in its NMD would be the extent to which they had exercised any powers in support of that action. The introduction of the permit scheme was seen as an important step in demonstrating this.

### Part 3 – Permit Schemes

This made provision for highway authorities (individually or by two or more acting together) to set up and operate Permit Schemes for the management and control of activities on the highway in accordance with Regulations made by the Secretary of State under Section 37 of the Act. The Council could now attach conditions to permits such as

- The days of the week and the times of the day on which works might be carried out.
- The duration of the works
- The amount of highway space that the works might occupy
- The provision of advance information and publicity measures

Regulations were made in November 2007, coming into force on 1 April 2008. Where a Permit Scheme was submitted and approved (with such modifications if any as the Secretary of State may direct) a separate statutory order would be made specifying the date the Permit Scheme would come into effect.

- 9.2 The report was the Council's response to Part 3. The implementation of the Permit Scheme was fundamental in giving the Council the necessary tool to control utility works efficiently and effectively. The delegation to the Director of Urban Environment of the authority to prepare and submit an application under Part 3 of the Act would enable the correct procedures to be carried out with the other authorities.

The implications of Haringey not adopting a Permit Scheme were as follows

- It would fail in its network management duty to co-ordinate work on the highway in a more effective way
- It would lose out on a significant income stream
- It would reduce the Council's ability to make Haringey a safer and better place to live.

- 9.3 We report that we authorised the Director of Urban Environment to make the necessary arrangements to prepare and submit, in conjunction with the London Permit Scheme Group, an application to the Secretary of State under Part 3 Traffic Management Act



2004 to operate a highway authority Permit Scheme. We also authorised the Director of Urban Environment to agree any variations to the Scheme agreed by the London Permit Scheme Group to achieve consistency throughout participating Boroughs in London, or as Directed by the Secretary of State. Further, that following the Secretary of State approving the scheme it be adopted and brought into effect after notice had been given to interested parties as required under the Regulations.

## **Housing**

### **10. EMPTY PROPERTIES COMPULSORY PURCHASE OF 209 MOUNT PLEASANT ROAD N17, 87 CARLINGFORD ROAD N15 (LEFT HAND SIDE) AND 82 MOSELLE AVENUE N22**

- 10.1 We considered a report which set out proposals to make Compulsory Purchase Orders at 207/209 Mount Pleasant Road, N17, 87 Carlingford Road (left hand side) N15 and 92 Moselle Avenue, N22. The Council will be aware that the use of compulsory purchase powers forms part of Haringey's Empty Properties Strategy, Housing Strategy, and Sub-Regional Strategy to bring back into use residential premises that had been long term vacant and where no other course of action was appropriate or could be pursued. It was also in pursuance of achieving a year-on-year increase in the number of privately owned empty properties brought back into use through advice or intervention (Best Value Performance Indicator 64).
- 10.2 The report described the condition of the properties and the work which had been undertaken to date by officers in the Strategic and Community Housing Services of the Urban Environment Directorate and of the North London Private Sector Housing Sub-region, to bring the properties back into use.
- 10.3 We report that we approved the use of Compulsory Purchase powers under Section 17 of the Housing Act 1985 and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 to compulsorily acquire the above-mentioned properties and we authorised the Head of Legal Services to make and seal the Orders for submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for consideration and approval. We also authorised the Head of Legal Services to confirm the Compulsory Purchase Order in the event of the Secretary of State returning the Order and upon confirmation of the Compulsory Purchase Order to proceed with the acquisition.
- 10.4 In the event that any of the owners agreeing, in the form of a legally enforceable undertaking, to bring the relevant property back into residential occupation use within a reasonable timetable, then the Head of Legal Services in consultation with the Director of Urban Environment was authorised to accept and enforce such an undertaking instead of proceeding with the Compulsory Purchase Order for the property in question.
- 10.5 We also agreed, subject to the confirmation of the Compulsory Purchase Orders by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government or the Council, to the disposal of the property to a Registered Social Landlord (RSL) in the first instance, or to a Private Developer (in which case the sale would be by way of auction with covenants applied to bring the property back into use as soon as possible) and to the re-cycling of the receipt from the disposal back to the capital programme budget for the continued private sector

housing Compulsory Purchase Order programme. Further, that the financial costs of the Compulsory Purchase Orders be met through the capital programme.

## **Safer Communities and Enforcement**

### **11. RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY REVIEW ON RESOURCING OF SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES**

- 11.1 We considered a report which proposed a response to the recommendations made by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee as a result of the Scrutiny Review of the Resourcing of Safer and Stronger Communities LAA Targets.
- 11.2 We noted that the terms of reference for the review were as follows: "To consider the future resourcing of actions to achieve strategic targets within the Safer Communities block of the Local Area Agreement for Haringey 2007 – 2010 and to make recommendations thereon to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee." The recommendations made in the original Scrutiny Review report, and our responses to them, would affect all Council departments. The whole Council plus its key statutory partners had a role to play in achieving the Safer Communities' targets.
- 11.3 We also noted that in Haringey there were eight external sources of funding totalling £6,207,750 which were utilised to achieve the safer communities' targets. The core funding allocated to this area of work by the Council was £1,053,400. From April 2008 the introduction of the Area Based Grant would integrate a number of the external funding sources which had traditionally been received by the Council's Safer Communities Business Unit. In managing the allocation of the Area Based Grant funding for key activities within the Safer Communities Business had been prioritised and recommendations 1 – 3 covered this issue.
- 11.4 In terms of legal Implications, Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 clearly stated
- "(1) Without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it, it shall be the duty of each authority to which this section applies to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area.
- (2) This section applies to a local authority, a joint authority, a police authority, a National Park authority and the Broads Authority."
- Recommendations 4 – 8 covered this requirement.
- 11.5 We report that we welcomed the recommendations made in the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee into its review of Resourcing of Safer and Stronger Communities Local Area Agreement Targets and we granted approval to the action plan which was set out as an Appendix to the report for the achievement of the recommendations where appropriate.

## Resources

### 12. SUSTAINABLE PROCUREMENT

- 12.1 We considered a report which outlined the proposed Sustainable Procurement Strategy and Policy of the Council. An Appendix to the report outlined the proposed Sustainable Procurement Policy and Strategy and explained how the Council's spending power could be utilised in support of sustainable development and contribute to the achievement of the Greenest Borough Strategy (in particular Priority 4: Leading example – managing the Council sustainably and Priority 5: Sustainable design and construction).
- 12.2 We noted that procurement was a considerable element of an organisation's economic power. As a local authority with responsibility for spending public money, the Council had a duty to ensure it is spent in the community's interests now and for generations to come. In order to deliver outcomes that supported sustainable development, the procurement process had to take account of social, economic and environmental objectives. In line with the Council's Equal Opportunities Policy, the Equality Public Duties Scheme and the Council's Guide to Equalities in Procurement, the social objectives in the proposed Strategy embraced the promotion of equality of opportunity at all stages of the procurement process.
- 12.3 The strategy and policy had been developed in support of the Greenest Borough Strategy and following the increasing UK Government emphasis around sustainable procurement. This included the UK Sustainable Procurement Task Force, which identified benefits arising from adopting sustainable procurement as:
- better stewardship of taxpayers' money;
  - environmental and social benefits;
  - public sector support for innovation;
  - encouragement for more environment-friendly technologies;
  - better management of risk; mitigation of concerns about upfront costs through less waste;
  - better information about purchasing patterns; and improved supplier relationships; and management.

All of these elements of sustainable procurement were, at the same time, examples of good procurement practice.

- 12.4 In addition to offering real value for money over the long term and contributing to meeting the targets in Greenest Borough Strategy, adoption of the strategy and policy would demonstrate leadership of the Borough. This would show the Council living its values. There were also increasing regulatory and policy requirements in the UK and Europe, primarily around financial reporting, waste management, energy use and sustainable production and consumption. The UK Government had set the target for the UK to be among the EU leaders in sustainable procurement by 2009, an aspiration shared by the Local Government Association. There were higher expectations of Councils in leading the corporate social responsibility agenda locally.

- 12.5 In order to help authorities take the steps needed to bring about sustainable procurement, the UK Sustainable Procurement Task Force had developed a Flexible Framework for implementation. The Framework outlined, step by step, the things that organisations needed to achieve in order to implement sustainable procurement. It broke these into 5 levels of achievement: from foundation, at Level 1; through to leading, at Level 5. Following a self assessment against the Flexible Framework, Haringey was currently averaging Level 1.5. We were informed that the framework had been endorsed by the Local Government Association and was recognised in the new Comprehensive Area Assessment (2008/09) as an indication of effective use of resources. The Strategy proposed called for Haringey to work in line with this Framework.
- 12.6 We report that in adopting the Sustainable Procurement Policy and Strategy we asked that our thanks be placed on record to the team who had produced it.

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

### **13. SUBSIDY AND PRICING SCHEDULE AMENDMENT**

- 13.1 We reported to the Council meeting on 18 February 2008 on the decisions we had taken following consideration of the Recreation Subsidy and Pricing Policy Review at our meeting on 22 January 2008. The report recognised both the challenge regarding 65+ user related implementation and the need for phased introduction. Recreation Services initiated implementation of those decisions in accordance with the Communications and Promotion Plan of the Review report. The latter included targeted consultation with 65+ users and the Older People's Forum, on the implementation of the revised policy and prices, and in particular how the Council could support the transition from free to charged use.
- 13.2 We considered a report which provided feedback from consultation on the implementation of the new subsidy and pricing policy and which sought our approval to the proposed pricing amendments for Borough 65+ resident users, to take effect from 7 April 2008. We 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.
- 13.3 The key concerns / feedback and responses reported to us were as follows:
- 'Users and stakeholders had expressed concern regarding the lack of consultation upon policy principles'.  
The 'ability to pay' principle was central and fundamental to the revised policy, and Members have previously agreed to focus on implementation consultation.
  - 'Concern as to how "means testing" would be managed'.  
It was not the Council's intention to introduce a new and additional process. Ability to pay would be determined through reference to and use of existing Council Tax Benefit claims/ assessment. This would be done through a sensitive and properly

managed procedure, including information and advice on the Benefit assessment criteria and process.

- 'Collective impact of a range of Council and/or partner change actions e.g. Housing rent increases'.  
Clearly services to residents were provided in a number of settings, by a range of public and voluntary sector providers, and within a value for money environment. The Council had actively sought to respond to these demands by targeting price reductions and public subsidy to the most financially disadvantaged, whilst recognising the need to make specific interim arrangements for 65+ users, and at the same time improving income generation through premium prices and payment options.
- 'A common strength of feeling amongst older users as to the eligibility and authenticity of some other unwaged/ low income users'.  
Clearly there would be individuals who seek to 'bypass the system', particularly where there was direct financial gain. The Council used existing thorough means/status testing assessment processes in determining leisure discount eligibility. Clearly status could and did change, and thus unwaged status would now be checked every 6 months rather than annually.
- 'Possible negative impact/ increased demand and cost for health and social care services'.  
The Council and PCT were already piloting a GP Exercise/ Physical Activity Referral Scheme which could provide the blueprint for more joint effective/ targeted use of public subsidies. The Council subsidy contribution was reflected in the pricing policy e.g. Swim retail price £3.50, Advantage /Advantage+ rate of £1.00/£1.50 = £2.00 to £2.50 subsidy.
- 'Concern as to how user and usage patterns would be monitored and reviewed, and whether prices would be further amended'.  
User numbers, frequency and patterns of use would be monitored through the Active Card and associated Leisure Management IT System. This information would be used to assess the impact of the new pricing policy and 65+ discount arrangements, to determine what, if any, further amendments might be required, whilst monitoring information would be reviewed at least monthly. Overall evaluation would be considered through the 2009/10 Business Planning process.
- 'Support for further targeted concessions for 65+ users, particularly for users just above the 'Advantage' (maximum discount) threshold'.  
A number of ideas have been put forward, and a package was proposed and set out below:

The following 65+ resident user package was proposed as an amendment to the fees and charges we approved in January 2008 -

For 65+ users:-

- Monday – Friday 9am – 5pm = Free access to all activities excluding specialist classes and pre-booked courses. Haringey residents only.

- Charges outside these times are on a flat day rate:
    - £1.50 Advantage+ = residents not eligible for Council Tax Benefit, and non residents.
    - £1.00 Advantage = residents eligible for Council Tax Benefit.
  - Haringey residents may also opt to pay monthly by direct debit at £10 per month.
- 13.4 Our previous decision had assumed a total level of additional income of £215,000 per annum, a proportion of which related to income from the new fees and charges to the over 65's. The overall estimate of additional income included a number of different assumptions in respect of take up and demand, which would need to be closely monitored once implemented. The change proposed would have the impact of reducing the additional income by an estimated £35,000 to £40,000 but this would be managed within the overall existing approved budget for the Leisure Service.
- 13.5 We report that we acknowledged the feedback and strength of feeling from residents aged 65 plus and groups and we agreed to vary our earlier decision so as to allow for the fees and charges schedule amendment outlined above. We also agreed that a progress report be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in six months time.

## **Leader**

### **14. HARINGEY'S LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT 2008/09 – 2010/11**

- 14.1 This matter was the subject of a report to the meeting of the Council on 31 March 2008.

### **15. THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE – JANUARY 2008**

- 15.1 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.
- 15.2 We noted that good progress was being made across all the priorities with 86.5% of indicators achieving green or amber status as at January 2008. We continued to make good progress on promoting independent living (87%, 13 indicators green or amber), encouraging lifetime well-being (100% or 14 indicators green or amber) and delivering excellent services (88% or 45 indicators green or amber). In summary, the balanced scorecard showed that for service delivery 87% of indicators were on target or close to the end of year target as at January 2008. For 12 of the 15 (80%) customer focus measures, performance targets were being met or close to being met. For financial health, 25 of the 27 traffic lighted measures achieved green or amber status, meaning for 93% 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 89% of indicators had maintained or improved performance since the end of last year.

- 15.3 Overall revenue budget monitoring, based on the December position, showed a forecast net under spend of £0.5 million. The main budget pressure related to Adult Social Care, and this was partly offset by additional treasury investment income. The DSG element of the overall Children and Young People’s Service budget was projected to under spend by £0.4 million in respect of the Network Family support budget. This would be the subject of a carry forward request in due course to meet the summer term 2008 commitments. In relation to the HRA, the net current revenue projection was a surplus of £0.6 million against the approved budget mainly due to additional one-off rent income.
- 15.4 The aggregate capital projected position in 2007/08 was an under spend of £18.9 million. The key variations and reasons for the projected under spend included programme slippage for the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme, Mortuary and IT/Achieving Excellence projects of £11.5 million that was recommended for re-profiling to later in the programme.
- 15.5 In accordance with financial regulations we approved a number of proposed budget changes and these are shown in the table below. These changes fell into one of two categories:
- budget virements, where it was proposed that budget provision be transferred between one service budget and another. Explanations were provided where this was the case;
  - Increases or decreases in budget, generally where notification had been received in-year of a change in the level of external funding such as grants or supplementary credit approval.
- 15.6 Under the Constitution, certain virements were key decisions. Key decisions were:
- for revenue, any virement which results in change in a directorate cash limit of more than £250,000; and
  - for capital, any virement which results in the change of a programme area of more than £250,000.

Key decisions are highlighted by an asterisk in the table.

- 15.7 The following table sets out the agreed changes. 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.

Virements we agreed are set out in the following table:

Period	Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Description
10	ACC	Rev*	(424)	(433)	Trainee Social Worker Scheme - transfer of the Children's element of the budget to CYPS
10	Children and	Rev*	424	433	Trainee Social Worker Scheme -

Period	Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Description
	Young People's Service				transfer of the Children's element of the budget to CYPS
10	POD	Rev	(89)		Organisational Development and Learning one off income received
10	POD	Rev	89		Organisational Development and Learning one off income received
10	ACCS	Rev	175	389	Adults and Strategic Structure realignment. Payments and Brokerage Teams.
10	ACCS	Rev	(175)	(389)	Adults and Strategic Structure realignment. Payments and Brokerage Teams.
10	UE	Cap	58		Tottenham Marshes funding from Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
10	UE	Cap*	(497)		Private Sector Renewal Grant. From 2007/08 changes in allocation of funds from North London Sub-Region pot, means that no individual borough allocations are being made in 2007/08
10	UE	Cap	75		LDA approved grant funding in respect of NLSA co-ordinator
10	UE	Cap	158		Bruce Grove Core Centre Townscape Heritage Initiative, budget adjustment to reflect current year spend
10	UE	Cap	133		Tottenham High Road Heritage Economic Regeneration Scheme, budget adjustment to reflect current year spend
10	CYP	Cap*	(7,026)		Re-phasing of BSF project budget.
10	UE	Cap*	(1,634)		Re-phasing of Mortuary project budget.
10	CR	Cap*	(1,801)		Re-phasing of IT project budgets.
10	CR	Cap*	(1,000)		Re-phasing of Achieving Excellence project budget

## 16. ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER URGENCY PROCEDURES

- 16.1 We were informed of the following decisions taken by Directors in consultation with Cabinet Members under urgency procedures -

### Chief Executive

Appointment of Councillor Amin to serve as one of the Council's representatives on the Haringey Strategic Partnership Board for the remainder of the 2007/08 municipal year.

## 17. DELEGATED DECISIONS AND SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS



17.1 We were informed of the following significant action taken by Directors under delegated powers -

**Director of Corporate Resources**

Stroud Green Library Building - Approval for the revision of contract for repair works in accordance with Contract Standing Order 11.02.

Review of the Commercial Portfolio - Approval for award of contract in accordance with Contract Standing Order 11.02.

Enfield Crematorium Exterior Building Works – Approval to award of contract in accordance with Contract Standing Order 11.02.

Ashley Road Depot Priority Electrical Refurbishment Works - Approval to award of contract in accordance with Contract Standing Order 11.02.

**Director of the Children & Young Peoples Service**

Building Schools for the Future - Gladesmore School - Approval to the award of a pre-construction contract following a mini competition to Balfour Beatty Construction in the sum of £82,196.38.