

Chair:  
Councillor George Meehan

Deputy Chair:  
Councillor Lorna Reith

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This report covers matters considered by the Cabinet at our meeting on 15 July 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**

### **Community Cohesion and Involvement**

#### **2. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT: END YEAR 2007/08**

- 2.1 We considered a report which sought our agreement to the criteria for selecting areas for equalities impact assessment and to the equalities impact assessment programme for 2008/09. We were informed that Equalities Impact Assessment was a duty on all public bodies which derived from a number of legal frameworks to promote equal opportunity and prohibit unlawful discrimination. The key legal frameworks were the Disability Discrimination Act, the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000 and the Sex Discrimination Act 2006. The Council was bound by this duty.
- 2.2 The Council was working to achieving Level 4 of the Equality Standard for Local Government (ESLG), which was a national framework for assessing the performance of local authorities on equalities. External audit and inspection regimes including the Audit Commission used the Standard's criteria when assessing local authorities on equalities. In order to achieve Level 4 to which the Council is aspiring, we would need to demonstrate compliance with the equalities public duties of which equalities impact assessment was a key component.
- 2.3 We report that we noted the schedule of impact assessments carried out in 2007/08 and we agreed the following areas for assessment in 2008/09 -

#### **Chief Executive's Service Directorate:**

- Flexible Working Model
- People Strategy
- Grievance, Capability, Bullying & Harassment
- Talent management and succession planning policy and framework
- Community Safety Strategy
- Quality Assurance Standards for funded groups
- Local Area Agreement

**Urban Environment Directorate:**

- Assisted Refuse/recycling collections
- Review of parking enforcement policy
- Paperless permits
- Relocation of R&R site
- Review of the Disabled Freedom Pass Qualifying Criteria
- Enforcement Strategy & Policy
- Licensing Policy
- Gambling Policy
- Restructure
- Worklessness Initiatives
- Wood Green Spatial Plan
- Regeneration strategy delivery plan
- Shop front improvement programme
- Income Maximisation
- Core Strategy
- Lawrence Road Planning Brief (SPD)
- North London Waste Plan
- Central Leaside Action Plan
- Housing SDP
- Open Spaces Strategy
- Lettings Policy
- Direct Lettings into Private sector
- Structure Review
- New Housing Strategy 2008-2011
- Homelessness Strategy 2008-2011
- Provision for Gypsies and Travellers
- Community Transport scheme

**Children & Young People Directorate:**

- CAMHS Strategy
- Teenage Pregnancy & Sexual Health Strategy
- Early Years & Children's Centres
- Mentoring Scheme
- Involving the parents of young people with Autism
- Family support strategy
- Anti-bullying policy
- Participation strategy
- Developing Sustainable Childcare
- Play Strategy
- School Admissions Recommendations 2007/8
- Connexions
- Re-organisation of Moselle & William C Harvey Special School

- Changes to Haringey Schools' Funding Formula and the Scheme for Financing Schools from 2008 -2009 - Outcome of the consultation 7 recommendations for change (AEN/SEN funding review)
- The Ethnic Minority Achievement review
- Supporting Teenage Parents project
- Children's Fund - Voice Theme

**Corporate Resources Directorate:**

- Introduction of e-benefit system
- Communication with tenants via text messaging or e-mail
- Pre-Business Plan Council budget
- Update of the Procurement Guidance to reflect move to e-procurement
- Recruitment and Retention Strategy of Legal Services
- Review of Commercial property portfolio
- Review of Community Buildings
- Office Accommodation Strategy
- Review of Management Structure of CPS

**Adults, Culture and Communities Services Directorate:**

- Bio Diversity Action Plan
- Sports Club Charges
- Lordship Recreation Ground Audience Development
- Carers Strategy
- User Payment Policy
- Personal and Sexual Relations Policy
- Joint Strategic Needs Assessment
- End of Life Strategy
- Experience Counts
- Muswell Hill Playing Fields – Master plan

## **Adult Social Care and Well Being**

### **3. ADULT, CULTURE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES ANNUAL COMPLAINTS REPORT 2007/08**

- 3.1 We considered a report which outlined the performance of the Adult Social Care complaints handling procedures and practices for the period 2007/08. We noted that the Local Authority Social Services Complaints (England) Regulations 2006 (and statutory guidance) required that for monitoring purposes the Local Authority had to produce annual reports on the operation of their complaint procedures. The report provided recommendations for improving complaint handling and ensuring early resolution.
- 3.2 We also noted that in order to ensure that we are responding to enquiries within timescale, regular complaints meetings were conducted with Service leads, enabling complaints to be reviewed and monitored to ensure effective closure of cases at early resolution stage. Weekly reports on outstanding complaints were submitted to the

Service leads and Service Managers. Monthly performance reports were submitted to the Directorate Management Team (DMT) and cascaded down to management meetings. The Directorate continued to raise awareness of the Council's Feedback Scheme through publicity information. We were informed that the performance target for 2007/08 had been set at 80% of stage 1 complaints to be completed within the 10 day timescale and that 91% had been achieved.

3.3 In terms of initiatives for 2008/09 we were advised that an updated Social Care training tool had been purchased and the Designated Complaints Officer and a member of the Organisational & Development Team completed the "train the trainer" training for this particular tool. Discussions were underway as to the best way of rolling out this training. This course was aimed at all staff and the objective was to ensure that staff knew how to resolve complaints at Stage 1. A training course was also being developed for senior managers who investigated Stage 2 complaints and also for the adjudicating officer. The Complaints Improvement Plan had also been revised to include –

- Continuing to develop and embed the importance of learning from complaints to improve our services
- Achieve the performance targets
- Ensuring that investigators of Stage 1 complaints are briefed on the importance of resolution at Stage 1
- Ensure that complainants are kept informed through out the procedure
- Ensure that stage 1 responses cover all issues raised
- Publicise the complaints procedure wherever possible.
- Recommendation that meetings are to be held after each Stage 2 investigation, with the senior managers and the complaints team. These meetings will ensure all recommendations are carried out.

3.4 Information gathered by the Directorate's Contracts team from a range of sources indicated a need for a more pro active approach to the resolution of minor issues in order to ensure that new care packages set up were meeting needs and that service users had access to information. This feedback had indicated that in a significant number of instances minor problems/ issues were not brought to light before the 6 week review so could not be resolved prior to the case being closed and put back in to the review system. As a consequence some service users felt their concerns were not heard and in instances where they have raised complaints/issues no one has followed up to verify resolution has occurred. In some instances issues/complaints raised did not relate to service providers but the difference between issues for which the care provider was responsible and issues that were the responsibility of Council was not always clear to a service user. This lack of clarity could create tension between the service user and care provider/care worker and result in a lack of confidence by the service user in the Council who purchased the service, resulting in complaints.

#### **4. RESPONSE TO THE SCRUTINY REVIEW OF ACCESS TO SERVICES FOR OLDER PEOPLE**

4.1 We considered a report which proposed a response to the Scrutiny Review of Access to Services for Older People. We noted that the Panel had looked at a number of issues

throughout the review and had made 16 recommendations in order to assist in improving the lives of older people in Haringey. The key findings of the Review had been -

- Along with the demographic pressures which were being faced in Haringey, there were also financial pressures. This included a 1% only increase in Social Care funding announced in the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007.
- Haringey Council, Haringey Teaching Primary Care Trust and the voluntary sector had shown that they could work well in partnership in order to drive change, particularly at a strategic level.
- There were examples of good practice in partnership working across Haringey with a commitment and drive to make further improvements by all parties.
- Robust processes were in place to ensure consistent and cost effective decisions were made when allocating care packages to make the best possible use of resources and optimise independence for older people.
- There were significant challenges in meeting the preventative and personalisation agenda whilst continuing to support those most in need.

- 4.2 The report pointed out that Haringey currently had a population of approximately 20,400 aged 65 years and over. Of these, approximately 4,200 received assessed services (including pieces of equipment) from Adult Services. Many more received non-assessed services. In line with the rest of the country, Haringey had a population that was incrementally growing older. Although population predictions indicated only an increase of around 3,000 people in the next 20 years, a sizeable proportion of these residents would be over 85 years and these were some of the most dependent residents of the borough who were most likely to require higher levels of support from health and social care systems. In addition to population growth, health inequalities across the Borough meant that some people were presenting with long term health conditions that required support earlier than might others.
- 4.3 In 2005, following extensive consultation, the Council, along with partners and older people's groups in the Borough published "Experience Counts" – a five-year strategy (which was currently under review) that set out key objectives setting the direction of travel for developing services for older people. The White Paper "Our Health, Our Care, Our Say" (DH 2006) had highlighted the need for preventative services and a personalised approach to services that made a real difference to the lives of individuals.
- 4.4 Adult Services was currently engaged with other parts of the Directorate in developing seamless pathways for people who approached any part of the Directorate into appropriate service provision. Adult, Culture and Community Services Directorate was currently in the process of further developing personalised services utilising the Social Care Reform Grant over the current year and following two years. This would lead to greater utilisation of Direct Payments and Individualised Budgets enabling people to be in greater control of their care and support. In common with most Councils, the adult social care budget was under increasing pressure and there remains a tension between targeting resources to those most at need under the Council's "Fair Access to Care

Services" (FACS) policy and investing in preventative services that were more widely available and support well-being.

- 4.5 We report that of the sixteen recommendations made in the Scrutiny Review 11 recommendations or parts of recommendations were accepted and 6 recommendations or parts of recommendations which were not applicable to Adult, Culture and Community Services, were noted. The agreed recommendations would need to be developed within the existing departmental budget while others would need to be resourced by Haringey Teaching Primary Care Trust (HTPCT). In particular, the broadening of the GP referral scheme and proposals from the HTPCT for improving foot health would be a call on HTPCT budgets. With regard to the Social Care Reform Grant, time limited resources were being provided to undertake the redesign of systems processes and transactions to transform service delivery, not to provide additional services. Alongside this additional investment, Councils were expected to spend some of their existing resources differently, utilising mainstream services to ensure the health and well-being of their communities and working in a collaborative way with third and private sector agencies.
- 4.6 During the course of our deliberations on the suggested response, clarification was sought of whether action would be taken on those recommendations of the Scrutiny Review that involved representations being made to the Department of Health to encourage more funding to allow the Council to support the low and moderate bandings of Fair Access to Care Services in line with the well being agenda, and also for Direct Payments to be extended to health care services. Confirmation was also sought that those recommendations which had been referred to the Primary Care Trust would be followed up. We report that we agreed that representations be made to the Department of Health on the matters detailed above subject to the Direct Payments for health care services proposed not affecting disability benefits. We also agreed that the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Well Being pursue with the Haringey Teaching Primary Care Trust the Scrutiny Review's recommendations concerning the GP referral scheme and proposals for improving foot health in Haringey.

## **Regeneration and Enterprise**

### **5. HARINGEY REGENERATION STRATEGY – DRAFT DELIVERY PLAN**

- 5.1 The Council will recall that our new regeneration strategy "People, Places, Prosperity" was agreed in January 2008 at which time it was agreed that an annual delivery plan would be produced so that the progress of the strategy could be monitored.
- 5.2 We considered the first annual Delivery Plan for our new regeneration strategy which sought to provide an accessible and succinct statement of our regeneration vision and objectives. The plan had not sought to set out every regeneration project that would occur in the Borough but instead tried to identify the key flagship projects under each of the three themes that would take forward their delivery. Future plans would set out the projects for the coming year and review the progress against the projects in the previous year. Many of the projects, especially those involving strategic sites would take several years before they were completed but each year particular milestones for the coming year would be identified.

- 5.3 Because the projects identified were flagship projects many of them were already within the Councils project management framework and were reported regularly to the appropriate boards. However, the delivery plan would enable partners and the public to see them a collective group and see how they link together to achieve our wider goals. We noted that the programme set in the delivery plan, especially the places theme, represented a very major programme of transformation covering significant parts of the Borough. In addition to the flagship programme there were a large number of smaller projects which would also contribute to these goals.
- 5.4 We report that the Delivery Plan along with the accompanying strategy would set the agenda for delivering major socio-economic and physical infrastructure developments in Haringey over the next 3 years to 2011. Our adoption of the delivery plan would identifies the projects within it as the agents for achieving the objectives of our People, Places and Prosperity strategy and would also demonstrate widespread joined-up working across Directorates and with external partners. Successful implementation would result in major physical change in the urban environment of Haringey along with greater economic vitality as a result of greater employment amongst residents and thriving prosperous businesses.

## **Housing**

### **6. SERVICE IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES FOR LEASEHOLDERS**

- 6.1 We considered a report which contained suggestions for changes to policy and practice with regard to rechargeable major works, in the main affecting leaseholders, which was of particular relevance as the Decent Homes Programme got under way. The report covered 3 areas:
- Suggestions for extending repayment options to leaseholders for rechargeable major works
  - Consideration as to whether leaseholders should be allowed to engage their own window replacement contractor in agreed circumstances
  - Consideration to extending opportunity to leaseholders to take advantage of discounted prices achieved through bulk purchase (for kitchen and bathrooms) through the Decent Homes Programme supply chains.
- 6.2 We noted that the question of payment options had been the subject of Government statements suggesting that local authorities should offer the full range of available payment options to help leaseholders pay their bills, and that they should share best practice. In addition the Audit Commission's Key Line of Enquiry (KLOE) in this area recommended that Local Authorities offer:
- flexible options
  - collect payments in advance
  - send a final invoice on completion
  - view forfeiture as the last resort

- 6.3 We also noted that in the course of preparing the report a review had been carried out of the information provided by all other London boroughs with respect to their policies for payment options and in allowing leaseholders to install their own windows and doors and that as part of the consideration of the relevant issues a questionnaire had been sent to Leasehold Managers in all other London boroughs. Homes for Haringey had undertaken considerable consultation on these proposals with leaseholders and leaseholders' suggestions had been incorporated in the report to address their main concerns
- 6.4 The Housing Strategy contained a number of key objectives and had the overarching aim of ensuring that Homes for Haringey provided and maintained an excellent housing service. Improving the quality and range of services to leaseholders was seen as contributing to the Council's key aims and objectives and we report that we agreed the following policy changes -
- The commencement of billing in advance for major works in order to improve the cash flow to the Council by bringing forward the start date for the receipt of payments by up to 18 months;
  - The provision to leaseholders of a higher discount (5%) for payment in full in order to provide an incentive to pay in full at the start of work, since they were only obliged to pay in instalments;
  - The provision of instalment periods of up to 3 years (including the 18 month advance billing period referred to above) on an interest-free basis;
  - Proposals to allow Interest only loans and a voluntary charge against the property;
  - Leaseholders being allowed to install and maintain their own windows and external doors in agreed circumstances and on a case by case basis; and
  - Leaseholders being enabled to benefit from the volume discounts available from the Decent Homes Programme (DHP) supply chains in respect of kitchen and bathroom units.

## **7. HARINGEY'S HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY 2008-11**

- 7.1 The Council will be aware that Haringey's Homelessness Strategy supported the Sustainable Community Strategy and the delivery of the Local Area Agreement by helping to address some of the most pressing issues facing the Borough, including child poverty, community safety, educational attainment, health inequalities, poor housing conditions, worklessness and the planned reduction in the use of temporary accommodation.
- 7.2 We adopted the Strategy which provided the necessary framework and impetus for effective partnership working and the delivery of efficiently managed and co-ordinated services for people who are homeless or at risk of becoming homelessness. We considered a report which advised us that development of the Homelessness Strategy had been inclusive and there was widespread multi agency support for ensuring that it was implemented successfully. The appointment of Homelessness Champions, together



with the endorsement of the Integrated Housing Board, would ensure the Strategy is owned by stakeholders.

- 7.3 Development of the Homelessness Strategy had also afforded the opportunity for Haringey to review how effective it had been in tackling homelessness and to assess how well equipped it is to meet future needs. Drawing on the findings of a review of homelessness, Haringey's new Homelessness Strategy emphasised the need for early intervention, homelessness prevention and partnership. It also sought to reduce people's reliance on the homelessness legislation and social housing to meet their housing need.
- 7.4 Unlike most other local authorities, we had chosen to produce a three year Homelessness Strategy. As well as ensuring that everyone focused on the task in hand, the three year timescale reflected the fact that, in halving the Council's use of temporary accommodation by March 2010, the Strategy would transform not just the housing situation in Haringey but also the quality and effectiveness of partnerships.
- 7.5 The Homelessness Strategy identified nine key strategic objectives that met local and national strategic priorities, and focused on service delivery and improvement. Expressed as a set of stakeholder commitments, the nine key objectives described Haringey's aspirations and how they will be achieved:
- We will actively support and promote a partnership approach to preventing homelessness
  - We will invest in early intervention and effective homelessness prevention
  - We will increase the supply of affordable homes
  - We will provide choice and encourage independence
  - We will halve, by March 2010, the number of homeless households in temporary accommodation
  - We will improve the quality and suitability of temporary accommodation
  - We will work proactively to safeguard children and vulnerable adults
  - We will improve customer service, involvement and satisfaction
  - We will ensure that our policies and procedures are fair, transparent and widely understood
- 7.6 Responsibility for ensuring the successful and timely implementation of the Strategy would rest with the Homelessness Strategy Implementation Group which would comprise key stakeholders and will report directly to the Integrated Housing Board.
- 7.7 The new Homelessness Strategy demanded a fresh approach to the way in which everyone in Haringey tackles and prevents homelessness. With its emphasis on multi agency working, implementation of the Homelessness Strategy would ensure that all of

the key issues are discussed and addressed. In order to make a meaningful impact on the number of homeless people who were not in education, employment or training, homelessness services would be aligned with Jobcentre Plus, the employment advisers and the Haringey Guarantee.

- 7.8 The creation of a homeless households support service (which would comprise the network of people whose work would involve regular contact with homeless people in temporary accommodation) would ensure that service users received consistent messages and were kept fully informed about services, initiatives and their move-on options. More than ever before, service users would be actively consulted and involved in designing, monitoring and improving the services provided for people who were homeless or at risk of becoming homeless.
- 7.9 We report that with its ambitious Action Plan, the Homelessness Strategy had the potential to completely transform Haringey's housing and homelessness services and, given the impact that homelessness was having on the health, educational attainment, life chances and well-being of Haringey's residents, it was essential that everyone in the borough did everything they could to assist its implementation.

## **8. TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION REDUCTION PLAN 2008-10**

- 8.1 We considered a report which advised us that Haringey had the second largest number of Households in Temporary Accommodation in London. It was critical that we achieved the Government's target for 2010 and this was a key priority for the Council to achieve a successful outcome. The production of a Homelessness Strategy which was a requirement for each local authority was the subject of a separate report to our meeting and appears elsewhere in our report. Given the levels of housing need and homelessness in Haringey, it was a core strategic document and our success in addressing homelessness and achieving the reduction in the levels of temporary accommodation required by 2010 was not only critical for the Council but also to the lives of many of the borough's residents.
- 8.2 The requirement for a Homelessness Strategy and the delivery of the Temporary Accommodation Reduction Plan would impact upon the Council's assessment under the new CAA framework. They were also important for the achievement of the Council's broader objectives set out in the Council Plan, the LAA targets and in the Community Strategy.
- 8.3 The report set out the Council's planned actions through a Temporary Accommodation Reduction Plan to achieve a target number of 2600 households in Temporary Accommodation by 31 March 2010 in line with targets set by the Department for Communities for Local Government. The achievement of this target remained one of our highest priorities over the next two years. The Plan was split into 3 major objectives -
- Objective 1 - Controlling the gateway for households entering Temporary Accommodation.
  - Objective 2 - Managing the Temporary Accommodation client base.

- Objective 3 - Improving the supply of permanent accommodation to reduce numbers of households in Temporary Accommodation
- 8.4 We noted that the costs associated with the measures proposed under the first 2 objectives, namely controlling the gateway for households entering temporary accommodation and managing the temporary accommodation client base would be contained within existing approved resources. However, the proposal to clear a backlog of homelessness assessments, estimated cost £78,000 currently had no budget provision. A bid had been made to the Capital Ambition funding for London, which should provide a sum of £200,000 to be allocated to fund the backlog project and provide for additional resources to support the delivery of the overall Housing Improvement Plan.
- 8.5 The main thrust of reducing the numbers in Temporary Accommodation was via objective 3, improving the supply of permanent accommodation through the use of Assured Short hold Tenancies (AST's). Currently approved budget provision of £586,000 was sufficient to fund 293 AST's at an average cost of £2,000. Any AST's above 293 would require additional resources, which must be identified and approved before any further AST's were secured. In order to meet these proposed targets and acceleration of the programme additional funding of £952,000 was now required.
- 8.6 Almost half of the cost of acquiring an additional 600 Assured Short hold Properties could be achieved through managing a reduction through the release of the more expensive properties currently procured and maintaining or increasing as required properties acquired as Private Sector Leases which were secure tenure for a longer period and were more cost effective. This was expected to produce a cost saving of £432,000 in 2008/09. The target property tenures were included in the plan proposed. In respect of the funding for the remaining cost of £520,000 to achieve the accelerated programme in 2008/09 funding could be transferred from the reserve held for homelessness subsidy issues which was increased by £692,000 as a result of the under spend in 2007/08. This funding must only be used for the payment of incentives for the supply of AST's.
- 8.7 We also noted that the delivery of the target of 2600 or less households in Temporary Accommodation by 2010 was a huge challenge, but not one that could not fail. It was of the highest priority for the Housing Service to deliver and resources from outside the service had been identified to provide hands on support to both deliver and take responsibility for delivering outcomes. The first key milestone was to achieve the target of 4000 by March 2009. We report that we agreed a target of no more than 4000 households in Temporary Accommodation by 31/03/2009 and no more than 2600 by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010. We also agreed the key objectives set out in the report as well as the funding for the additional costs of providing assured short hold tenancy properties in 2008/09 as set out above.

## **Children and Young People**

### **9. ANNUAL SCHOOL PLACE PLANNING REPORT**

- 9.1 We considered a report on demand for pupil places in our primary, secondary and special schools and which updated us on action to respond to this demand.

- 9.2 The report suggested that on the basis of discussion held the work priorities for 2008/09 should be -
- To develop plans and demographic data during the autumn of 2008 to ensure the potential PAN reinstatements were still required by 2010 and plans were in place to allow this to happen if necessary.
  - To consult on increased capacity at Rhodes Avenue primary school for September 2011.
  - To provide an update on the proposed additional provision around Tottenham Hale.
  - To monitor the demand for school places in the Wood Green area.
  - To continue to work with colleagues on SEN data and projections.
  - To continue to work with colleagues on post 16 projections.
- 9.3 We report that we endorsed the work priorities outlined above and agreed that the consultation on the possible expansion of Rhodes Avenue primary school in the west children's network to create an additional form of entry proceed and that a further report be submitted to us in January 2009 on the outcome of the consultation and to determine whether statutory notices are published. Approval was also granted to the consultation on additional school capacity around Tottenham Hale be carried out from September 2009 and to an additional school place planning principle arising from the recent Primary Strategy consultation. A further report on school places would be presented to us in July 2009 and we will keep the Council informed of developments.

## **Environment and Conservation**

### **10. PUBLIC REALM COMMISSIONING STRATEGY – OPTION APPRAISAL**

- 10.1 We considered a report the purpose of which was to appraise the four procurement options in order for us to select the most appropriate option to deliver the aims and objectives of the Haringey Strategic Partnership and Council Plan and, for Public Realm and Specialised contract options, to identify a suitable procurement process and ascertain the most appropriate contract vehicle.
- 10.2 We noted that officers had completed a procurement option appraisal on how the Council would commission future frontline Highways, Street Lighting and Waste Management Services. The four options appraised were:
- Public Realm (Option 1) – Combining all frontline (Highways/Street Lighting and Waste Management) services into one public realm contract.
  - Specialised (Option 2) – The Highways/Street Lighting and Waste Management services would tender their own 'specialised' service contracts.
  - Externalised Highways/Street Lighting contracts and Waste Management Services provided In-House (Option 3) – The Highways/Street Lighting services would be tendered and all waste management services would be provided by an In-house team.

- Externalised Highways /Street Lighting and an Extension to the Integrated Waste Management Contract with a continued In–House Recycling Service (Option 4).
- 10.3 The subsequent commissioning strategy set out in detail the development, results and conclusion of this option appraisal, in order to enable us to consider all the technical information and select the most appropriate procurement scenario to deliver Haringey's Sustainable Community Strategy objectives. We also noted that this project fell within the remit of the Achieving Excellence programme and a key underlining aspect of this programme had been to demonstrate that projects delivered improvements in performance and customer perception together with ensuring services were efficient and provided value for money. These three principles had been incorporated throughout the option appraisal.
- 10.4 We were advised that the total annual revenue and capital value of the existing public realm service were £20 million and £9 million respectively. The funding the Council received from Transport for London's (TfL) Local Implementation Plan was subject to an annual bidding process and therefore could vary year on year. The money funded schemes which included Principal Road renewal, road safety projects and town centre improvements. Any new contractual arrangements would need to be flexible enough to respond to changes in funding streams, including during the course of a financial year when Transport for London often released additional funds to allow the implementation of additional projects in the borough.
- 10.5 The report recommended an extension to the existing waste management contract with Haringey Enterprise Ltd (HEL), by a period of 16 months (with a new end date of April 2011), in order to pursue the proposed route of the Competitive Dialogue process for procurement of the specialised waste management contract (Option 2) and to gain the maximum benefit from this procedure. The implications of extending the contract would be a deferment of planned budget savings of £1.165 million per annum from 2010/11 to 2011/12. The Value for Money (VfM) analysis included within the options appraisal had confirmed that these savings could be achieved under either option 1 or 2.
- 10.6 We were also advised that the existing contract with HEL allowed for uplift in 2009/10 above the level of inflation. This was estimated at £300,000 above the current provision for inflation. HEL had proposed efficiency savings of £200,000 subject to an extension which would leave a shortfall of £100,000 in the service's budget as a result of the extension which would need to be taken account during the Council's budget setting.
- 10.7 The increased duration of the Highways/Street Lighting contract(s) from 2 years to 4 years was likely to increase VfM for the Council (although it was not possible to accurately quantify this increase at this point) as it would enable the contractor to spread the significant initial investment required for staff and other resources over the longer contract period and allow this investment to be paid back over a longer period. The savings achieved from extending the contract duration to 4 years would be channelled

into improving quality and to meeting the level of investment required to improve highways condition performance. A report has been completed into the level of investment required to achieve top-quartile performance, which estimated a required investment of around £3.65 million per annum over 10 years. The findings of this report would be presented to the Cross Party Members Steering Group for the Public Realm procurement to enable the affordability of the suggested investment levels to be considered.

- 10.8 In order to complete the street lighting replacement programme a further £9 million would be required over the next 10 years as well as £1 million for investment in illuminated signs over this time. The Council's budget setting process for 2008/09 to 2010/11 agreed resources of £500,000 phased £350,000 in 2008/09 and £150,000 in 2009/10, to meet specialist legal and technical costs associated with the procurement of a single contract, as anticipated under the Public Realm option. It is anticipated that the proposed procurement under Option 2 would be managed within this budget.
- 10.9 We report that we approved the Specialised Contracts option as set out at Option 2 and the use of a Competitive Dialogue procurement process. We also approved the extension of the Integrated Waste Management and Transport contract with Haringey Enterprise Ltd as proposed as well as the extension of the proposed Highways/Street Lighting contract period as detailed above. Approval was granted to the extension of the current Highways and Street Lighting contracts with John Crowley (Maidstone) Ltd and EDF Energy Contracting respectively and to the establishment of a Cross Party Member Steering Group to oversee and steer the development of the ongoing waste and highways procurement projects. The constitution including the membership of the Group would be determined by Cabinet Member for Environment and Conservation.
- 10.10 Approval was also granted to a formal public consultation on future waste management services being carried out with Haringey Sustainable Community Partners, residents, traders and visitors.
- 11. NEW APPROACH TO CONSULTATION FOR THE EXTENSION OF CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES**
- 11.1 We considered a report which proposed the adoption of a new approach to consultation for the extension of existing Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's) where evidence of a majority of support had been provided by residents.
- 11.2 We were informed that there were 15 CPZ's in the Borough which had been introduced in areas where commuter and shopper parking pressures had a negative impact on residents. These were usually located in areas that attracted high levels of non-resident parking, such as train/tube stations and commercial areas. Prior to the introduction of the Zones, residents were often unable to park near to where they lived and there were traffic management and safety implications where vehicles would circulate in areas looking for parking spaces.

- 11.3 Reviews of the existing CPZ's had resulted in extensions to the Zones where responses had indicated support for inclusion. At the same time where the majority of responses from roads opposed parking controls then those roads had been omitted from further consideration where it had been possible so to do. As the number of CPZ's in the Borough increased roads just outside the Zones often suffered from displacement parking which resulted in the Council receiving more requests each year from residents of roads just outside a Zone asking that their roads be included.
- 11.4 It was not possible to review all Zones on an annual basis and it was proposed that we consider extending Zones to smaller areas where evidence of support had been provided to the Council that the majority of residents and businesses clearly supported parking controls for their road. If there was clear evidence of such support then the Council would move straight to statutory consultation for the introduction of parking controls rather than have a formal consultation period first as per the present arrangement.
- 11.5 The adoption of this new approach would allow residents just outside a CPZ the opportunity to petition the Council for inclusion in the CPZ and provided sufficient evidence of support for inclusion existed this would replace the existing first stage and measures would be taken to extend the CPZ to include the additional road(s). The advantage of this approach would be the cost benefit of only having to conduct one consultation rather than two and for the Council to be more responsive to resident demand.
- 11.6 The approach proposed would also speed up the delivery of parking controls for the benefit of residents suffering from displacement parking. Whereas it currently took some 14 months to implement or extend a CPZ, the adoption of the approach proposed would reduce this by about half. As part of the process proposed consideration would be given to extending the statutory consultation area to roads neighbouring the area of support which would allow residents of the neighbouring roads to decide whether or not they would also support inclusion in the knowledge that the existing Zone was to be extended and that they might experience a level of displacement parking.
- 11.7 We report that we approved the adoption of the new approach to consultation for the introduction of extensions to existing controlled parking zones as outlined above and agreed that funding be identified and secured to enable the new Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) schemes to be implemented. We also agreed to a proposed programme of extensions which were set out in an Appendix to the report.

## **12. ADOPTION OF REVISED NORTH LONDON WASTE STRATEGY**

- 12.1 We considered a report the purpose of which was to seek approval for the adoption of the revised North London Joint Waste Strategy (NLJWS) 2008 and associated Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Environmental Report.

- 12.2 We noted that the 2008 draft of the NLJWS has been updated in several areas from the 2004 version to account for:
- The Government's updated Waste Strategy for England 2007 which includes more ambitious recycling and composting targets (50% by 2020).
  - The GLA Act now requires London strategies to be 'in general conformity with' rather than 'have regard to' the Mayor of London's Municipal Waste Management Strategy.
  - Minor changes to language and wording to remove ambiguity, make the strategy up-to-date, and improve the precision of the document.
- 12.3 Haringey's future recycling target as set out in the Recycling Strategy for Haringey 2006-2020 was to reach 45% recycling by 2015/16 in line with the proposed NLJWS 2008 target of 50% by 2020. The draft 2008 version of the NLJWS which was the subject of consultation had also included a proposed revision of the recycling target for 2010/11 from 35% to 40%. However, following the consultation process the original target of 35% has been reinstated, and this will be reflected in the final draft of the NLJWS 2008. There were 23 proposed amendments to the Strategy which were listed in an Appendix to the report.
- 12.4 We also noted that the effects of the policies within the NLJWS were all predicted to demonstrate positive environmental benefits in all of the objective areas and thus it had not been necessary to change any of the policies contained within the NLJWS as a result of the SEA process. However, as a result of the SEA, Chapter 6 'Identifying the Best Option for North London' replaced the previous 'Identifying the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) for North London'. This was due to the European SEA Directive (Directive 2001/42/EC) necessitating a retrospective SEA of the NLJWS replacing the BPEO as the principle decision making tool supporting waste management strategy preparation.
- 12.5 While the focus of the SEA process was on environmental effects in this case it was decided to broaden the assessment to cover social and economic effects making it more consistent with the Sustainability Appraisal process. However, it had left out other balancing factors such as deliverability and cost, which were previously incorporated into the BPEO. The SEA Environmental report noted that there were no issues of conflict identified between the objectives contained within the NLJWS and the other plans and programmes that were considered to be relevant. However, it was noted that the publication of Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management 2005 and the publication of Waste Strategy for England 2007 could result in some issues because both were published after the publication of the 2004 draft of the NLJWS. Accordingly, the NLJWS was updated in particular the recycling and composting targets to bring them in line with the new national waste strategy objectives. A new additional target for recycling and composting of 50% by 2020 had been introduced, and this was reflected in the amended action set out in the Appendix to the report.
- 12.6 Changes had also been made to all four of the existing NLJWS scenarios and a new 5<sup>th</sup> option – the 'Procurement Scenario' had been added to the Strategy. Whereas in the previous 2004 draft of the strategy a recommended scenario was put forward (the Procurement Scenario), following the consultation process it had been decided not to



recommend a particular scenario. This would enable the procurement process for future waste management facilities to be technology neutral.

- 12.7 Changes to the previous options had been made to reflect current national waste strategy targets, and all scenarios had been remodelled on the basis that the current collection systems being used by the boroughs would be retained in the future rather than the previous assumption that collection systems would converge. The previous 'best' option (Option 3 – Partnership Scenario) was very similar to the new Procurement Scenario (Option 5) with two notable exceptions. The first was the increased capacity of the Energy from Waste (EfW) plant in the procurement scenario (540,000 tonnes per year; a 90,000 tonnes increase). The second was the choice of a Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) plant instead of an Anaerobic Digestion (AD) plant. However, no particular scenario was being formally recommended as part of the 2008 NLJWS. New appraisal indicators and criteria had been proposed following the SEA but none which would adversely affect Haringey.
- 12.8 We report that we approved the revised draft of the NLJWS which would prepare the way forward for managing North London's waste in a sustainable manner and in accordance with European, national and regional policies and strategies. We also agreed the associated SEA Environmental Report. We also agreed that, subject to any amendments remaining broadly in line with the content of the existing version of the NLJWS, authority to agree any amendments to the Strategy that became necessary following consideration of the draft by each partner Borough's formal approval process be delegated to the Director of Urban Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Conservation.
- 13. RESPONSE TO THE SCRUTINY REVIEW OF WASTE RECYCLING COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL**
- 13.1 We considered a report which set out the Cabinet's response to the report of the Scrutiny Review of Waste, Recycling, Collection and Disposal.
- 13.2 We noted that the Scrutiny Review had contained 23 main recommendations and 34 sub-recommendations giving a total of 57 recommendations in all. Of the recommendations and sub-recommendations that had been made:
- 32 had been agreed;
  - 18 had been agreed in principle;
  - 1 had been agreed in part;
  - 1 had been partly agreed and partly agreed in principle; and
  - 5 had not been agreed.
- 13.3 The responses to these recommendations had been broken down into the following categories:
- new contract requirements;
  - policy;
  - collection methodologies;
  - Information and education;

- business waste recycling
- recycling and waste reduction from Council buildings; and
- promoting re-use.

13.4 The Scrutiny Review had provided a valuable examination of the current arrangements for waste collection and recycling. Through this scrutiny review there had been an opportunity to -

- consider how services are currently set up to deliver the outcomes and targets required by the Council;
- think about what the future challenges are for these services, both in a national and local context;
- inform the design and specification of the contract that will replace the Integrated Waste Management and Transport Contract; and
- consider the future for the policies and strategies around waste as a resource and the emerging focus on CO2 and climate change, especially through the new Waste Strategy 2007 for England and the new National Indicator set.

13.5 We report that we approved the suggested response to the Scrutiny Review of Waste Recycling Collection and Disposal and we agreed to the recommendations being incorporated within the Front Line Services business plan subject to the proviso that any recommendations requiring additional funding would be dealt with as part of the Council's budget setting process in 2009/10 and beyond as appropriate.

## **Resources**

### **14. FINANCIAL PLANNING 2009/10 – 2011/12**

14.1 We considered a report which set out key financial and business planning issues to enable us to consider the resource strategy for the administration and we noted that there were a number of national policy issues were outlined that would need to be considered as part of the Council's business planning process. The national local government funding position was guided by the previous years three year settlement following the comprehensive spending review 2007.

14.2 We also noted that the local strategic context was defined by our manifesto commitments and their incorporation into the Community Strategy and the Council Plan. These priorities and actions informed the business planning and resource allocation process. The existing medium term financial strategy was soundly based and provided additional investment in Council priorities whilst delivering significant levels of efficiency savings. This report rolled the three year strategy forward one year and identified a subsequent budget gap in that third year. It also proposed a further target for efficiencies in the first two years thereby offering the Council additional flexibility for investment and delivering more opportunities for increased value for money. The overall savings target proposed in the report was £7.6 million.

- 14.3 In overall terms, taking account of the starting position at the end of the 2008/09 budget process and given that we had a three year grant settlement and a matching medium term financial strategy in place, and after allowing for the matters set out in the report, an overall position was as set out in an Appendix to the report. This set out the gross budget showing the starting position, changes anticipated for that year, and the funding elements assuming a 3.0% increase in Haringey's Council Tax (as per previous planning assumptions). This assumption might be re-considered in light of the overall financial position later in the process.
- 14.4 An assumption on the level of Revenue Support Grant had been made that provided the new year of 2011/12 with a floor increase estimated at 1.5%, the same as in 2010/11. While the review of the formula would be carried out in time to make changes from 2011/12 onwards, the impact of these changes would not be known for some time.
- 14.5 A review of the risks identified in the report incorporating some sensitivity analysis around the range of financial consequences had been carried out and the Financial Planning Risk Analysis updated and we noted that the levels of reserves were considered sufficient to deal with the identified risks. For the purposes of prudence the report recommended that an allowance be made for additional pension fund contributions in the third planning year at this time while other changes and variations against existing contingencies would be reviewed again later in the process. The total resource shortfall of £7.6 million shown in the Appendix demonstrated the continuing financial challenge faced over the planning period. As mentioned above the savings targets proposed allowed for consideration of some further investment options as part of the budget process, which represented 0.6% of the net budget for each of the first two years which was in addition to the existing 12.1% already in the plans.
- 14.6 We report that a more detailed business planning and budget timetable will be presented in due course, but the key dates are outlined in the table below. Informal budget challenge meetings will be chaired by the Leader and will include the Cabinet Member for Resources and the Cabinet Member for the Service as well as senior officers. All revenue and capital budgets will be part of this process.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
Key priorities stated in Council plan	Jun 08
Cabinet consider financial planning report	Jul 08
Pre-business plan review (PBPR) preparation	Jul – Sep 08
PBPR officer review process	Sep 08
Budget challenge meetings	Early Oct 08
Cabinet agree release of PBPRs for consultation	Nov 08
Budget consultation process including Overview & Scrutiny Committee	Dec 08
Cabinet consider draft settlement	Dec 08
Cabinet agree budget package	Jan 09
Council agree budget package and council tax	Feb 09
Finalise individual business plans and overall Council Plan	Apr 09

## **Leader**

### **15 THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE – APRIL/MAY 2008**

- 15.1 We considered the regular finance and performance monitoring report for April and May 2008 which was based on the financial monitoring reports prepared for the budget and performance management review meetings held on 19 May and 16 June 2008 for periods 1 and 2 and the service submission of key performance indicators that had been agreed for 2008/09 and submitted in the Directorate Dashboards. The report gave an indication of the level and quality of services delivered on the ground. It monitored the Council's position in relation to a number of indicators that would be used to assess the Council in the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA).
- 15.2 In an Appendix to the report performance against 60 monthly indicators linked to the Council's priorities was detailed:
- Making Haringey one of London's greenest boroughs
  - Creating a better Haringey: Cleaner, Greener and Safer
  - Encouraging lifetime well-being
  - Promoting independent living
  - Delivering excellent services
- 15.3 A significant number of the new national indicators lend themselves to quarterly or annual monitoring and in future a more detailed report would be prepared on a quarterly basis. This would also review activity against key objectives as set out in the Council Plan.
- 15.4 We noted that overall good progress had been made in the first two months of 2008/09. Out of the 62 indicators for which performance information is available, 46 (74%) were shown to be achieving green or amber status as at May. The report highlighted a number of areas for focussed monitoring. For these, it was imperative that the action was taken to bring performance in line with agreed targets.
- 15.5 With regard to the financial implications, the overall revenue budget monitoring, based on the May position, showed that the General Fund was forecast to spend at budget. Some budget pressures were detailed in the report that Services were seeking to contain within the budget. The dedicated schools grant element of the overall Children & Young People's budget was projected to spend at budget. While in relation to the housing revenue account (HRA), the net revenue projection was also to spend at budget. The aggregate capital projected position in 2008/09 was projected to under spend by £0.5 million, this projected under spend was within the Adults, Culture & Community area and the reason for this was detailed in the report.
- 15.6 Financial regulations require proposed budget changes to be approved by Cabinet. These are shown in the table below. These changes fall into one of two categories:
- Budget virements, where it was proposed that budget provision be transferred between one service budget and another. Explanations are provided where this is the case;

- Increases or decreases in budget, generally where notification has been received in-year of a change in the level of external funding such as grants or supplementary credit approval.

Under the Constitution, certain virements are key decisions. Key decisions are:

- For revenue, any virement which results in change in a directorate cash limit of more than £250,000; and
- For capital, any virement which results in the change of a programme area of more than £250,000.

Key decisions are highlighted by an asterisk in the table.

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

Period	Service	Key	Amount current year (£000)	Full year Amount (£000)	Description
1	Various	Rev*	11,762		Area Based Grant (ABG) allocation for 2008/09 that was not in the base budget.
1	Various	Rev*	886	886	Budget adjustments to reflect revised service arrangements with Homes for Haringey (HfH).
1	CR	Rev	86	86	Some staff changes and a redistribution of resources within the Department.
1	Various	Rev*	552	552	Allocation of Improvers Budget into services.
1	PPPC	Rev	97		Enfield Primary Care Trusts contribution to Health Alliance budget for 2008/09 regarding Joint Enfield & Haringey HIV Prevention Programme.
1	CR	Cap*	2,450		Setting agreed accommodation strategy phase 2 budget for 2008/09.
1	CR	Rev	128	128	Setting agreed accommodation strategy phase 2 budget for 2008/09.
2	UE	Rev*	600	910	London Development Agency funding relating to ULV North London Pledge (LDA Area Programme/Project).
2	UE	Cap	(212)		New Deal for Communities Programme £212k allocation used in 2007/08.
2	UE	Cap*	3,983		Growth Area Fund (GAF 3) grant. Capital grant determination for 2008/09.

2	ACCS	Cap	(500)		Re-phasing of Muswell Hill Library capital refurbishment programme into 2009/10. Capital receipt connected with the scheme is not likely to be delivered this year (2008/09).
2	CR	Cap*	(2,205)		Following the Corporate IT prioritisation board in May which reviewed the call on the IT capital programme, projects have been agreed in principle pending development of full business cases. This robust process has lead to the need to re-profile expenditure and therefore budget into the next financial year. The current 2008/08 approved IT capital programme is £4.645m. Each project manager has recently produced details of spend profiles, that results in a requirement to move £2.205m into 2009/10.

## **16. HARINGEY'S LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT 2008/09 TO 2009/11**

- 16.1 We reported the draft Local Area Agreement (LAA) to the Council on 31 March 2008 for noting and endorsement. We have now considered an update on the progress made in the development of the 2008/09 – 2010/11 Local Area Agreement seeking our endorsement of the final version after negotiations with the Government Office for London (GoL). We noted that the Haringey Strategic Partnerships (HSP's) Performance Management Group (PMG) agreed the final submission on behalf of the Partnership at its meeting on 28 May 2008. The concluding negotiated changes detailed in the body of the report, were incorporated within the submission, were approved by the PMG.
- 16.2 We were informed that the HSP had negotiated the selection of 35 improvement indicators, a number of local targets (which included our existing stretch targets), from the list of 198 national indicators as set by Government. These improvement indicators and local targets sat alongside 16 attainment targets for the academic year 2008/09. Thematic Boards considered and agreed their final selections based on local priorities and the recommendations of GoL and the various Government departments. The indicators were aligned to thematic boards and had identified lead agencies with a named senior officer as required by statute. Many of the indicators were cross cutting and delivery would impact across thematic areas. In these instances the indicators would be reported to and monitored by more than one thematic board.
- 16.3 We were also informed that the partnership's target leads had successfully negotiated with Central Government three year targets for the 35 national indicators within Haringey's LAA. These were listed within the outcomes framework which had been formally submitted to Government Office for London on 30 May 2008. It was reported that GoL had now advised that a number of national had been deferred until 2009/10. However, thematic boards would continue to performance manage these indicators locally and progress against the indicators would be submitted to GoL in 2009/10.
- 16.4 In addition to the deferred indicators, a number of changes Haringey's selection of 35 national indicators and local targets were agreed by the HSP PMG prior to submission to GOL and these are set out below -

- National Indicator 54 - Disabled Services for Children (deferred until 2009/10) was substituted with NI 60 Core Assessments.
- National Indicator 32 - Repeat Incidents of Domestic Violence (local target) was removed due to the national definition of the target being tightly defined to the delivery of the Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARAC) which had not yet been rolled out to this area.
- Two local worklessness indicators: Number of eligible individuals supported into employment through the Haringey Guarantee taking up working tax credit; and Number of eligible Haringey Guarantee participants taking up child tax credit, was replaced with the Number of registered Haringey Guarantee participants with a completed better off calculation. This substitution was made due to technical issues with recorded measurable data.

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

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

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

Waiver of Contract Standing Order Requirement to Tender (approved in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People) in connection with the award of the contract for Positive Activities for Young People to Y-Gen Ltd.

Creation of six new posts in the Children and Young People's Participation Team

Award of contracts for BSF Design Quality Indicator Facilitation Role (for 12 schools)

Children's Fund Programme 2008/09 – Waiver of Contract

Haringey Autism and Markfield Summer Play Scheme – Waiver of Contract

Variation of Contract for ICT Technical and Design Consultancy for Building Schools for the Future