

# **MINUTES OF MEETING CABINET HELD ON Tuesday, 20th June, 2017, 6.30pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Claire Kober (Chair), Peray Ahmet, Eugene Ayisi, Ali Demirci, Joe Ejiofor, Joe Goldberg, Alan Strickland and Elin Weston**

**ALSO ATTENDING: Councillors: Carter, Newton, M Blake, Connor,**

## **1. 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.

## **2. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Arthur and Councillor Vanier.

## **3. URGENT BUSINESS**

The Chair agreed to accept a late item of business, which was an addendum report to be considered with exempt item 24, disposal of the PDC. A late request had been received from the Education Skills and Funding agency to amend the Heads of Terms, included in the exempt part of the agenda. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources would further outline, in the open part of the meeting, at item 17, the implications of this change to the recommendations.

## **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest put forward.

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

There were no representations received.

## **6. MINUTES**

The minutes of the Cabinet Meeting held on the 7<sup>th</sup> of March 2017 and 11<sup>th</sup> of April 2017 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

## **7. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Cabinet considered the Scrutiny Reviews on Physical Activity for Older People and Child Friendly Haringey.

## **8. CHILD FRIENDLY HARINGEY - SCRUTINY REVIEW AND CABINET RESPONSE**

Councillor Blake introduced this Scrutiny review on behalf of the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel Chair.

Councillor Blake began his introduction to the review, by underlining the importance of local government and partner systems listening to children. He emphasised the importance around implementing a child centred focus which was not through a 'top down' approach.

Councillor Blake referred to the Panel's recommendation of taking forward the long-term aim of UNICEF accreditation. The Panel were impressed with work of other boroughs that have become child friendly and they felt adopting a similar approach in Haringey with partners was important. They recognised that this was a long term process, but becoming a UNICEF partner would also provide external challenge.

The Panel listened to views of local children and the importance of tackling: safety concerns, mental health issues, homelessness, housing, education issues, and reducing households in poverty. It was important to consider these views in forthcoming children polices. Also in these changing times, to ensure that the child's voice was heard through the Council and partner systems, and in schools.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families thanked the Chair of the Children and Young People's Panel and Panel members for their work on this review. There was a shared ambition to work towards improving the lives of children and young people in the borough and providing children the best start in life. Although, the Cabinet were not able to agree all of the recommendations in detail, they were in agreement with the spirit and the principles being put forward.

### **RESOLVED**

To approve the Children's Services responses to the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as outlined in Appendix 2 of the report.

### **Reasons for decision**

The evidence supporting the Panel's recommendations is outlined in the main body of the report (**Appendix 1**).

### **Alternative options considered**

The evidence supporting the Panel's recommendations is outlined in the main body of the report (**Appendix 1**). The Cabinet could choose not to accept the recommended

response by officers to them, as outlined in Appendix 2. The potential implications of alternative courses of action are referred to within this, as appropriate.

Some of the recommendations presented in the Review would have financial and resourcing implications that have not fully been costed by the Panel and Cabinet is asked to consider this as part of their decision.

## **9. PHYSICAL ACTIVITY FOR OLDER PEOPLE SCRUTINY PROJECT**

Councillor Connor, Chair of the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel, introduced the Scrutiny review which had considered tackling the issue of physical inactivity for older people with the added aim of reducing social isolation. The project had focused on making a difference and considering the practicalities, on the ground, for social care services when offering solutions.

Councillor Connor highlighted four key recommendations: physical activity as a priority in care homes, utilising Healthwatch powers to ensure physical activity was prioritised in the care system, considering the homes to hospital pathway to include physical activity as a part of the care being provided, taking forward home-grown ideas such as the 'year of walking' and promoting this to ensure it flourishes, and challenging leisure providers to think about their physical activity offer to vulnerable groups.

Councillor Connor was pleased that an activity service directory was being developed by the Bridge Renewal Trust which would be made available by July to help older people find activity services close to them.

Councillor Connor further thanked contributors who shared information about how older people can to access information on how to become active.

The Leader responded to the review, on behalf of the Cabinet, and welcomed the extensive piece of work undertaken by the Panel. The Leader was impressed with the work put into the review to compile a number of recommendations, a majority of which, were agreed to. Those recommendations that were not agreed were where funding needed to be secured and, on the basis that future funding was secured, would be taken forward.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To note the Overview and Scrutiny Report for the Physical Activity for Older People Project (attached as Appendix 1)
2. To agree the responses to the Overview and Scrutiny Report recommendations (attached as Appendix 2)

## **Reasons for decision**

The reasons for decision are detailed in section 4 of the Overview and Scrutiny Report for the Physical Activity for Older People (attached as Appendix 1).

The recommendations and responses (Appendix 2) address the concerns around the low rates of physical activity amongst older people detailed in the Panel's report.

It should be noted that not all the recommendations could be fully agreed. This is firstly due to the separate decision making processes that are required to achieve full agreement. These separate decision making processes could not be completed within the timeframe required for adoption. Likewise, funding is not in place for all recommendations. Fuller explanations around the recommendations and responses are detailed in Appendix 2.

The financial implications of these recommendations are currently neutral. Some realignment of people resources is required and accepted. Where actual funding is required, as detailed in the recommendations, this is subject to successfully drawing down external funding from bodies such as Sport England. Activities requiring support / delivery by Fusion and other partners have been agreed with them.

It can also be expected that longer term savings will be made if older people are healthier and more independent as a result from becoming more active.

## **Alternative options considered**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee explored a number of views, good practice and evidence from many sources to enable the collation of the report and the subsequent recommendations.

The recommendations have been carefully considered in light of our strategic priorities and the resources available. Detailed responses have been drawn up to each recommendation and in most cases there is agreement to take these forward to help the Council and its partners improve physical activity rates amongst older people in the Borough. Where we do not fully agree that a recommendation represents the right course of action, we have detailed this in the response.

## **10. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

The Leader advised the meeting that two deputations had been received in relation to item 12 on the agenda, proposed relocation of Highgate Library service.

### **Deputation 1 -Save Highgate Library**

The first deputation was from the Save Highgate Library Group, and the Leader invited the group's deputation spokesperson, Natasha Sivanandan to put forward the group's representations.

The group was in opposition to the relocation of Highgate Library service and to the potential future disposal of the site. They referred to the gathering local concern about

the future of Highgate Library, reflected in a petition that had collected over 2000 signatures in a three-week period.

Ms Sivanandan spoke about the benefits of the Highgate Library for the community and attributed reduced attendance to the closure of the Library on Saturdays. It was further contended that adding a Library service to a multiple use arts centre would not work well and there was no obligation on Jacksons Lane to provide a Library on site.

The group questioned the public engagement being led by the architect as they felt this constituted a conflict of interest. They questioned why a Council led public consultation had not been held before an in principle decision was being put forward to Cabinet.

It was felt that taking an in principle decision to relocate the Library and dispose of the Highgate Library building was premature and would be difficult to deescalate once taken, and would also not allow consideration in future to opposing views.

The group called on the Cabinet to consider the unique aspects of Highgate Library, the important role of libraries in the community and asked Cabinet not to ignore the views of local people. They asked that no in principle decisions are taken before a public consultation exercise.

The Leader thanked the deputation party and responded to the representations. The Leader began by highlighting the cuts imposed on Councils over the last 7 years which had resulted in a 40% reduction in Council budgets and meant the Council had had to re-assess how it delivered services. The Council had always been committed to a universal public service offer and Libraries were at the core of this offer as a place to learn and socialise. The Cabinet report highlighted the care given to Library provision and the fact that no Libraries had closed in the past 7 years was evident of this commitment.

However, it was important for the Council to give regard to the falling numbers of Library visitors, across the country and the new and emerging priorities for local people, also ensuring that Libraries were fit for purpose in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The Leader further emphasised that the arrangement being sought with Jacksons Lane Arts Centre was co-location of the Library and not a merger. A feasibility study was being conducted to ensure that there was dedicated space for the Library that is accessible and allows quite study and social activities. The feasibility study was being conducted with an open mind, expected to complete by the end of July/ early August. An in principal decision was being sought to provide the Arts Council some certainty that co-location was being explored, to aid JLAC's capital funding bid.

The Leader was clear that if the feasibility study did not find the co location suitable, it would not be taken forward and the £1m capital funding found elsewhere by the Council to support Jackson's Lane Art Centre bid.

## Deputation 2- Highgate Library Action Group

The Leader invited Sue Chinn to put forward the representations of the Highgate Library Action Group.

- The Group felt that the decisions being taken by Cabinet were premature before a feasibility study was completed and asked that the report be withdrawn.
- The Group commended the petition that was being collated by the Save the Highgate Library Group which had encouraged more users to the Library.
- The Group were unhappy with the report mentioning the disposal of the Library before a feasibility study had been completed. They felt that this undermined the process and was pre determination . This also resulted in a lack of future security for the Highgate Library service with these decisions on record .
- The Deputation contended that a co-location exercise would still need involve engagement with HLAG and Jacksons Lane Art Centre Group before an agreement was reached therefore an in principle decision should not be taken. HLAG further questioned what would happen to the Library if the Jacksons Lane site was sold.
- The Deputation also felt that the public did not trust the process, as although the Council were not disposing of the building, at the present time, the recommendations gave them the option of doing this at a later date.
- The Group further questioned the future of Highgate Library with the decisions being put forward and the precedence of these decisions for other small libraries that may have disability access issues.

The Leader thanked the deputation and recognised the Highgate Library Action Group had dedicated a lot of time energy along to supporting the Library over the years.

The Leader reiterated that, if the scheme to relocate the existing Highgate Library service to Jacksons Lane Arts Centre proves not to be feasible, the Council will not dispose of the existing Library site and will find the £1m capital match funding for Jackson's Lane elsewhere. If the feasibility study was positive, on the co-location, then the Library service would need to fully relocate before the existing site is disposed of.

## **11. FINANCIAL OUTTURN 2016/17**

The Leader introduced the report which set out the Council's provisional budget outturn for the year ended 31 March 2017. The report further included the provisional

revenue and capital outturn for the General Fund showing the variances against budget together with the movements on reserves and the provisional capital and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) revenue outturn. It also provided explanations of significant under/overspendings.

The Chief Operating Officer agreed to provide Councillor Newton with written answers to the following questions:

- Page 170, appendix 2 scheme 316, explanation of the difficulties with the contractor that have led to the underspend in asset management and when they will be resolved?
- Page 172, appendix 4, virements, explanation on why the staffing budget has increased by £282,000?

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the provisional revenue and capital outturn for 2016/17 as detailed in the report;
2. To approve revenue carry forward requests of £9.4m at Appendix 1;
3. To approve capital carry forwards requests totalling £81.6m at Appendix 2;
4. To approve the use of reserves as set out in Appendix 3;
5. To approve the quarter 4 capital budget virements at Appendix 4;
6. To approve the quarter 4 revenue budget virements at Appendix 4; and
7. To approve the revised MTFs capital programme profile set out in section 17 of this report.

### **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.

### **Alternative Options considered**

The report of the Council's outturn and management of the financial resources is a key part of the role of the Chief Operating Officer (Section 151 Officer) and no other options have therefore been considered.

## **12. PROPOSED RELOCATION OF HIGHGATE LIBRARY SERVICE**

The Leader introduced the report which was seeking an in principle agreement from Members to the relocation of Highgate Library, to Jacksons Lane Arts Centre and was further seeking an in principle agreement to the disposal of the freehold of the existing Highgate Library site following a successful relocation of the library which would be through the Highgate Library Service Relocation Project ("the Scheme").

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

- That an in principle decision was being sought on disposal before the feasibility study was completed, to provide comfort to the Arts Council, of the Council match funding the capital funding bid from Jackson's Lane Arts Centre.
- Assurance that the community in Highgate will continue to have a Library service fit for purpose in the 21 century.
- That there would be a future consultation on the relocation of the Library and Highgate library offer, subject to a positive feasibility study.
- Jacksons Lane Arts Centre can acquire their building lease as any other community organisation in the borough can do. A Community Asset Transfer Policy for community buildings which sets out terms for transfer to a private or community organisation would be due for decision at July Cabinet.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To agree in principle to the Scheme to relocate from the existing Highgate Library service (shown edged red on the plan at Appendix B) to Jacksons Lane Arts Centre (shown edged red on the plan at Appendix A) subject to a feasibility study to be approved at a later meeting of Cabinet, but in considering this recommendation, Members are referred to the legal comments of the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance at paragraph 8.2 in the attached report.
2. To agree that the Highgate Library site ( as shown edged red on the plan at Appendix B) be reviewed on the basis that it is surplus to requirements and that the freehold interest can be disposed of, subject to the existing Highgate Library service being able to relocate to the JLAC and to submit a further report to Cabinet with the proposed terms for the disposal of the site for approval;
3. To agree that costs associated with necessary condition works to JLAC and all costs associated with relocating the library service to JLAC (including fit out and fees) will be funded by the capital programme but to the maximum total amount of the capital receipt obtained from the disposal of the existing Highgate Library site (valuation letter for the disposal can be found at Appendix C, which is the Part B Exempt Report) and the new Library service will continue to be managed by the Council. The Council's contribution will include £1m of match funding, which will be alongside Arts Council funding and JLAC other funding sources. The total funding contribution from the Council will be part of a later report presented to Cabinet;
4. To agree to the inclusion of a new scheme (Jackson Lane Arts Centre Enhancement & Highgate Library Service Relocation project) within the approved capital programme.

## **Reasons for Decision**



The opportunity to relocate the existing library service in Highgate to JLAC has been presented to the Council and has the potential to significantly improve the current offer to the community by improving the library environment and technology available and also presenting a more coherent approach to the wider community offer in the area.

There is currently very limited funding for improvements to the existing Highgate Library service. The relocation of the library service will make capital available to support an enhanced library space on the JLAC site and complement the Arts Council funding which is being sought to support refurbishment and condition works at JLAC.

The JLAC is a Grade 2 listed former church building for which the Council has freehold ownership. The lease to the JLAC expired on the 11<sup>th</sup> August 2013 and they are holding over on the lease and have a right of renewal under the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954. The building is in a poor state of repair with a number of condition issues and a backlog of repairs and maintenance. The Arts Council funding therefore provides the opportunity for capital to be available to prioritise these condition works to be completed at the earliest opportunity.

A timely decision on this opportunity is required in order for the library service relocation to be included in a variation to the existing Arts Council funding bid.

### **Alternative options considered**

Do nothing: If the Council chooses to not progress this opportunity it will only make minor improvements to the library services in Highgate. There will not be the same partnership opportunities with JLAC to provide a more collaborative approach to the arts and cultural offer within the local area. In addition to this without the match funding to the Arts Council bid, the JLAC building does not have an opportunity to become more accessible, efficient and sustainable, nor does it have the capacity for growing audiences and intensifying use. The lack of condition works could make some areas of the building increasingly unusable and therefore the Council as Landlord would need to address these concerns, but without adequate budget for medium or long term improvements.

## **13. AGREEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY BUSINESS RATES RELIEF - REVALUATION SUPPORT SCHEME**

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Social Inclusion and Sustainability introduced the report which set out the Council's allocation of Government's funding for discretionary business rate relief and sought agreement on the criteria for allocating this additional business rate relief to local businesses.

### **RESOLVED**

To approve the Discretionary Business Rates Relief – Revaluation Support Policy, as appended to this report at Appendix B and described in more detail at section 6 of the attached report, which:

- Allocates discretionary business rates relief to rate payers where - The business rate increase is £500 or more (after all other applicable reliefs have been applied)
- Automatically applies a 42% discount on the monetary increase in business rates to affected businesses in 2017/18

With the following exclusions:

- a) Premises occupied by multinational and national chain companies
- b) Excepted hereditaments within the meaning of s 47 Local Government Finance Act 1988 and wider public sector premises
- c) Businesses not located in the borough for the duration of 2016/17 and/or have left since April 2017
- d) Premises with rateable values in excess of £200,000

### **Reasons for decision**

This policy proposal sits in the context of the Council's wider economic growth priorities for the borough. We believe the recommended policy best supports economic growth as it targets small, medium-sized and independent businesses over multinational, and national chain businesses. The policy proposal aligns with the Council's existing policies to encourage business resilience and growth in Haringey and support local job creation. For this reason, the policy proposal supports private businesses over public sector premises (a number of which are hereditaments already excluded in accordance with s 47 Local Government Finance Act 1988).

Haringey Council will be expected to use discretionary business rates relief to distribute the Government's extra funding for 'revaluation support' to those businesses that have seen increases in their bills. The rationale behind the proposal and options consulted on are detailed in section 6 of this report; and principles below:

- Target relief at businesses that are facing an increase in their business rate bills following the revaluation, encompassing different sizes, sectors and locations across the borough
- Distribute the extra relief in a way that is proportionate to how much a businesses' bill has increased, and in a fair and equal manner
- Apply to ratepayers occupying lower value properties
- Ensure that the extra relief is distributed to local businesses quickly and smoothly
- Be relatively simple for the Council to administer

We are also seeking to ensure that relief for businesses is distributed as quickly as possible and minimises administrative costs where possible. We believe this is fundamental, both to the Government's intentions of the scheme and to our priorities to support businesses that have seen large increases in their business rates since the 2017 revaluation.

## Alternative options considered

To apply the relief in a similar way to that recommended (in section 6) but to also include (rather than exclude) multinational and national chain businesses in the scheme. In expanding the number of eligible businesses the percentage discount relief allocated to the monetary business rate increase would fall. This equates to allocating a 25% discount on the monetary increase, costing £1.27 million in 2017/18. Note the recommended option enables a 42% reduction.

The consultation supported the proposal that excluding multinational and national chain businesses is a fairer way of distributing the relief to businesses that are less able to cope with the business rate increase. A majority of the respondents to the Council's consultation stated that preference should be given to small, medium-sized and independent businesses; and Haringey's presenting Authority, the Greater London Authority, stated that firms operating nationally or internationally may be benefitting from reductions in business rates in other parts of the country.<sup>1</sup>

To apply the relief as per the recommendation in section 6 but to include the wider public sector. We are minded not to extend the fund to wider public sector organisations. We believe this is in line with the aims of the fund, which are to support business and promote growth. Therefore, we believe it is best to support those small, medium-sized and independent businesses in Haringey facing difficulties.

To apply the relief as per the recommendation in section 6 but to include businesses not in the borough for duration of 2017/18 or have since left. It is considered that their inclusion with limited funds would not be prioritised; and would involve a disproportionate administrative burden to calculate a pro rata relief. Businesses that have occupied premises in Haringey for the full financial year are to be prioritised. Also, there are other reliefs that may be available to new businesses in the borough.

To apply the relief as per the recommendation in section 6 but to include premises with rateable values in excess of £200,000. We are minded not to provide the relief in this way. This in line with the DCLG consultation (March 2017) point where it states, "further assume, by and large, more support will be provided to":

- Ratepayers or localities that face the most significant increase in bills
- Ratepayers occupying lower value properties (i.e. properties with a rateable value below £200,000)

To apply the relief as per the recommendation in section 6 but to include businesses with increases below £500. We are minded not to apply the relief in this way. We consider the £500 threshold follows the spirit of the discretionary relief scheme by supporting those businesses hardest hit by rates increases. This rationale is also

---

<sup>1</sup> **Extract from GLA feedback to the Haringey consultation:** The GLA supports this proposal in principle as it is our view that the relief scheme should be targeted at small and medium sized local businesses and independent traders in genuine hardship or experiencing the largest relative rises in bills. It is quite likely that firms operating nationally or internationally may be benefitting from reductions in business rates liabilities on their properties elsewhere in England and are better able to manage the impact of the 2017 revaluation on their finances.

informed by the large administrative cost if there was not a threshold; set against the comparatively low level of relief to businesses.

The following options were considered and discounted at the Cabinet member signing meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2017 and therefore not consulted on:

Haringey Council could use its own funds to 'top-up' the Government's allocated funding for implementing this extra discretionary relief. This option has been discounted because it would result in a financial cost for the Council at a time when the organisation needs to find financial savings as part of its medium term financial strategy.

To target all of the Government's funding for discretionary relief at one particular high street, regeneration zone or economic sector. This option has been discounted because the 2017 revaluation will have significant impacts on all high streets and localities across the borough, and impact upon retail, workspace and industrial sectors. To concentrate all the Government's funding on just one locality or sector within the borough would be unfair.

To target all of the Government's funding for discretionary relief through a large scale 'hardship fund' which businesses would apply for. This option has been discounted because of the significant administrative challenges for assessing thousands of applications on a case by case basis. It would not be practical, could lead to lengthy delays in awarding relief and treat businesses inconsistently.

#### **14. LEASEHOLDER POLICY ON ESTATE RENEWAL SCHEMES (REVISED RE-HOUSING & PAYMENTS POLICY) FOR CONSULTATION**

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning introduced the report which was seeking approval to consult on a revised re – housing and payments policy which was previously agreed in July 2016 but required revision in light of progress with the HDV [Haringey Development Vehicle] and taking into account new DCLG and GLA guidance on estate renewal.

This revised policy aimed to provide:

- Borough wide commitments to residents, whose properties will be demolished as part of estate renewal and regeneration schemes, on how they will be re-housed and the terms they can expect. This is aimed at improving lives of residents, extending promises tenants and leaseholders beyond statutory requirements and improving life chances.
- Set a benchmark for the housing options that must be offered on a borough wide basis.
- Clarify the Council's commitments to tenants.
- Extend the options for leaseholders beyond the statutory minimums set out in the existing ERRPP.
- Extend the commitment to all Haringey Development Vehicle schemes and Housing Association schemes where the Council determines it has a strategic interest.

- Respond to the recent publication of guidance on estate regeneration by the Department of Communities and Local Government and the Mayor of London and the issues around the Secretary of State's decisions on the Aylesbury Estate.

In response to questions from Councillor Newton the following information was noted.

- There would be some estate renewal by the HDV and some by Housing Associations. Whilst the pledge is for equivalent terms, if a new resident moves to the estate and has a new landlord it may be on a different type of tenancy. However, Cllr Strickland stressed that Council Tenants moving into a HDV property will have lifetime security as they do in their current tenure.
- The leaseholder shared equity and shared ownership options put forward go beyond the Council's statutory obligations. There will be a value difference when moving to an improved regenerated area but it is clear that people will not be penalised and will get their share of the uplift when selling on their property.
- The Council cannot guarantee exactly same rent when moving from one place to another – which is also the same situation now. Currently the rent setting formula depends on your landlord and the size of the property. For example, if a resident was moving to a larger home in the regeneration to meet family space needs, then the rent may increase. The Head of Housing stressed that the rent being applied, on a replacement social rented home, will be a social rent based on the national rent setting formula, not an "Affordable rent" that can be up to 80% of the market rent.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the draft Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy (Appendix 1) for consultation and in particular:
  - a) The application of this policy to all estate renewal schemes of 50 or more properties led by the Council
  - b) The extension of this policy to schemes led by the Haringey Development Vehicle, and Housing Association schemes where the Council determines that it has a strategic interest
  - c) The commitment to all residents that:
    - No tenant, leaseholder or freeholder will be financially worse off as a result of estate renewal
    - All tenants will have a guaranteed right of return to an appropriate sized home on an equivalent social tenancy at an equivalent rent
    - All tenants who wish to move away will be supported to do so
    - All resident leaseholders and freeholders will have a guaranteed right of return, and will have an offer of a home that is affordable to them, either on an open market, shared equity or shared ownership basis.

2. To note that the Policy allows for individual regeneration schemes to offer additional options above and beyond those in this Policy where these are viable and appropriate for the scheme.
3. To approve the setting aside of the Council's revision to its Allocations Policy in April 2017 which restricted of eligibility for social housing on the basis of incomes and savings, where the offer is part of an estate renewal scheme covered by this policy.
4. To approve the consultation plan set out at paragraphs 6.51-6.54.
5. To notes that, following 3.3 above, a further report will be submitted to the Cabinet which will include a summary of the consultation outcomes, a full Equalities Impact Assessment and a final updated Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy for approval, in line with the outline timetable set out at 6.54].

### **Reasons for Decision**

- The reason for recommendation 3.1 is to bring the existing Policy into line new national and regional guidance and to set out within it a clearer offer to all residents on renewal schemes in Haringey.
- The reason for recommendation 3.2 is to ensure that while the Policy sets an effective benchmark for all renewal schemes, it does not constrain individual schemes from making additional offers.
- The reason for recommendation 3.2 is to ensure that tenants and leaseholders are not restricted from moving or becoming tenants by recent changes to the Allocations scheme; in order to enable a full range of options to be offered.
- The reason for recommendation 3.4 is that while there was consultation on the existing ERRPP in 2015/16, the draft revised ERRPP sets out a much clearer and more extensive offer to residents.
- The reason for recommendation 3.5 is to ensure Cabinet have sufficient time to consider the outcomes of the consultation and the findings of the EqIA before formally adopting the policy.

### **Alternative Options considered**

To retain the existing ERRPP with no change. This was rejected because the current ERRPP is, in effect, no more than a statement of the statutory minimums to which tenants and leaseholders are entitled. It sets out a general aim to achieve the outcomes set out in the draft revised ERRPP, but makes no commitment to these. It leaves any commitments and any additional offers over and above the statutory minimum to be determined on a scheme by scheme basis. This is a legally defensible position but is not one that promotes confidence among residents and as such does little to garner resident support for proposed these estate renewal schemes.

To include all commitments being discussed in some current schemes as the Borough baseline. This was rejected because there are some schemes where the financial viability and the detail of the scheme itself may allow it to make offers over and above

those set out in the draft revised ERRPP, such as gifted equity shares or enhanced compensation payments. However, setting these as the borough baseline may well render some proposed regeneration schemes unviable, or at a minimum reduce the funding available for the scheme as a whole. As such, this would not be in the wider interests of all residents in the regeneration area.

To apply this new Policy solely to Council renewal schemes. This was rejected because it would exclude the HDV and schemes where the landlord is a Housing Association (e.g. Wood Green) from the Policy. As the HDV will play a major role in future estate renewal in Haringey it is essential residents have confidence that the commitments in the Policy will be delivered by the HDV. Similarly, while the Council is not the landlord in Wood Green it has a strategic interest in ensuring this renewal scheme is a success and thus ensuring residents have confidence that they will benefit from the scheme.

**15. ADOPTION OF CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR NORTH TOTTENHAM, SCOTLAND GREEN, BRUCE GROVE, TOTTENHAM GREEN, SEVEN SISTERS/PAGE GREEN AND SOUTH TOTTENHAM**

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning introduced the report which sought Cabinet's approval for the adoption of six Conservation Area appraisal and management plan documents (attached at Appendices 4-9) that make up the Tottenham High Road Historic Corridor - North Tottenham, Scotland Green, Bruce Grove, Tottenham Green, Seven Sisters/Page Green and South Tottenham, following completion of public consultation.

In response to questions from Councillor Ejiofor, the following information was noted:

- Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans will be used by the Council to inform decisions about how best to manage these areas, including enforcement action and as a basis for determining the acceptability of development proposals. It was hoped that the appraisals and management plans will be of assistance to property owners in the maintenance and management of their own buildings.
- In relation to 7 Bruce Grove –The Planning Service were working with the owner and responses to the planning orders were improving. The Assistant Director for Planning explained that having a more up to date Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans will better enable the Council to protect buildings where needed, but it should be noted that some buildings are owned by community organisations who may not have a lot of funding to take improvements forward. However, by having a better framework in place will help escalate improvements.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the comments received to the consultation, and how these have been taken in to account in finalising the draft documents, highlighted in paragraph - 6.7-6.11 and set out in detail in appendices 1 and 2.
2. To approve the adoption and publication of the finalised Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans as attached at Appendices 4-9.
3. To authorise the various changes to Conservation Area boundaries detailed in Appendix 3, including the removal of the Conservation Area designation from South Tottenham.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Council has a statutory duty to ensure that conservation areas are preserved or enhanced and publish policies for the implementation of the same.

The current appraisals for the Tottenham High Road conservation areas have not been updated since 2009. Up-to-date appraisals and management plans will provide a sound basis for development management decisions which are defensible on appeal. The documents will also serve as a useful guide for the Council as well as the property owners and those putting forward heritage projects and development proposals as to how best to preserve or enhance the area's character.

The Conservation Areas fall within the area covered by the emerging Tottenham Area Action Plan, which promotes development and change along certain parts of the High Road. It is therefore important that the Council adopt these documents in order to support the Council's local plan policies and ensure that, where development and change is proposed, this takes into account the significance of the area and opportunities to preserve or enhance its historic character.

The appraisals include recommendations for revisions to the Conservation Area boundaries as per the statutory duty under Section 69 of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990). The Council must ensure that designated conservation areas are of sufficient special architectural or historic interest to warrant designation, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 127) and Historic England guidelines.

### **Alternative options considered**

The existing conservation area appraisal for the Tottenham High Road Historic Corridor was updated in 2009. However, continuing to use this document is not considered advisable. The area has undergone significant change since the document was written and it is therefore out of date. The emerging Tottenham Area Action Plan



(Policy AAP5: Conservation and Heritage) indicates the need for review of such documents.

The appraisals include recommendations for alterations to the boundaries of the conservation areas. The option of leaving the boundaries as they currently are being considered but this course is not recommended. Some areas have been altered to such an extent that they no longer warrant statutory designation. The National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 127) states that “When considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that the area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest”. In cases where there is no discernible special character, the designation is unwarranted.

**16. ADOPTION OF ALTERATIONS TO THE STRATEGIC POLICIES (2013), SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD, DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT DPD, AND TOTTENHAM AREA ACTION PLAN DPD**

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and Planning introduced the report which set out the outcome of the independent Examination in Public of the above four Local Plans and advised that these be recommended to full Council in July for adoption as part of the local development plan for Haringey.

In response to a question from Councillor Newton on the protection of Tottenham High Road historic heritage, it was noted that the previous six Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans, that had just been agreed, reflected the priority given to strengthening planning policy for Tottenham High Road. Cllr Strickland also referred to the Tottenham Townscape Heritage Initiative which was a jointly funded by the Council and Heritage Lottery fund to improve shop fronts on the Tottenham High Road. Therefore, the Cabinet Member was confident that both the policy and investment actions being taken, supported improvements, whilst preserving the historic heritage of the High Road.

**RESOLVED**

1. To note the outcome of the independent Examination in Public of the Alterations to the Strategic Policies 2013, the Site Allocations DPD, the Development Management DPD, and the Tottenham AAP, as set out in Section 8 of the attached report and in the Inspector’s Report (attached at Appendix A);

2. To recommend that Full Council adopt the Alterations to the Strategic Policies 2013, the Site Allocations DPD, the Development Management DPD, and the Tottenham Area Action Plan with the changes recommended by the Planning Inspector as set out in schedules of modifications to the Inspector's report (attached at Appendices B - E).

### **Reasons for Decision**

To progress the local development plans to adoption in accordance with the current Local Development Scheme, to ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan for the Borough is in place and to comply with regulatory requirements.

### **Alternative Options considered**

It is recommended that the Council now proceed to adopt the four Local Plans incorporating the modifications as agreed and as appended to the Inspector's Report. The modifications have been made in light of the discussions of the main issues between the Council's officers and other participants at the Examination in Public (EiP) hearing sessions and the Inspector's comments throughout the process. They have been the subject of public consultation and, in making the modifications, the Planning Inspector has taken into account the responses received.

The only other option available for consideration at this stage is withdrawal of one or more of the Local Plans. This option would be at odds with the Council's adopted Local Development Scheme and it would leave Haringey without a substantial part of an up-to-date Development Plan. Given the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) presumption in favour of sustainable development that applies where boroughs do not have an up to date development plan, a decision not to adopt would leave the Council with little local policy control over the determination of applications, relying on the extant Strategic Policies and those UDP policies which are in conformity with the NPPF. It would also be a significant barrier to implementing the Council's strategic priorities for regeneration and growth, and would obstruct securing the infrastructure necessary to meet the demands of growth in the Borough. However, there are no grounds currently that would warrant the Council's consideration of this option.

## **17. DISPOSAL OF THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTRE**

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources introduced the report which set out the terms of the disposal of the PDC on a 125 long lease for the purpose of refurbishing the building and site to provide 'The Grove' a special school for children with autism spectrum disorders.

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources put forward an amendment to point 4 of the heads of terms, to note that the lease be granted to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) instead of the Heartlands Community Trust. This was due to the levels of funding that will be required to refurbish the building from the ESFA with DCLG requiring greater control and responsibility through leasing the site from the Council. The refurbished building would then be sublet to the Heartlands Community Trust who will occupy and run the school.

In response to a question, the change of name on the lease had no impact on the Heads of Terms agreed with the ESFA and the arrangements with the Heartlands Community Trust to set up the school. The change supports the arrangements in place to take forward the refurbishment of the building and set up the school.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To agree that the PDC is declared surplus to requirement and vacated and;
2. That the PDC to be disposed of to the DCLG for the purpose of setting up special school for children with autism spectrum disorder. That the disposal be by way of a long leasehold interest for a term of 125 years at a premium set out in Part B of this report and based on the Heads of Terms set out in Part B of this report.

### **Reasons for decision**

Currently the Professional Development Centre building is part vacant and not fully utilised and does not offer appropriate accommodation in line with the Council's future accommodation strategy.

The disposal will provide a new school, 'The Grove' Heartlands Community Trust which will provide up to 104 spaces for children with autism spectrum disorders in the Borough. The current occupiers will be relocated within existing Council buildings or alternative accommodation.

### **Alternative options considered**

The alternative is to not dispose of the site. However, this will mean that the Borough will continue to send children with autism spectrum disorders out of Borough or to a more expensive provider, with a resulting continued unsustainable pressure on the Council's high needs block budget, which funds education services for children with special educational needs and disabilities.

Another alternative is to lease part of the site to the EFA. This has been explored by the EFA on the basis of refurbishment or a wholesale redevelopment. The refurbishment of part would not provide sufficient space for the school and although the building is not listed demolishing the building would mean the loss of a building with significant architectural merit.

## **18. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CORPORATE PARENTING COMMITTEE AND APPOINTMENT OF CABINET MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES AND PARTNERSHIPS 2017/18& CONFIRMATION OF THEIR TERMS OF REFERENCE.**

The Leader introduced this annual report, recommending the establishment of the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee. It was also recommending appointment of

Cabinet Members to the LHC Joint Committee, Shared ICT and Digital Joint Committee and the Community Safety Partnership.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To establish the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee, and that the terms of reference for this sub committee, attached at appendix A be noted;
2. To note the terms of reference for the LHC, Shared ICT and Digital Service Joint Committee and Community Safety Partnership attached at appendix B, C, and D.
3. To appoint the Members, indicated below, to serve on the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee, and the LHC Joint Committee, Shared ICT and Digital Service Joint Committee and Community Safety Partnership

### Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee

Chaired by the Cabinet Member for Children and Families –  
Councillor Elin Weston  
Cllr Anne Stennett,  
Cllr Pat Berryman,  
Cllr Shelia Peacock  
Cllr Felicia Opoku  
Cllr Bob Hare  
Cllr Liz Morris

### LHC

Cabinet Member for Housing Regeneration, and Planning  
X1 Labour position - Cllr Bevan

### Shared ICT and Digital Service Joint Committee.

Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources  
Cabinet Member for Finance and Health  
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Culture [Substitute Member]

### Community Safety Partnership

Cabinet Member for Communities  
Cabinet Member for Children and Families  
Opposition Councillor Cllr Newton

## **Reasons for decision**

To keep an overview of the Councillors statutory role as a corporate parent to children in care and young people leaving care.

The Council currently uses LHC frameworks as an efficient way of procuring technically complex products and services for its building refurbishment and maintenance programmes. By becoming a Constituent Member of LHC the Council will benefit from:

- Influencing the future direction of LHC including the identification of new products and services which could be beneficial to the Council.
- Increased learning of procurement practices and technical know-how for use by the Council's officers in carrying out its own procurement programmes.
- Share of the LHC annual surplus.

Participation and membership of the Shared ICT and Digital Service Joint Committee will provide the Council with democratic oversight of the strategic delivery of the shared service.

Appointments from Cabinet are required to the Community Safety Partnership to reflect statutory duties and enable high level, accountable, strategic, oversight of issues relating community safety.

### **Alternative options considered**

The Constitution advises that all Advisory or Consultative Committees will continue in operation only until the first meeting of the Cabinet, in the next municipal year following their establishment, when they must be expressly renewed or they cease to exist. Therefore, the alternative option would be for the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee to cease and this would mean that there is not a scheduled opportunity for members and officers to meet and discuss the wellbeing of children in care and to ensure that the Council is meeting its corporate parenting obligations. This Committee is different to the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel as it concentrates on Looked after Children and care leavers and reports directly to the Cabinet.

Haringey has been a member of the LHC, formerly the London Housing Consortium, for forty years. In February 2012 the Haringey Cabinet approved a recommendation to remain in the LHC Joint Committee and leaving this consortium would affect accessing some shared procurement expertise and support on compliance.

Not appointing Cabinet Members to the Shared ICT and Digital Service Joint was the only other option but this would not allow the Council to provide democratic oversight of key decisions affecting the joint service.

The Community Safety Partnership is a statutory partnership body and therefore not appointing Cabinet Members to this body is not an option.

## **19. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

### **RESOLVED**

To note the delegated and significant actions undertaken by directors in April and May.

**20. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

**RESOLVED**

To note the minutes of the following:

- Cabinet Member signing on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of April 2017
- Cabinet Member Signing on the 4<sup>th</sup> April 2017
- Leader's Signing on the 4<sup>th</sup> of April 2017
- Cabinet Member signing on the 4<sup>th</sup> of April 2017
- Cabinet Member Signing on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2017
- Cabinet Member Signing 9<sup>th</sup> May 2017
- Leader's Signing 16<sup>th</sup> May 2017
- Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee 18 April 2017

**21. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None

**22. 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 &5, Part 1, schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

**23. PROPOSED RELOCATION OF HIGHGATE LIBRARY SERVICE**

As per item 263

**24. PDC**

As per item 267.

**25. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS**

None

CHAIR: Councillor Claire Kober

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

