

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY, 11TH SEPTEMBER, 2018, 6.30pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Joseph Ejiofor (Chair), Emine Ibrahim (Vice-Chair), Charles Adje, Peray Ahmet, Patrick Berryman, Mark Blake, Zena Brabazon, Noah Tucker and Elin Weston**

**In attendance – Councillors: Morris, Culverwell, Bull, Amin, Cawley - Harrison.**

## **65. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

## **66. APOLOGIES**

There were apologies for absence from Cllr Hearn.

## **67. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

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

There were no representations received at the agenda publication stage in relation to the exempt items on the agenda.

## **69. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest put forward.

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

There were no Overview and Scrutiny matters for consideration by Cabinet.

## **71. MINUTES**

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 14<sup>th</sup> of August 2018 were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

## **72. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

Noted that there had been two late deputations put forward in relation to agenda item 12, designation of Finsbury Park and Stroud Green Neighbourhood Area and Forum. These representations had not been accepted as they did not comply with Committee Standing Orders 29, 30 and 31. The Leader would address the deputation's main concern which was the exclusion of Finsbury Park from the Neighbourhood Area boundary as part of item 12.

## **73. BUDGET MONITORING**

The Cabinet Member for Finance introduced this budget monitoring report which covered the position at Quarter one (period 3) of the 2018/19 financial year, including Revenue, Capital, Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budgets.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the Council, like other local authorities, continued to face budget challenges and the report was forecasting a £6m overspend. This was after an application of £7m from the budget resilience reserve which was set up in the previous financial year in anticipation of savings, at the end of period 3, being harder to deliver. The Council were acting early and applying reserve funding to support the demand led services in Children's and Adults that were currently overspending and looking for other ways to make the budget balance if needed.

In response to questions, the following was noted:

- Assessment of a 33% delivery of savings, reflected a realistic approach to savings delivery. This was taking account of some savings that had been rolled over from previous years and which were similar savings most Councils were finding hard to deliver. Rather than anticipate a higher delivery, it was appropriate to be realistic about savings delivery and look at other budget areas, at an early stage, to deliver the shortfall if required.
- The whole Council net budget of £235m would form the basis of budget discussions.
- Within the budget discussions, delivering a fair Council Tax reduction scheme to support low income families with Children was a budget priority.
- In terms of the impact of the capital underspend for the Council's revenue account, the cost of borrowing, that the Council would incur during the year, would be less. There could be impact on business cases and delivery on the proposed capital scheme but this type of situation would usually be highlighted in the compilation of the report and there was nothing significant in regards to this.
- There was a need to make use of the reserves at this stage until the savings can be delivered and new savings available.
- A cut was different to a saving, and across the Council there have been cuts to services over the last 7 years. It could be assessed that the overspends were a

symptom of the overall cuts to funding in the borough, including partner's funding such as the Police. Agreed with the conclusion that the use of the word 'savings' should not imply that was money being put aside by the Council.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the forecast revenue outturn for the General Fund (GF), including corporate items, of **£5.9m overspend** post mitigations of £7.5m and consider what remedial actions need to be implemented to bring closer to the approved budget (Section 6, Table 1, and Appendix 1).
2. To note that the final 2017/18 general fund outturn, post completion of the external audit, was an increased overspend of £0.404m compared to the £0.019m reported in the outturn which has been offset against the GF reserve. The 2018/19 brought forward GF reserve balance is now £15.5m still in line with the level proposed in the budget paper approved by Full Council in February 2018.
3. To note the net HRA forecast of £0.2m overspend. (Section 6, Table 2, and Appendix 2).
4. To note the net DSG forecast of £2.59m **overspend**, the actions being taken to seek to address this and the potential implications for the GF. (Section 7 and Table 3).
5. To note the latest MTFs savings position in 2018/19 which indicates that only 33% (£5.2m) will be achieved. To consider what remedial action is required to improve this position. (Section 8, Table 4).
6. To note the latest capital forecast expenditure of £192.8m in 2018/19 which equates to 84% of the approved budget. To also consider & approve the proposed changes to the approved budget (Section 9, and Table 5).
7. To endorse the measures in place to reduce overspend in service areas; and
8. To approve the budget virements as set out in Appendix 3.

## **Reason for Decision**

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

## **Alternative Options Considered**

The report of the management of the Council's financial resources is a duty of the Interim Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer), helping members to exercise their role and no other options have therefore been considered.

## **74. REVIEW OF PLANS TO ESTABLISH A YOUTH ZONE IN HARINGEY**

The Cabinet Member for Communities, Safety and Engagement introduced the report, and drew attention to the key issues associated with the recommendations. It was proposed to rescind the previous decisions taken on the Youth Zone on the basis of a new developing approach, in the borough, to Youth services, responding to the agenda around violent crime and the impact this has on children. This new approach would have emphasis on collaboration with the community and with voluntary sector partners. There was commitment to supporting Youth services through a different budget process to that of the Youth Zone option.

The Cabinet Member expressed that the proposed Youth Zone model would have been detrimental to the partnership between the Council and Voluntary sector and the decision could have led to an expensive youth centre, which only met a small number of young people's need and which was in not advantageous in regard to transport connections.

In response to questions from Cllr Adje, Berryman and Morris the following information was noted:

- The Cabinet Member did not recommend going forward with the existing Youth Zone proposal, as it was important to assess having Council strategies in the context of young people's safety and tackling violent crime. This was a key message highlighted by the Cabinet Member at a number of recent meetings with voluntary sector groups where there has been early discussion about 3 strategies, being worked on. This included a strategy for vulnerable children, Youth services, and the proposed violence reduction strategy which would all correlate and move forward together.
- Furthermore, this work would consider the research from Godwin Lawson foundation and involve further discussions on youth engagement to enable good consultation on these strategies. In summary, the Youth Zone model was not seen as appropriate for how the Council intend to move forward with their Youth services but with the added caveat that Onside's work in other London boroughs would be looked at as they develop. It was essential to move Youth Services forward whilst listening to young people and the community.
- Early anecdotal feedback from partners, working in close contact, with young people, about on the summer programme, was positive. Extra resources had been worthwhile, resulting in a quiet summer in Haringey. The officer report, reviewing how the summer scheme had worked was due for consideration by the Cabinet Member and would provide more information on how the additional investment had been progressed.
- The funding of the Youth Zone had been earmarked to come from budgets across Children's services. The advocated course of action was to preserve

the Youth service, strengthening the services, which had been subjected to severe budget reductions. The Council were committed to finding extra resources and were seeking external funding with a bid to the Mayors fund. The time frame for the strategies mentioned above was interlinked and would involve public consultation.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To rescind all previous decisions made relating to a Youth Zone in Haringey, in particular, its establishment, location, funding and the partnership with Onside and to dissolve any arrangements made for a Youth Zone.
2. To delegate to the Director of Children's Services, in consultation with the Lead Member for Communities, to take any further steps necessary to dissolve the arrangements made for a Youth Zone.
3. To agree that Officers continues with the task of shaping the landscape of youth provision in Haringey as set out below in Paragraph 6.3.2.

## **Reasons for decision**

The overall strategic approach of the Council and partners to addressing the needs of young people at risk and tackling serious youth violence has not yet been developed or agreed. Work is underway to ensure that this approach is grounded in the views and contributions of local communities and of young people directly affected, as well as of a range of professionals with experience and expertise in this area. An in-depth needs analysis has been prepared which will allow targeting of resources through a better understanding of what may have most impact in Haringey and a range of interventions are being explored to consider whether they would work well together to address need in Haringey. The implications of such analysis and engagement for youth provision have not yet been worked through which means that the landscape in which a Youth Zone would be operating in the borough is not yet clear.

The engagement so far with community members, young people and other stakeholders to develop the strategic approach outlined above has confirmed that a community-based response resonates widely and is emerging as a strong plank of any future developments. Members are keen to optimise the opportunity to work directly with local communities, recognising and building on their strengths and assets in developing and implementing the overall strategic approach.

In light of the work to develop a sustainable and strategic approach to addressing young people at risk, questions have been raised about whether a single base for youth provision, rather than a network of community settings acting as bases for provision across Haringey, is a preferable approach. Again, it is considered too soon to be in effect shaping future provision around a single offer when the overall priorities and outcomes for young people at risk have not yet been developed or agreed more widely.

A further factor contributing to the decision being placed before Cabinet, regards the location and site of the proposed Youth Zone, which was planned to be developed on

premises at Woodside High School. Such provision would enhance the youth offer in Wood Green, the infrastructure for which is recognised to be underdeveloped. However, the potential premises identified are land designated as Metropolitan Open Land, an important consideration for any development. Members are keen to explore options which do not compromise the amount or quality of such land in the borough.

It is fully recognised that working in partnership with Onside would bring considerable additional investment into the borough for youth provision. However, such a partnership also requires a significant proportion of the Council spend on existing youth services to be diverted to supporting a Youth Zone. Given the fragility of funding for youth provision and the need for a strong evidence base for future investment, and for the reasons outlined above, Members do not consider it desirable to make such a commitment at this point in time.

### **Alternative options considered**

The option to continue to develop a Youth Zone for Haringey on the site of the Woodside High School in partnership with Onside was considered but discarded for the reasons set out above.

The option to pause development of a Youth Zone for Haringey in partnership with OnSide in light of issues with the site as set out above and to pursue other sites was considered but discarded for the reasons set out above

## **75. CREATION OF A SINGLE HOMELESSNESS HUB**

This report, was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health, and sought authority for the Council to take a lease on a property known as 332–334 High Road, Tottenham (“Property”) for use as a co-located Assessment Centre and Hub for single homeless people and those at risk of homelessness. The report recommended to Cabinet acquisition of a lease on a property that will both re-provide the supported housing Assessment Centre and create a unique Assessment and Referral Hub for Single Homeless People.

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health highlighted that rough sleepers and single homeless people experience some of the worst outcomes of all the borough’s residents and were more likely to be unemployed, unhealthy, unsafe and at risk of an early death. The proposals in the report aimed to change that outlook and to offer single homeless people and rough sleepers chances to get the right, flexible and person-centred support. By creating a safe and holistic environment for single homeless people in the Hub, the Council would be better able to ensure their accommodation, care and support needs can be met, to offer tools to rebuild valued lives and to reduce the stigma that being homeless brings.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal added that this was a good crosscutting portfolio initiative which deals with the multiple dynamics of a person finding themselves in the severe situation of being homeless. This was a significant issue in the borough and the current rough sleeping health and wellbeing initiative in

Finsbury Park being taken forward by the Council with Islington was commended for its targeted approach . The Cabinet Member was pleased to support this report.

In response to a question from Cllr Morris, the maximum units available was 21 but the hub would support more people to access other available accommodation and support.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To agree to the Council creating a new service 'The Single Homelessness Hub', which will perform the statutory homelessness function for single homeless adults aged 18 years and over, and offer a diverse range of wraparound services to achieve improved outcomes for rough sleepers, homeless women and young people, as well as others. The existing short-stay Assessment Centre service, provided by St Mungo's Community Housing Association, will be relocated to the same building as the Hub.
2. To agree to the Council taking two leases (of the ground and upper floors) of the property known as 332-334 High Road, Tottenham at a rent of up to £225,000 per annum for both leases and subject to the Head of Terms, (currently in negotiation) being agreed and subject to any planning permission for change of use; and
3. To agree to give delegated authority to the Assistant Director of Economic Development and Growth after consultation with the Assistant Director Commissioning to agree the heads of terms and the final terms of the lease;
4. To agree to the Council to then sublet the upper floors of accommodation in the Property to the commissioned Assessment Centre support provider, which at present and until January 2020 is St Mungo's Community Housing Association at a rent of not less than £176,000.00 and subject to the heads of terms being agreed; and
5. To agree to give delegated authority to the Assistant Director of Economic Development and Growth and the Assistant Director Commissioning to agree the heads of terms and the final terms of the sub lease and any management agreement.
6. To agree to approve revenue funding of £240,000 per year to develop and deliver a Single Homelessness Referral and Advice Hub, as a Council-led service, in the two commercial units of the property.

## **Reasons for decision**

The Council's Assessment Centre for single homeless people will not be able to operate from its current premises at Dial House after April 2019 due to sale by its previous owner and plans for redevelopment by its current owner. New premises, therefore, are required as a matter of urgency to accommodate this service and 23 vulnerable adults for the future.

The property at 332-334 High Road provides both high quality accommodation and space for a Hub service in one building. It offers the right number of bedrooms to facilitate the commissioning of a resource efficient assessment centre, and is well positioned in the borough to maximise accessibility. Securing the premises at 332-334 High Road Tottenham for the relocated Assessment Centre offers a unique opportunity to develop a Single Homelessness Hub. By approving this proposal, there is an opportunity to offer an effective response to prevent homelessness as well as to support those already experiencing homelessness, thereby reducing costs for the Council and the wider public sector in supporting a vulnerable and often complex cohort of individuals.

### **Alternative Options Considered**

There is a statutory requirement to provide housing for single homeless people only where they are identified as vulnerable and in priority need under Section 189 of the Housing Act (1996 amended 2002). Haringey like all London boroughs recognises the human, social and economic costs associated with homelessness and the need to ensure that people are adequately supported to recover from it and where possible prevent future instances. Therefore, whilst it would be possible to end the contract for the Assessment Centre service when the lease for the current building ceases and not identify an alternative, this would be out of line with known demand for homelessness services in Haringey, with the Council's strategic objectives to ensure all adults lead healthy and fulfilling lives and with the national approach to single homelessness. Therefore, continuing without agreeing a solution to the requirement to leave the current building is not considered a viable approach.

It would also be possible to reject this proposal in favour of seeking another building that could reprovide the Assessment Centre but not offer the opportunity to create a referral and advice Hub. However, despite Haringey having its own property portfolio, registered provider partners and established links with landlords and developing organisations, sourcing a building with the required number of accommodation units, which would be suitable for a cohort of single homeless people and would be available on or before the date required, had proved impossible until this opportunity presented itself. Therefore, it is considered not only an excellent opportunity to develop an innovative Hub service, but also a unique opportunity to secure a lease for an appropriate building to reprovide the much-needed Assessment Centre service.

It would also be reasonable to suggest that the proposal be modified, in favour of pursuing a lease on either the accommodation or the commercial element of the building in isolation. However, negotiations with the landlord to date have made it clear that this option is not being offered, due to the reduced likelihood of leasing either part of the building separately with the proposed uses. Therefore, it is

considered that the only viable option is to lease both elements of the building as part of one lease because there is not an option available to lease only one element of the space.

The creation of a co-located single homelessness assessment centre and referral and advice Hub is more than a response to the immediate need to relocate the current service. It presents a unique opportunity to build on the extensive strategy and analysis work as part of the Supported Housing Review (2017), Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategies (2018), Single Homelessness Pathway Review (2018) and the emerging work of the Making Every Adult Matter Steering Group as well as others.

## **76. DESIGNATION OF FINSBURY PARK AND STROUD GREEN NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA AND FORUM**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report, which considered the designation of a Finsbury Park and Stroud Green Neighbourhood Area and a Finsbury Park and Stroud Green Neighbourhood Forum.

The Leader expressed that the Council welcomed neighbourhood planning and local communities taking a leading role in shaping the future of their local area. The Finsbury Park and Stroud Green Neighbourhood Forum would be the third such forum designated in Haringey, following on from those for Highgate and Crouch End. Straddling the boundaries of three local authorities the Forum will have a key role in promoting cross borough working and addressing cross boundary issues. The Council was committed to working with the Forum and neighbouring Councils to facilitate the bringing forward of a neighbourhood plan and to ensure local people could achieve their ambitions for their neighbourhood.

The Leader recognised that the Finsbury Park Working Group was disappointed that the report was recommending adoption of a neighbourhood area, which excluded the area of the Park itself. The reasoning behind this was because the neighbourhood area proposed excluded neighbourhoods that adjoin some boundaries of the Park and it was the Council's view that this would exclude some communities from making decisions about the Park.

The Leader further drew attention to paragraph 4.4 and 4.5, which set out the reasons for not including the Park in the neighbourhood area. This included the Park's Regional Park significance and its future being considered important to many neighbourhoods within the three Boroughs and further afield. There was concern that other neighbourhoods within the vicinity of the Park would lose influence and sway over the future of the Park and not have the opportunity for consultation on issues that affect them. The Leader emphasised that Neighbourhood forums areas could not overlap. Potentially, if a similar forum was created in south Haringay, a decision to include the Park in this boundary, would exclude local residents from having any say on a local issue. The Leader further explained that it was for these governance reasons that the Council had the discretion to exclude the Park under the Localism Act 2011, within the guidance –section 61 {g} and section 61 {i}

The Leader drew attention to the recommendation on page 70 which referenced appendix 9, the proposed boundary. This was at page 235 of the pack and this had been incorrectly stamped as appendix 3.

There were questions put forward from Cllr Culverwell and Cllr Morris and the following information noted.

- It was true, that the surrounding Councils would not have made comments about the proposal to change the boundary in their Committee reports. However, the Council had a right, within the law, to make the change as the boundary line was in the borough so it was appropriate that this was only set out in the Haringey report.
- In response to the maintaining good working relationships with Hackney and Islington Councillors, there was a wider meeting about the Park events in the coming weeks. The designation of the neighbourhood area and forum was a separate planning issue. The Leader further reiterated that it was within the gift of each individual Council to determine the boundary of the neighbourhood area to provide the best possible governance for the area. The Council were proposing that the best way possible to maintain governance and local influence in the area was to take the Park out of the designation. The Leader further reminded the Councillor that if the Park were included in the designation this could potentially dis - clude a future South Haringay neighbourhood area forum in decision making about the Park.
- The decision to not include the Park in the designation was not based on the consultation responses but on a separate governance duty to ensure that local influence is maintained in the Park
- CIL [Community Infrastructure Levy] money could still be requested to be used on projects in the Park. A decision to not include the Park in the neighbourhood area boundary would not affect this.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To consider the summary of responses to the consultation on the applications for the Finsbury Park and Stroud Green Neighbourhood Area and Neighbourhood Forum (Appendix 8).
2. To refuse to designate the Finsbury Park and Stroud Green Neighbourhood Area, as identified in Appendix 1 and Appendix 7, pursuant to Section 61G and 61I of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (“the Act”) in so far as that area is within the London Borough of Haringey
3. To designate the Finsbury Park and Stroud Green Neighbourhood Area as amended by Officers and identified in Appendix 9, pursuant to Section 61G and 61I of the Act in so far as that area is within the London Borough of Haringey
4. To agree to designate the Finsbury Park and Stroud Green Neighbourhood Forum, as set out in Appendix 1, pursuant to Section 61F of the Act

## **Reasons for Decision**

An application for the designation of the Finsbury Park and Stroud Green Neighbourhood Area which falls within London Boroughs of Islington, Hackney and Haringey, as identified on the map submitted as part of the Neighbourhood Area application (at Appendix 7), has been made to the Council and the proposal has been subject to consultation. The application meets the relevant regulations.

## **Neighbourhood Area**

In light of representations received Officers recommend that Cabinet designates the Area but with amendments to the proposed boundary within Haringey, namely to exclude the Finsbury Park itself.

The representations received highlight Finsbury Park is wholly within the Haringey administrative area, and thus there was significant concern that the proposed Forum would have undue influence over the future management and development within the park, for which the majority of membership is not within Haringey under whose administrative responsibility lies.

Additionally the Park is a Regional Park with more than local significance, and its future is considered important to many neighbourhoods within the three Boroughs and further afield. There is therefore concern that other neighbourhoods within the vicinity of the park would lose influence and sway over the future of the park and that there will not be the opportunity for consultation on issues which may affect them.

Officers would therefore conclude that there are no existing administrative or physical boundaries which justify the attachment of any part of the park exclusively to the Stroud Green/Finsbury Park Forum Area, and the inclusion of it within the proposed Forum Area could be to the detriment of other neighbourhoods within the vicinity of the Park. It is noted that there are a number of existing mechanisms which afford protection to the interests of residents and park users. This includes an active Stakeholder Group which includes representation on behalf of local residents (in the form of local councillors, resident associations and the Friends of Finsbury Park).

If Cabinet are minded to refuse to designate the Neighbourhood Area boundary as proposed, the provisions of section 61G(5) of the Act would apply. This requires the Council to exercise its power of designation so as to secure that some or all of the specified area forms part of one or more areas designated (or to be designated) as Neighbourhood Areas. This means that a smaller Neighbourhood Area would need to be designated (removing any areas which instigated refusal). As the proposed Neighbourhood Area crosses a local authority boundary the powers of designation apply to each Local Planning Authority for their own area only. It is therefore recommended that Cabinet use the Council's powers of Designation to designate a boundary for the Finsbury Park and Stroud Green Neighbourhood Area as amended by Officers and identified in Appendix 9

## **Neighbourhood Forum**

An application for the designation of a Finsbury Park and Stroud Green Neighbourhood Forum (Appendix 1) has been made to the Council and the proposal has been subject to consultation which demonstrated no objections from stakeholders. The application meets the relevant regulations.

It is recommended that Cabinet designate the proposed Neighbourhood Forum.

### **Alternative options considered**

The Council is required by Section 61G and 61I of the Act to determine an application to designate a neighbourhood area within 20 weeks of submission of the application. The only alternative options would be for the Council to:

- designate the area as submitted without alterations
- Refuse to designate the Forum.

For the reasons given above, the designation of the area as submitted is recommended to be modified. The section below outlines how the proposed Forum meets the requirements in regulations and there have been no objections received. Therefore it is not recommended to refuse the application to designate the Forum.

## **77. HORNSEY LIBRARY REFURBISHMENT AND ESSENTIAL MAINTENANCE**

The Cabinet Member for Civic Services introduced this report, which recommended revising the scope of the original Hornsey Library scheme to incorporate health & safety improvements and essential building fabric repairs. The existing budget of £1.011m needed to be increased by £2.266 to £3.277m.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that Hornsey Library is a grade II listed, Council-owned property. It was one of the Council's three main libraries and an important civic building. The proposed additional capital investment was vital in ensuring the building was in sound structural condition. The capital funds complemented investment in internal refurbishment, and together the whole project should result in a revived library inside and out.

The Cabinet Member continued to refer to the library provision of key services, and contribution to the Council's corporate priorities. As well as a fine book stock, the library included an exhibition gallery; café area; internal garden and a lovely children's library. In addition, it provided a home for an amazing collection of musical scores used by orchestras and musicians from around the country.

The library was in a very prominent position, adjacent to Hornsey Town Hall. Renovation of the library will assure its status as a civic institution and would be complemented by the new arts centre being developed as part of the Town Hall renovations.

In response to questions, the following was noted:

- The funding allocation for other libraries in the borough was set out at section 6.1 of the report. In relation to the flat above Stroud Green library, there was

ongoing discussion about how this space could be used. There was a suggestion for residential use and other ideas such as use by writers and artists. The Cabinet Member had met with Friends of Stroud Green library, and was examining how the asset can be utilised and its role as cultural facility extended.

- In relation to the Capital allocation spending plan for library, the Cabinet Member would check if this includes the ZEN gardens. The Director for Customers, Transformation and Resources advised that there would be some improvement to the public realm outside of the Library and offered to meet with Cllr Morris to talk through the drawings and proposed plans.

## **RESOLVED**

To approve the virement of £2,266,000 from the Corporate Landlord and Carbon Management budgets over a two-year period. This will allow for critical maintenance; health and safety works and structural and building fabric improvements within Hornsey Library as set out in section 9.1.2 of the report.

### **Reasons for decision**

Hornsey Library is a 55 year old, grade II listed building. It was designed as a purpose-built working library. The library currently requires a significant amount of maintenance, as it still has many of its original fittings such as the heating system, building fabric (windows, roof and wall cladding), and electrical systems etc. The majority of these are now failing and causing operational and safety issues. There are also accessibility issues to some elements of the building.

The proposed budget increase and associated virement will enable the refurbishment project to proceed, reducing the risk of re-work, which could be required with resulting delays if the maintenance is carried out later. It will allow the library to continue to provide modern, fit-for-purpose and fully accessible services, meeting the needs of the local community in the future. The works are due to start on site in January 2019 and take approximately 7-8 months to complete.

The investment into Hornsey Library will mirror the commercial investment into the town hall development and will represent the Council's commitment to investment into its libraries and infrastructure, retaining a significant well-loved landmark building as a Council asset. The structural works will enable an already well-used facility to continue to function properly into the future.

It is anticipated that investment in new energy equipment and insulation, will reduce operational running costs for the Council through energy consumption and ongoing routine maintenance. The inclusion of solar PV panels will promote the Zero Carbon ambition of the Council to the wider community.

### **Alternative options considered**

A 'do nothing' option is not considered appropriate as it would see the building continue to deteriorate and continue to fail the public through building closures from faults such as no heating or leaking roofs/windows, to safety issues from failing masonry panels.

Only carry out internal modifications to improve the service, the original scheme. This was discounted, as it does not address the building condition issues such as the leaking roof and windows, the boiler, which is constantly breaking down; and the external cement wall panels, which are crumbling; or the uneven pavements, which are health and safety risks. If these works were carried out separately later then there would be a significant amount of rework to the newly installed fixtures and finishes, as well as the potential risk of adhoc library closures.

Carry out all maintenance within the building. This option was discounted as it would mean an additional cost of £1,000,000 above this proposal, and it is recognised that there are limited funds within the Council. The building and operational maintenance requirements can be met by the virement funds requested. It is also expected that the remaining works will be carried out over the longer term period and will not have any impact on the proposed scheme.

## **78. REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT (RIPA) 2000: USE WITHIN THE COUNCIL 2018/19 AND UPDATES TO THE COUNCIL'S POLICY**

The Leader of the Council introduced this report which informed Cabinet about issues relevant to the use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA) 2000; and provided a refreshed policy for approval.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To note the use of RIPA by the Council; and
2. To approve the amended RIPA policy at Appendix 1.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 requires members to be advised about the use of powers under RIPA and to approve the Council's policy for the use of directed surveillance.

### **Alternative options considered**

Approving this Council policy was a statutory requirement and therefore there were no alternative options to consider.

## **79. WATER, WASTEWATER & ANCILLARY SERVICES FOR HARINGEY BUILDINGS CONSISTING OF THE CORPORATE, HOUSING AND SCHOOLS ESTATES**

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources and Insourcing introduced the report and reflected on the impact of the privatisation agenda on monopoly industries such as water provision and the situation this had led to with de-regulation and the previous water supplier exiting the retail market and handing over water provision and water waste disposal for the borough to another supplier, Castle Water.

There was proposal to enter into a new contract for the provision of Water, Wastewater & Ancillary Services following a collaborative procurement exercise conducted on behalf of members of the London Energy Project (LEP) and NHS London Procurement Partnership and to award the contract to Anglian Water Business (National) Ltd trading as “Wave” for a period of two years. This would be with an option to extend for a further 2 years.

The Cabinet Member for Civic Services highlighted some of the issues that a school, of whom she was a governor, had encountered with the current supplier and which had not yet been fully resolved. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources and Insourcing agreed to investigate progress on these issues.

Cllr Culverwell spoke about a live situation with the current water supplier at a school in his ward, concerning disposal of waste water. The Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families provided assurance that she had already spoken with the Assistant Director for Schools and Learning on this matter and there had been agreement to complete the necessary water works in the October half term. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families would provide a further written response to Cllr Culverwell, after the meeting.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To award the contract for the Provision of Water, Wastewater and Ancillary Services to Anglian Water Business (National) Ltd trading as “Wave” (on the basis that it represents best overall value for money, following a thorough evaluation of quality and price) as permitted under CSO 7.01(b) in accordance with CSO 9.07.1(d) for a total sum of £3.1m. The contract is for two years with an option to extend for another two years if needed.
2. To delegate authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration, and Planning to undertake all necessary actions to enable the contract to be awarded to Anglian Water Business (National) Ltd trading as “Wave” under Lot 3 of the Crown Commercial Service (CCS) Framework Agreement RM3790. These actions are detailed within Appendix 2.

### **Reasons for decision**

Under the Water Act 2014, Haringey Council are required to appoint a contractor for a Water Retailer and to do so in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015

(PRC 2015). This contract is required to deliver Water Supply and management of Waste Water.

The successful tenderer (Anglian Water Business (National) Ltd trading as “Wave”) submitted a bid that offered the best value to the Council. Together the LEP with the Council, are confident that this retailer has the capability to deliver the services to the required standard.

The successful tenderer showed a good understanding of the services required by the Council. The contract value is £3.1m covering the supply of water and wastewater and an ancillary service to reduce water demand. It covers a maximum of four years. This will be delivered on an existing procurement framework managed by the Crown Commercial Services (CCS) (Lot 3 RMO3790)

### **Alternative options considered to secure best value**

#### Do Nothing

Castle Water are the default water and waste water company (retailer) responsible for water billing and administration.

Even if the Council was minded to remain with Castle Water, the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (PCR 2015) dictates that authorities are required to conduct a competitive process to select a retailer for water and waste water services.

#### For the Council to run its own full tender and appoint its own supplier

The option of an individual authority conducting its own tender or mini-competition was not recommended because the risks and costs of running this tender exercise, including the use of staff resources to write a service specification and conduct a tender exercise, are not commensurate with potential benefits of retailer service efficiencies and savings.

#### Pan LEP route (Preferred and actioned)

The recommended option was to join the LEP Team who would manage (at no additional cost) a pan-LEP mini competition for all LEP members to access a single retailer through a Central Purchasing Body (CPB) framework. This would be run on the basis that a CPB framework for water provides a reasonable route to market at an affordable price for service. All LEP authorities' portfolios will be competed together via a CPB framework, with each authority having its own call-off contract.

The key reasons for this were:

- the pan-LEP aggregated customer base is both attractive and prestigious for suppliers, meaning retailers responded with high quality, well priced bids;
- the resource any CPB can afford to dedicate to a large aggregated tender is greater than Haringey Council could provide;
- a single retailer for water would not restrict market competition and will deliver greater benefits than multiple retailers, for example a dedicated customer

- service management function, technology deployment trials, flood and drought protection support services;
- retailers have vastly differing capabilities in core business functions, such as consolidated billing and online portfolio, account and query management platforms, therefore these aspects must be tested as part of the mini-competition process and the quality/price ratio must be appropriate for the competitive price differential vs potential for savings through efficiency gains; and,
  - LEP team managed the full tender process (the service specification, mini-competition, evaluation process, oversee pre-contract set-up and manage the strategic retailer relationship).

## **80. WOODSIDE AVENUE**

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced this report which sought authority to acquire properties (“the Properties”) on Woodside Avenue. The properties would form part of the proposed Cranwood Site for new housing. The two Properties were known as 104 Woodside Avenue, London N10 3JA and 106 Woodside Avenue, London N10 3JA. Acquiring these properties would enable the Council to continue with its plans for a housing scheme which will deliver new social rented housing in the west of the borough, where there is currently a severe shortage of social rented homes.

Following consideration of exempt information:

### **RESOLVED**

- To agree the acquisition of the property known as 104 Woodside Avenue, London, N10 3JA;
- To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning after consultation with the Director of Finance to agree the purchase and the terms of the acquisition for 104 Woodside Avenue. The acquisition is to be for planning purposes;
- To agree the acquisition of the property known as 106 Woodside Avenue, London, N10 3JA for planning purposes;
- To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning after consultation with the Director of Finance to agree the final contract for the acquisition of 106 Woodside Avenue;
- To fund the acquisitions and transaction costs from the Strategic Acquisitions budget of the agreed capital programme.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Council is progressing with plans for developing new Council-owned housing. It is specifically progressing with potential proposals for a new housing development on the Cranwood site in Muswell Hill. [The rest of this section is exempt].

### **Alternative options considered**

An alternative option is not to acquire the properties. [Further information is contained in the exempt part of the report]

## **81. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

None

## **82. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

Cllr Brabazon had a query relating to a delegated decision taken by the Director of Children's Services on the refurbishment of Cumberland Road. Agreed that a response be provided outside of the meeting.

### **RESOLVED**

To note the significant and delegated actions taken by Directors in August.

## **83. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None

## **84. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

### **RESOLVED**

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

## **85. WOODSIDE AVENUE**

As per the exempt minutes and item 80.

## **86. EXEMPT MINUTES**

The exempt minutes for the 14<sup>th</sup> of August 2018 meeting were agreed as an accurate record.

## **87. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS**

None

CHAIR: Councillor Joseph Ejiofor

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank