

# MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY, 9TH OCTOBER, 2018, 6.30pm

## PRESENT:

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

**In attendance: Cllr Cawley- Harrison & Cllr Culverwell.**

### 88. **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.

### 89. **APOLOGIES**

There were apologies for lateness from Cllr Mark Blake.

### 90. **URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

### 91. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest put forward.

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

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

### 93. **MINUTES**

The Cabinet Member for Finance raised the following minor discrepancies:

- Item 73 - Budget Monitoring - bullet point 2 - £235m should read £250m.
- Item 73 – Budget Monitoring - final bullet point - last sentence - should be amended to read that *the Council should distinguish between a saving made by 'cutting a service' and a saving made through improving efficiencies.*

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 11<sup>th</sup> of September were agreed as an accurate record, subject to the above amendments being made.

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

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

#### **95. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS**

The Leader advised the meeting that a deputation had been received from Chris Mohr, in relation to agenda item 9, Borough Plan consultation.

The Leader invited Ms Mohr to address the Cabinet.

Ms Mohr referred to the Borough Plan regarding the priorities for children and was seeking agreement from the Council to taking in at least three additional unaccompanied refugee children a year over the next ten years, in turn providing a legal route to safety for just a few of the most vulnerable young people that were stranded in Europe and the Middle East.

Ms Mohr outlined that the deputation was part of a national campaign, launched by Alf Dubs with the charity 'Safe Passage', to mark the 80th anniversary of the Kindertransport in 1938-9, when Britain took in 10,000 children and young people, including Alf Dubs and as well as the mother of a member of the deputation party attending this Cabinet meeting, to save them from the Nazis. It was noted that the national campaign was called 'It's our turn', and similar deputations were taking place across the UK asking local authorities to each make the same commitment. It was noted that Hammersmith and Fulham had already promised to take 100 places and Islington Council had also recently made this same commitment.

The deputation were clear that such a commitment was dependent on the Council getting increased government funding to meet the costs of supporting the refugee children in full. The deputation recognised that the Council welcomed refugees and took care of a high number of unaccompanied minors whilst existing government funding was inadequate to meet these costs. However, the charity 'Safe Passage' felt that if enough Councils make this pledge, the numbers making the offer will help persuade the government increase funding levels. Therefore the deputation needed the Council to offer as many places as it could.

The deputation outlined that locally, in Haringey, there was a strong community support for this initiative from the three main faith communities, service providers, and from individuals represented in the deputation. The deputation represented a group of about twenty Haringey residents, some of whom were already involved in supporting refugees locally in various ways. The deputation and group were all committed to assisting this process and helping the young arrivals in whatever way they could.

The 80th anniversary of the Kindertransport was due to be celebrated on November 15th, when Alf Dubs and 'Safe Passage' charity hope to announce the pledges from Councils and lobby the government for adequate funding.

In conclusion, the deputation asked the Cabinet to commit the Council to a pledge to resettle at least three additional child refugees a year over the next ten years, provided the costs were met in full by central government. The deputation further requested the Cabinet respond to the deputation party representatives by the end of October with some idea of numbers of refugee children it would take.

The Leader thanked the deputation for their presentation and invited Cabinet Members to put forward questions to the deputation party.

The Cabinet Member for Civic Services commented positively on the campaign and sought an understanding of the progress being made with government on this issue. It was noted that research had been completed on the funding for refugee children, which showed that the current government funding levels were not sufficient. It was hoped that if enough local authorities around the country could pledge support, this could provide support to the campaign to increase funding and support. There was already a PAN London group of local authorities that had written to the secretary of state on this matter and now the emphasis was on obtaining as much support from local authorities to support these existing representations.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families, responded to the deputation. The Cabinet Member began by thanking the deputation for putting forward their representations and appreciated the positive comments and recognition of the Council's historic achievements in supporting refugees and refugee communities.

The Cabinet Member continued to outline the Council's current support to unaccompanied asylum seeking children. It was noted that, nationally, the Council were expected to support a number of unaccompanied asylum seeking children that amounted to 0.007 of its child population, which equated to 42 children. The Council were currently supporting 45 asylum seeking children as looked after children. This also equated to 10% of Looked after Children supported by the Council. In addition, the Council provided support to 76 young people, between the ages of 18-25 who were previously unaccompanied minors and formally looked after children. In total the Council were supporting 121 young people.

The Cabinet Member highlighted the specialist support that is often required to help unaccompanied minors as they would have been through the most traumatic experiences in their own country and would have experienced serious abuse and violence in their journey and unfortunately on arrival in to the UK. The Council wanted to help these children, that were in their care, recover from these experiences and live happy and fulfilling lives.

The Cabinet Member further welcomed the deputation's recognition of the current financial strain on the local authority. Following nearly 10 years of austerity and reduced government funding to support vulnerable children, there was a limited budget allocation. The Cabinet Member advised that, based on current government, funding settlement levels, to support three additional vulnerable children per year over

the next 10 years, would cost the Council £1.3m which under current financial circumstances could not be sustained by Children's service budget. However, if there were a government commitment to provide this additional funding, in full, then the Council would be happy to welcome at least three more child refugees per year over the next ten years.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families agreed to write back to the deputation with the numbers of children that it could support with additional full government funding.

The deputation party thanked the Cabinet for considering their deputation.

## **96. BOROUGH PLAN CONSULTATION**

The Leader of the Council introduced this report which summarised the process and content of the Council's new Borough Plan, and would set the strategic vision for the borough over the next four years.

The Leader continued to outline that the Council were ambitious for Haringey's future as a whole and for the people who called the borough home. The Borough Plan would set the framework for the Council and its partners to deliver on this ambitious agenda.

The administration wanted to run a collaborative Council that genuinely engaged people in shaping the borough's future and the Leader encouraged people to respond to the consultation.

The impact that 8 years of austerity upon Council's finances was recognised. The Council, had had to deal with the mix of these direct cuts to income alongside unfunded budget pressures

The Leader advised that over the next four years the Council expected to see a reduction in the Council's budget and a continued increasing demand for services. It was therefore even more important that to have clear priorities that set out how the borough, can come together to deliver on its ambitions. This was to ensure that resources were focused to have the greatest impact where there was the greatest need.

The Leader expressed that changing how the Council did things was important. The default position of the administration was to deliver services directly where this was prudent to do so, in order to maximise accountability, quality and other benefits to the community, as well as improving value for money where possible. The administration believed that public services needed to be responsive to change and more democratically accountable.

The Leader drew attention to the 5 specific priorities of the Borough Plan:

1. Housing – A safe, secure and affordable home for everyone, whatever their circumstances;
2. People – Strong families, strong networks and strong communities nurture all residents to live well and achieve their potential;

3. Place – Stronger, connected communities where together we improve our environment by making it safer, cleaner and greener;
4. Economy – A growing economy which provides opportunities for all our residents and supports our businesses to thrive
5. Your Council – The way the Council works.

The Cabinet would be focussing on key issues highlighted in the Borough Plan such as Haringey having the third highest numbers of people in temporary accommodation in London and the population outnumbering available housing by around 12000 people. The rates of violent crime with injury and domestic violence with injury were also both the second highest in London and required partnership focus.

There were also achievements and successes to be proud of as a borough, with 86% of residents satisfied with their area, all Haringey schools and early year's settings rated as outstanding or good, over 120 venues where cultural activity takes place, and 25 Green Flag Parks.

The Leader concluded that every local authority has to have a plan that translates the administration's priorities for the next four years into a set of objectives and a programme for action for the Council and its partners. This report introduced Haringey Council's Borough Plan, and invited residents, partners and stakeholders to engage in the consultation and come together to make Haringey a better place.

In response to questions from Cllr Adje and Cllr Cawley- Harrison, the following was noted.

- The consultation would open next week and would run for 8 weeks.
- In relation to the Council's preparations for Brexit, there would be further information shared at the full Council meeting this week. The Borough plan was a 'live' document and would be able to respond to any local economic changes as a result of the Brexit outcome.

**RESOLVED:**

1. To agree to go out to consultation on the Borough Plan, which included:
  - a) Five Priorities – each containing Outcomes, Objectives and Delivery Actions;
  - b) Equality Principles and illustrative objectives;
  - c) Partner Statements; and
  - d) Pledges – Voluntary and Community Sector; Engagement with Residents; Business.
2. That following the consultation, a revised version of the Borough Plan be considered at Cabinet in February 2019 for formal adoption.

Reasons for decision

The Council's current Corporate Plan comes to an end this year. The Council needs to agree a new strategy to cover 2019-23, which will set the strategic vision for the organisation and major partners in the borough.

The new administration was recently elected on a defined policy agenda. The Borough Plan seeks to deliver the political priorities of the administration over the next four years.

The Council is currently developing its Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). The outcome of the Borough Plan consultation and final strategy will inform the MTFS of the organisational priorities for 2019-23.

The Council has a statutory duty to publish equality objectives. The Borough Plan is the core document through which the Council identifies and agrees where to tackle inequalities in the borough. The Borough Plan document includes draft equality principles and illustrative objectives, which will also be subject to public consultation.

#### Alternative options considered

There are a number of alternative options, including:

- a) Do not publish a new Plan; and
- b) Extend the current Corporate Plan.

It is not considered feasible to pursue option A, as the Council's Corporate Plan ends this year, which means a new Plan must be published. The Council is required to agree an overarching strategic document, which sets the parameters in which all other strategies operate.

It is not considered appropriate to extend the governance period of the current Corporate Plan, as this does not reflect the current administration's priorities and the nature and extent of partnerships across the borough, which contribute to the delivery of the Plan's outcomes.

## **97. DISCRETIONARY HOME LOSS PAYMENTS TO SECURE TENANTS OF TANGMERE**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report, which sought approval to making Discretionary Home Loss payments to secure tenants of Tangemere Block in Broadwater Farm who have moved since 26<sup>th</sup> of June 2018.

The Cabinet Member referred to the 26 June Cabinet decision on rehousing Tangmere residents before the end of October when the gas supply by Cadent was due to cease following structural issues with the block. However, it was important to note that the June Cabinet meeting did not make any decision on the future of Tangmere, as it wanted to seek the opinions of Tangmere residents before making this decision in November.

The Cabinet Member emphasised that moving home was stressful and particularly where someone was losing their home permanently. She explained that for this reason, the law set out that these secure tenants were eligible for Statutory Home Loss payments where their home was to be demolished. However, the law did not recognise the similar disruption caused when a property was being repaired/strengthened and where the households may be away from their original home for up to a year.

Taking into consideration the discussion with residents, the urgency of the Tangmere moves to allow residents to be re-housed by the 31<sup>st</sup> of October, together with the potential length of time tenants would be away from their home if the decision on structural repair was taken, Tangmere was felt to be an exceptional case. The report proposed to further recognise this by offering Discretionary Home Loss payments to all Tangmere's secure tenants regardless of the eventual decision around Tangmere's future.

This would be a single payment that would be paid and there would be no subsequent payment, should a decision be made to demolish the block.

The Cabinet Member expressed that the section 105 consultation on the future of Tangmere block and Northolt block was going well and there were good response levels given that residents were also moving at the same time. The consultation period ended on the 10<sup>th</sup> of October and remaining residents at Tangmere and Northolt Block that had yet to respond to the consultation were encouraged to do so.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley- Harrison, the following information was noted.

- Going forward the Cabinet Member could examine the potential for making home loss payments for residents living in temporary accommodation for a prolonged period to allow for required structural works on properties. However, it was further clarified that where residents were living in long term temporary accommodation in a block or property that required structural works and were then subsequently moved to allow for these works, they would not automatically be eligible for a home loss payment. The Council and Homes for Haringey would likely need to assess these circumstances and consider how long the resident had been in temporary accommodation. This situation would not apply to Tangmere.
- The consultation closed on the 10<sup>th</sup> of October and it was not appropriate, at this stage, to speculate on the outcome of the decision on Tangmere block and Northolt block. The outcome of the consultation and decision on these two blocks would be considered at Cabinet in November.
- It was noted that 70 residents in Tangmere had so far accepted housing offers with 42 signing tenancy agreements.

**RESOLVED**

1. To note the cost of payments as set out in 6.8 of the attached report.
2. To note the payment conditions set out in 6.10 of the attached report.
3. To approve the payment of Discretionary Home Loss Payments to secure tenants of Tangmere who have moved since 26 June 2018.
4. To approve as required by Section 1 – Financial Regulations paragraph 5.23 (b) within the Housing Revenue Account virement of £554K from the Depreciation Dwellings budget to a new budget Discretionary Home Loss Payments.

### **Reasons for decision**

Recommendation 3.3 is made because;

- a) Should a decision be made to demolish Tangmere, secure tenants will be eligible for a statutory Home Loss payment.
- b) Should a decision be made to strengthen the block, there would be no statutory requirement to make any payments to Tangmere secure tenants. However, there is still considerable inconvenience for secure tenants who are having to move at short notice, and would be unable to return to their home for at least a year even if the block is strengthened.
- c) Extending the Home Loss payments beyond the statutory requirement will also help achieve the operational requirement to vacate the block before the end of October 2018, as the discretionary payments will be made once residents have moved out of Tangmere.

### **Alternative options considered**

Home Loss payments restricted to where there is a statutory duty to pay these.

This option was rejected, as should a decision be made to strengthen the block, this would not offer any compensation payments to tenants who would be required to be away from their home for at least a year.

Further, it would not help to meet the urgent requirement to vacate the block before the gas supply is shut off at the end of October 2018.

## **98. CAPITAL LETTERS**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced this report which set out a proposal to join the pan-London 'Capital Letters' scheme which will collaboratively procure new properties to rent on behalf of London boroughs, supported by the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG).

The Cabinet Member reiterated that there was a desperate shortage for housing in Haringey. With limited supply and properties often required at short notice, this also incurred significant costs to the Council.

Capital Letters was a pan-London scheme, which sought to increase the supply of temporary accommodation, reduce the cost of this accommodation, and reduce the need for households to be accommodated out of the borough. This scheme would also combat the competition between boroughs to secure emergency and temporary accommodation, which was also driving up the costs. The pan-London approach would impact on this high cost and would enable boroughs to work together on common housing issues.

It was therefore proposed to enter into partnership with other boroughs to enable a significant impact on reducing those costs.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley- Harrison, the following information was noted:

- It was considered unlikely that MHCLG would not be funding the scheme beyond the first year. This funding could not yet be confirmed until the spending review was announced.
- If the scheme were not funded in second year, it would not mean that the scheme collapsed. It would only mean that additional funding was not available to acquire additional properties in future years. However, the funding from the first year would have been utilised to secure properties that could be used over a longer period. In the event that the scheme collapsed, this would not lead to a financial risk for the Council as set out at paragraph 6.27. Also any Assured Short Hold Tenancies would have been acquired in the first year, which would have already been paid for.
- It was clarified that the 50% of Council-secured property lets proposed to be added to the capital letters scheme part of our proposed commitment to the scheme. There was an expectation that the capital letters scheme would acquire 4500 homes in addition to what the boroughs acquired independently. It was the ultimate intention for all Council property lets to be put into the capital letters scheme but the Council would firstly consider how this arrangement works in the next three years before such a commitment was considered and any staff transferred to the scheme.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To note the £39 million over three years potentially being made available by MHCLG for pan-London collaboration on the procurement of accommodation for homeless households.
2. To note the draft Articles of Association at Appendix A
3. To note the draft Members Agreement at Appendix B

4. To approve, in principle, for the Council to join Capital Letters London Ltd, a Company Limited by Guarantee that will be established by the London boroughs, as an 'A member'.
5. To delegate to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal and the Statutory Legal and Finance Officers, the following:
  - a) Finalising and agreement of the Articles of Association
  - b) Payment of up to £100,000 from Flexible Homelessness Support Grant funding in lieu of seconding staff as set out in 6.11
6. To note that under the constitution part 3 Section D – local Choice Functions / function 16 - the appointment of officer(s) to the Capital Letters Board falls to the Chief Executive. Nominated officer(s) will represent the Council at Company meetings, and will vote and exercise all rights of Membership on behalf of the Council.

### **Reasons for decision**

The decisions recommended are required to join the Company and participate in the collaborative procurement approach and to access the MHCLG funding.

The estimated aggregate financial benefit of the proposals to London Boroughs are up to £116m over the first three years, plus potential savings on changing how placements are made and reduced repeat homelessness through tenancy sustainment. Joining the scheme early will maximise Haringey's share of these savings.

Currently other London boroughs have temporary accommodation in Haringey meaning Haringey must place many households outside of the borough. Capital Letters will help rationalise temporary accommodation in London with properties obtained in Haringey being prioritised for households from Haringey.

### **Benefits to Haringey borough of being in the first phase:**

It is proposed that Capital Letters membership will grow in a number of phases with some boroughs joining the first phase and others joining in later phases. There are a number of reasons why it would be advantageous for Haringey to be part of the first wave of boroughs, which are anticipated to start operations in April 2019.

- i. The MHCLG subsidy per borough will be greater in the first year. This is important in terms of the proportion of centrally funded staff compared to borough-funded staff, which should provide a greater uplift to procurement numbers for the boroughs in the first wave.
- ii. The boroughs involved in the set-up of the company will have much more control over the way it is set up and its Articles of Association than boroughs who join after the company has been established. This may also include the terms and conditions of future boroughs joining the scheme.

- iii. Boroughs who do not join Capital Letters will still have properties procured by Capital Letters in their area. Although Capital Letters will abide by the agreed Inter- Borough Accommodation Agreement rates, there is nevertheless a significant risk that property owners and agents will prefer to work with Capital Letters than within individual boroughs. This is because of the profile it will have when launched, and because of the more streamlined ability to let properties across London with one organisation than with a number of different boroughs, all with slightly different terms and conditions and different personnel.
- iv. If Capital Letters is successful then it will be possible for Haringey to secure more private rented and leased properties in London within or close to Haringey, reducing the need to place families in nightly paid accommodation in neighbouring boroughs or elsewhere in London. It would be better to secure these benefits sooner rather than later.

### **Alternative options considered**

To not join the scheme and instead rely on the existing team in Homes for Haringey, which procures Assured Shorthold Tenancies and nightly rate bookings, and on new Haringey-only schemes such as the Community Benefit Society and Purchase, Repair and Management Company.

This was rejected, as existing resources are unlikely to be able to achieve the level of uplift that Capital Letters can with the additional funding. The two new schemes focus on purchasing properties when property owners wish to sell, whereas Capital Letters will focus on renting and leasing properties, which landlords wish to retain. Not joining the scheme will also, lead to any properties Capital Letters obtains in Haringey being allocated to households from other boroughs who are members of the scheme.

To not to join the company in the first phase, but rather wait and assess the scheme's progress.

This option was rejected, as it would result in a lost opportunity to access MHCLG grant funding for the first year, and delay the benefits of reduced costs and more local placements. There would also be less influence on the scheme's design by joining once the scheme has been established.

To join the company as a 'B member'.

Although this option would still enable the Council to receive services from Capital Letters, joining as a 'B member' would mean that the Council has less influence over the strategic direction of the company and the specific Articles of Association relating to 'B members'. Joining as a 'B member' also means that they would not have access to MHCLG subsidy for newly procured properties. The distinction between 'A' and 'B' membership is noted in the 21.2.3 of the draft Articles of Association at Appendix A.

There is an option to reduce funding for 'A membership' by seconding up to two staff to Capital Letters.

While there is no intention to make any compulsory secondments at this stage, this option may be taken up if individual members of staff request to take up this opportunity on a voluntary basis.

## **99. BIRKBECK LODGE**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report, which sought approval for the Council to carry out the conversion of the now vacant Adult Day Care Centre and Kurdish Community Centre at Birkbeck Lodge into emergency accommodation units.

In introducing the report, the Cabinet Member highlighted the following issues:

- The Council had a duty to house homeless families where they found themselves in situations where they required emergency accommodation.
- Emergency accommodation was the most expensive form of temporary accommodation provided by the Council and often involved expensive nightly rates being paid by the Council.
- Historically, there had been a heavy reliance on use of B&B accommodation, which was often of poor quality.
- The Council was seeking to provide all emergency accommodation within the borough in-house. There already existed two converted properties for use as emergency accommodation (Broadwater lodge, Whitehall lodge).
- This would be the third conversion of premises to provide emergency accommodation to families in the borough and an important new design feature was that all bedrooms would have an en-suite bathroom. There would be no shared bathroom facilities at the premises. All forms of future emergency accommodation would take into account this new requirement. There would still be communal areas, such as the kitchens to allow as many units of accommodation as possible.
- Homeless families should only be in emergency accommodation for up to 12 weeks but the Cabinet Member recognised in certain circumstances, this was longer. This period allowed the Council to assess whether it had an obligation to provide housing duty for them.
- A lot of emergency accommodation providers were not to a high standard and could continue in this low quality model due a demand in their services.

The Cabinet Member closed her introduction by stating the impact on children who found themselves in emergency accommodation could be immensely damaging and Cabinet should do all it can to improve the quality of emergency accommodation.

Following questions from Cllr Brabazon, Cllr Hearn, Cllr Mark Blake and Cllr Cawley-Harrison, it was noted that:

- There would be a member of staff on site 24/7. This was important as homeless families might be vulnerable and support was necessary.
- The purpose of the report was for a decision to be made to approve the capital investment required for work on the conversion of Birkbeck Lodge into

emergency accommodation, not to release the revenue budget for managing it. The running cost budget would be met from the housing benefit income of families at the emergency accommodation and, because of the 24/7 support, extra cover to the costs might be provided from some of the larger lodges that have a better economy of scale. Savings on emergency accommodation were highlighted at point 8.4 of the report.

- Regarding accessibility, all rooms were on the ground floor and would be step free and wheelchair accessible.
- The creation of Birkbeck Lodge will increase the Haringey's capacity to keep households within the borough during the critical first few weeks.
- It was considered appropriate to start looking across the portfolio of properties owned by the Council to see where other premises could be converted into emergency accommodation and, if possible, for those to be fully self-contained. This was explored with Birkbeck Lodge; however, given the lack of emergency accommodation available at the time, this was not in the final plan, as it would have reduced the number of rooms available to homeless families.
- The 24/7 provision of staffing at Birkbeck Lodge would not change despite the available provision of CCTV, detailed in the report. Security of the premise was paramount and it was important to provide staffing and surveillance, especially where families were sharing communal areas.
- The accommodation would be appropriate for families, as far as possible. Rooms were of different sizes, with a different number of beds, and certain rooms could be joined to accommodate bigger families if necessary. As the portfolio of the Council's emergency accommodation premises grows, it would be able to better suit accommodation to homeless family's needs. It was the Council's intention to house families in the most suitable accommodation, where possible.
- There was no intention to add sprinklers to the premise as this was not a requirement by set regulations, and there could be a risk that they may do more harm than good given that these emergency rooms would be on the ground floor. However, the Homes for Haringey Managing Director would seek advice from the Fire Brigade and other authorities on this matter and write back to Cllr Cawley- Harrison.

## **RESOLVED**

1. To approve the conversion of the ground floor of 2-152 Birkbeck Road into temporary accommodation.
2. To approve the Agreed Maximum Price (AMP) submitted by Engie Limited (Engie) (formally Keepmoat Ltd) for the Birkbeck Lodge Temporary Accommodation Conversion Works.
3. To approve the total professional fees of £62,951, which represents 6.42% of the contract sum.
4. To note the total project costs of £1,043,495.

5. To authorise Haringey's Legal Department to issue a letter of intent for the amount of up to and not exceeding £98,054 being 10% of the contract sum under the Council's Contract Standing Orders (CSO) 9.07.3 allowing the planned work to start on site as soon as possible.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Council uses emergency accommodation such as the type proposed at Birkbeck Lodge to house households who approach the Council as homeless, whilst Homes for Haringey continue to work with the household to explore their housing options. These additional bed spaces will reduce the need to procure expensive and dispersed short-term housing to accommodate households while their applications are being assessed.

The reasons for recommendations 3.2 and 3.5 is to enable the project to commence by issuing the letter of intent and, pending conclusion of the formal contract, the award of the contract to Engie.

### **Alternative options considered**

The option of doing nothing was rejected as this would leave the space unused and risks squatting and/or falling into long-term disrepair.

The option of converting this space into permanent Council housing was considered, but there is a pressing need for more emergency accommodation in-borough for households who approach the Council as homeless. The proposed conversion would not prevent the Council from converting the space it permanent Council housing in the future.

## **100. AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR INTEGRATED HARINGEY ADULT SUBSTANCE MISUSE TREATMENT AND RECOVERY SERVICES**

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced this report which sought approval to award the contracts for provision of adult substance misuse services to Haringey residents experiencing drug and alcohol problems, their families and friends, in accordance with Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1 (d). Cabinet was informed that problems with alcohol and drugs remained an issue for many residents within the borough but it was often those from the most economically deprived areas who needed help the most. The Cabinet Member thanked the officers and their team for the work they had done with regard to this issue and noted that service users had been involved in the tender process. Cabinet noted that this report would be further considered in the exempt part of the meeting.

The following information was provided to Cllr Cawley- Harrison:

- That the award of contract was in three parts (drugs, alcohol, and recovery) and the details on the specifications would be provided at a later date
- In response to a question on whether the Adults and Health Overview Scrutiny Committee could be provided with oversight of the regular appraisals and

performance statistics of the three awarded providers, it was noted that this was not normal practice. However overarching strategic information on the provision of drugs, Alcohol and recovery services could be provided to the Scrutiny Committee.

- A written response would be provided as to why the 'Percentage of injecting drug users tested for Hep B and Vaccinated fully' did not include those who dropped out before becoming completely vaccinated and whether this artificially inflated the success rates of the figures.

Further to considering exempt information at item 22,

## RESOLVED

To approve the award of contracts to the successful providers in accordance with Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1(d) for an initial term of 4 years commencing from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2019 to December 2023 with an option to extend for a period or periods of up to a further 2 years and another 2 years at a total value of £14,671,695.53 for the initial 4 years and the total value of £29,508,286.21 over the 8 years as follows:

Lot 1 – Specialist Drug Service	Lot 2 – Specialist Alcohol Service	Lot 3- Recovery Service
The successful tenderer to commence on 1st January 2019 for a 4-year contract.	The successful tenderer to commence on 1 <sup>st</sup> January 2019 for a 4-year contract.	The successful tenderer to commence on 1 <sup>st</sup> January 2019 for a 4-year contract.
With an option to extend the contract for 2 years and another, further 2 years.	With an option to extend the contract for 2 years and another, further 2 years.	With an option to extend the contract for 2 years and another, further 2 years.

Table 1. Brief summary on the outcomes of the tender

## Reasons for decision

The Council is responsible for ensuring that there are accessible effective substance misuse treatment services for the local residents. In 1 April 2013, the responsibility of commissioning of substance misuse services was transferred from the NHS to local authorities, resources for these services were transferred within the ring fenced Public Health Grant.

The recommendations as outlined in section 3 are based on those providers who scored the highest Most Economical Advantageous Tender (MEAT) scores and therefore would offer the best value to Council in terms of quality and price. The quality component of this tender was 60% and 40% price. The quality component is deemed to be of importance as part of the service provision is of a clinical nature and as such compliance with standards are crucial.

## **Alternative options considered**

The tendering of these services is part of public health's wider commissioning plan and an agreed Business Case for the tendering of drug and alcohol contracts. The existing Council-held contracts for these services are due to end in December 2018.

### **101. THE ACQUISITION OF THE FREEHOLD OF CANNING CRESCENT HEALTH CENTRE**

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced this report which sought approval for the acquisition of the freehold interest in the former Health Centre in Canning Crescent and contained proposals for its future use. The Canning Crescent Health Centre, 276-292 High Road ("Property"), was a former mental health centre located in Wood Green which had been advertised for disposal by Barnet Enfield and Haringey Mental Health National Health Service Trust. This report set out a proposal to acquire the Property and repurpose the existing building for community use relating to adults with mental health issues. The Cabinet Member commented that a large number of individuals were affected by mental illness at some point in their lives and this was a rare chance for the Council, working in partnership with the NHS, to offer a mix of provision on a single site to enable local residents with poor mental health to enjoy better outcomes.

Further to considering exempt material pertaining to the report at agenda item 23,

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. To the acquisition of the property known as Canning Crescent Health Centre, 276-292 High Road, Wood Green (as shown edged in red on the plan in Appendix 1) from the Barnet Enfield and Haringey Mental Health National Health Service Trust for a sum of £2.4m and based on the Heads of Terms attached at Appendix 3 of this report. The property is to be acquired for general fund purposes; and
2. To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning after consultation with the Director of Finance and the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health, to agree the final terms of the contract.
3. That the total cost of acquisition (£2.4m plus transaction costs as set out in 6.27) and the costs for the initial development of the project of c£0.3m are met from the Strategic Acquisitions budget within the approved capital programme.
4. To note that, subject to further due diligence and development planning, officers intend to return to Cabinet in 2019 for approval of the Detailed Design and Detailed Costs (capital and revenue) and approval to procure.

#### **Reasons for decision**

The acquisition will benefit the Council by enabling the delivery of supported housing units to serve the need of residents in the Borough and by providing a new improved facility for the Council's Clarendon Recovery College. The proposal will deliver revenue savings for the Council and release land elsewhere in Wood Green for housing delivery.

The revenue savings will be achieved by stepping existing clients down from residential care and/or supported living with a care team into purpose built supported housing on a single site. There are also positive benefits for residents of a supported living scheme within the borough, rather than having to move out of borough to receive the support they need, especially given the proposal to co-locate other provision on the same site.

This is an opportunity for joint working and a fully joined up approach with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) for revenue costs and contribution and also an opportunity for the Council to work closely with a future care provider. This scheme will be a key part of implementing the Council's agreed Supported Housing Transformation Plan and our joint commissioning intentions with the CCG to improve the lives of people with severe mental illness.

The relocation of the Clarendon Recovery College will improve the usage and footfall to this facility, with improved outcomes and greater chance of recovery. Savings may be made by moving the Clarendon Recovery College to a new property as there is potential to increase the income for the Clarendon Recovery College, to improve its outcomes in terms of independence and thereby to reduce Council subsidy.

The release of the existing Clarendon Recovery College site will contribute to the Council's housing targets. Housing is in high demand in the borough with over 3,000 families in Temporary Accommodation and over 9,000 households on the waiting list.

Should Cabinet approve the acquisition of the site there will follow a period of design development, options appraisal, cost planning and development planning. Officers will return to Cabinet for approval of the final development plan. The development plan will include detailed designs and costs for the preferred development option and a funding, delivery and operation strategy.

### **Alternative options considered**

The alternative option is not to acquire the property. This would mean that the opportunity to provide 21 units for supported housing within one site will be lost.

Disregarding any hospital care, if provision is not found for the new units, residents will continue to use the alternative residential and other care services in place now from the independent sector, at an annual cost of £690,601 to the Council, with a further contribution of £172,650 from the CCG in joint funding.

In addition to the above, should the project not go ahead, a suitable alternative location would have to be identified for the Clarendon Recovery College before the redevelopment of the Clarendon Road South site could take place.

The Council is in a position to acquire the freehold of the Canning Crescent building prior to market. Should the Council not acquire the property at this stage the site will be sold on the open market. In the event that the Council acquires the property but the project does not go ahead the Council could then sell the site with overage payable to NHS Trust as set out in the draft Heads of Terms.

## **102. EXTENSION OF THE HOUSING REVIEWS CONTRACT**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced this report which sought approval for an extension of the contract with Housing Reviews Limited (HRL) to undertake reviews of allocation and homelessness decisions under Parts VI and VII of the house Act 1996. Cabinet was informed that the Council, in deciding what, if any, duty is owed to homeless applicants, had to make necessary enquiries to be sure that they were eligible for assistance. Such decisions were open to be reviewed if challenged and there was a set time within which applicants could seek a review. The Homelessness Reduction Act (HRA) now added additional points at which a review could happen. For the review process to be fully effective, there should be seamless delivery of this function. This ensured the quality of service to applicants, as well as minimising the risk of legal challenges, managing costs and protecting the reputation of the Council. This report recommended extending the current Housing Reviews Contract while officers monitor the impact of the Homelessness Reduction Act and explored other suitable options over the next year.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley Harrison, it was noted that:

- The expected time scale to bring the contract back in house, or put it back out to tender as a full contract, was 1 year.
- The Council might have to recruit more reviewing officers in the future if there was an increase in the number of reviews by applicants. After reviewing the first 6 months of the impact of the Homelessness Reduction Act, the increase in reviews was not as much as was expected. However, it was considered that 6 months was too soon and a longer review period would be needed to assess the Act's direct impact upon services.
- A shared service with other boroughs was also an option that could be considered for future delivery of review applications.
- The reviews being conducted externally to the Council had the added benefit of improving the perception of independence in the reviewing process and could assist in reducing the number of legal challenges.

### **RESOLVED**

1. To approve, in accordance with Contract Standing Oder (CSO) 10.02, an extension to the Council's current contract with Housing Reviews Limited for the reviews of allocation and homelessness decisions for a period of 12 months, from 1 December 2018, with a 6 months break clause. This will be at an estimated cost of £20,000, based on current contract rates, but subject to

maximum costs of up to £50,000 being incurred if more reviews than currently estimated prove to be required during the contract extension.

2. To note that the requested extension will give officers time to track and fully review the impact of the Homelessness Reduction Act 2018 (HRA) on demand for Housing Reviews and develop a service delivery model that will achieve the best possible outcomes in terms of quality and value for money. During the extension period, officers will explore the option of Homes for Haringey or the Council delivering the function internally as well as other suitable options, such as developing a shared delivery solution with other boroughs.

### **Reasons for decision**

The Council has statutory responsibilities with regard to reviews under Parts VI and VII of the Act. It can either carry out these reviews itself, or delegate them to third parties under the terms of the Local Authorities (Contracting Out of Allocation of Housing and Homelessness Functions) Order 1996.

The current contract expires on 30 November 2018; so an extension of the contract to HRL for 12 months is required to avoid disruption in the review process. This will also allow for all reviews contracted to HRL to be determined while Officers begin appraising options. Failure to do so would pose a significant risk to the Council.

The rates for conducting reviews would be fixed for the duration of the contract extension and the contractor will be paid in arrears upon completing a review.

The cost of contracting out to HRL the Housing Review function was £19,179 in 2017/18 and the amount spent from 1 April to 12 September 2018 is £12,976. It is expected to cost approximately £20,000 from 1 December 2018 to 29 November 2019, depending on the number of reviews requested, though it is possible that caseloads could increase due to the Homelessness Reduction Act, which is why approval for a maximum cost of £50,000 has been sought. The cost of carrying out the function within Homes for Haringey has been estimated at approximately £50,000 per annum, so using the external provider should deliver savings to the Council.

### **Alternative options considered**

#### Asking HRL to continue undertaking reviews beyond the term of the contract without extending the contract:

If the contract with HRL is not extended for 12 months while a review is taking place, HRL will not be authorised to carry out reviews on behalf of the Council and any reviews conducted by HRL would be open to legal challenge.

#### Bringing the reviews function back in-house:

If the contract was not extended, all cases currently allocated to HRL would have to be passed back to the Council immediately to complete. The Council does not have sufficient staffing in place to deliver the statutory reviews function 'in house' from 30 November 2018, when the contract expires. Previous attempts to recruit staff to deliver this function were unsuccessful. The lack of capacity to complete these reviews would result in delays, increased costs and likely legal challenges. However,

the option of bringing the reviews function in-house will be fully reviewed during the extension period.

Contracting out the reviews function to another borough's reviews team:

Southwark Council's Review Team has been conducting reviews on behalf of a number of other London authorities since 2017. If the contract was not extended with HRL, an alternative could be to conclude a contract with Southwark and pass all cases currently allocated to HRL to them, on expiry of HRL's current contract to complete. Officers have not yet appraised the viability of this option and whether it would deliver best value for money and quality. However, the option of contracting out this function to Southwark or another Council will be explored fully during the extension period.

**103. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR MECHANICAL VENTILATION IMPROVEMENTS (PHASE 2) TO NORTHOLT, KENLEY, STELLAR HOUSE & KENNETH ROBBINS HOUSE**

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought approval for the appointment of the successful contractor to undertake the refurbishment of the communal extractor fans, cleaning of ducts and installation of intelligent vents to individual dwellings to Northolt, Kenley, Stellar house and Kenneth Robbins House. The project formed part of the Council's overall Council Housing Capital Programme, which in 2018 would see over £45m invested in the borough's Council housing stock as part of its five year investment programme which exceeds £250m. The project would improve ventilation systems in flats and would reduce damp and condensation related issues, while also improving fire safety. A total of 339 homes would benefit from those works.

In response to questions from Cllr Cawley- Harrison, it was noted that

- Ensuring the longevity of equipment so that it did not fall into disrepair and required replacement was factored in the long-term business plan which was essentially a finance model for the housing and revenue account. The plan provided for sufficient investment in stock to ensure works were completed in a timely manner. There was also a detailed plan completed 5 years in advance on asset management strategy.
- Regarding the recovery by the Council of £55,000 from 38 leaseholders, it was noted that no comments or observations had been received. Leaseholders would be billed separately for the work as it was an additional service charge.

Further to considering the exempt information at item 24,

**RESOLVED**

1. To approve the award of a contract to H2O Nationwide Ltd for the refurbishment and upgrading of the centralised mechanical ventilation services at Stellar House, Kenneth Robbins House and Kenley over a contract period of 23 weeks for a maximum sum of £520,458 (rounded up) subject to reduction, in consultation with the contractor and in accordance with Paragraph 3.2 of this

- report, to omit the cost of the works to Northolt from the tendered sum before the award letter is issued and the signing of the contract.
2. To delegate the approval of the revised contract value to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning once the cost of Northolt has been removed from the contract.
  3. To approve the total professional fees of £58,114 which represents 11.166% of the contract sum and notes the total project cost of £578,572.
  4. To authorise, under the Council's Contract Standing Orders (CSO) 9.07.3, the issue of a letter of intent for an amount of up to but not exceeding £52,045, being 10% of the contract sum.

### **Reasons for decision**

A competitive tender scheme was carried out for Phase two of ventilation works to high rise blocks in the borough and approval of the outcome of the tender is required to allow the contract to be awarded and the planned refurbishment and upgrading of the centralised mechanical ventilation services work to be ordered.

The new system will protect residents within their properties in the event of a fire, as smoke will be detected as it is drawn into the vicinity of the extract grille by the negative pressure in the bathroom or toilet. The airflow valve will shut down isolating the remainder of the riser within 5 seconds and an audible alarm will be activated.

The current systems do not perform to the requirements of the Building Regulations Part F1. An historic combination of double glazing and draught proofing and the deteriorated condition of the roof fans and ducts has caused a critical reduction of the ventilation rates to dwellings and this could lead to a consequential increase in dampness-related repairs. Restoring the ventilation schemes to beyond their original design performance will greatly reduce these issues and lead to reduced repair costs over the life of the system.

The new system will be a smart, digital solution that has smart air terminals that have Bluetooth technology embedded which enables each terminal to be interrogated, cycle tested and validated as fully functional without access to the property itself and in real time. Further, data from the air terminal can be downloaded via this wireless link to detect instances in which the terminals alarm functions have been activated, the status of the standby battery and whether the device has been disconnected from the mains supply. All of this data is date and time stamped to aid analysis and compliance checking.

### **Alternative options considered**

The alternative option is to repair the existing system which could result in ongoing maintenance issues and not addressing the potential fire risk.

#### **104. LEASING OF THE GROUND FLOOR AT 54 MUSWELL HILL - MUSWELL HILL HEALTH CENTRE**

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Insourcing introduced this report which concerned the relocation of 3 current GP practices in the Muswell Hill area to a single new site, 54 Muswell Hill for use as a Health Centre.

This site was owned by the Council and the details of this ownership were contained in the report. Essentially, the 3 GPs wanted to relocate and to set up at this site and the Council were supporting this objective as it met the overall Council view of providing better integrated care in the borough.

Cabinet noted that there existed some access issues with the proposed location, due to it being on a hill. However, these access issues also existed with the current location of the 3 GP practices and the Council were seeking to identify and address these issues.

Instead of sub-contracting the site to an international property company who would likely further sublet this site for a profit, the report proposed the Council retaining the site in ownership and leasing this to the GPs whilst also fitting out the site. This was considered value for money and met the objective of considering direct delivery of services where possible and feasible and prudent. The Council would use capital funding to complete the fit out of the Centre and would be able to obtain a rental stream when leasing the site to the GP's

In response to Councillor Hearn's question the following information was provided.

- It was confirmed that the location was felt suitable by the GP's as it was better than their existing locations. Noted that this centre would be accessible and step free. The issue was with its location on a hill and the Council would take a view on this from the access officer report. Noted that there would be three parking spaces at the site and one would be allocated to patients with a blue badge. Assurance was provided that officers would review the assessment and make sure that the steepness of the hill was not the barrier to the GP's locating there.

#### **RESOLVED**

- a) To agree to the grant of a lease of the whole of the ground floor (outlined red in the plan in **Appendix A**) of the 54 Muswell Hill to the GPs (The Muswell Hill Practice with and on behalf of Rutland House Surgery, The Queens Avenue Surgery) or such other entity as shall be agreed between GPs and the Council subject to draft terms set out in **Appendix B (in draft)** and subject to confirmation by the District Valuer of rent to be paid by the GPs.
- b) That the Council should allocate a sum as set out in **Part B** of this report the approved Capital Programme contingency for the fit out of the ground floor of

54 Muswell Hill as a GP hub to a specification set out in **Appendix C**, with authority to procure contractors and a facilities management operator to be procured or drawn from available framework panels.

- c) To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing Regeneration & Planning after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources and Insourcing and the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health to agree the final terms for the lease to the GPs and to agree the final costs for the fit-out works, subject to agreement with the NHS/CCG on both the NHS funding and process for securing the fit-out works.
- d) That if agreement with the NHS for funding and the lease with the GPs cannot be agreed within this financial year, the Council should proceed to market the ground floor space to secure another permitted user in the health and care sector under the planning use-class for the property.

### **Reasons for decision**

There are three main GP practices in Muswell Hill N10: The Muswell Hill Practice, Rutland House and Queens Avenue. The premises for all three are undersized for the current patient lists and fail to fully comply with the Disability Discrimination and Equality Act. The allocation of the Council's interest in the ground floor of 54 Muswell Hill for a new health facility will provide a modern facility capable of serving 25,000 patients from one site. The integration of the three practices into one would be gradual and not achieved on the initial opening of the new Muswell Hill building. The Muswell Hill and Rutland House practices intend to merge and would enter into the lease with the Council. Queens Avenue Practice has a lease which runs beyond the likely opening of 54 Muswell Hill and so would not relocate to the new GP hub at the same time as the other two practices. Queens Avenue Practice would also need to make use of another property (yet to be identified) for its storage and back-office support, using separate funding from the NHS outside of this project with the Council.

The Council acquired the property at 54 Muswell Hill in mid-2017 as part of the land swap approved by Cabinet in October 2015. The property was acquired for general fund purposes. The two upper floors are currently part of an affordable housing project previously agreed by the Cabinet. This upper space is to be fitted out for six shared ownership flats and the cost of this is already included in the Council's Capital Programme and recent housing funding bid to the Mayor for London. The fit-out of these residential units is currently in the procurement stage for completion early in 2019. A decision is needed now on allocating the ground floor of 54 Muswell Hill for the GP hub project so that the entire property, including the residential units on the upper floors, may be completed and occupied by the end of 2019, given that by that stage it will have been vacant for two years.

The ground floor space will provide a long-term location for the delivery of high quality, accessible primary care in Muswell Hill. This joint working with the CCG is a pioneering approach to integrated primary health and part of a wider approach to collaborating with the CCG and NHS on co-location and property requirements. The development will complement the existing, larger health centre in Hornsey (Hornsey Central Neighbourhood Health Centre), which hosts a number of Whittington Health

community services, as well as a large GP practice and the Haynes Dementia Hub. These two locations together will support the Council's ambitions to deliver high quality integrated health and care services in the West of Haringey. The GPs have assessed the property and believe it to be suited to their needs in terms of location and accessibility. Given the location on a hill, we will supplement this with our own access report from the Council's accessibility team before finalising lease terms with the GPs.

## **Alternative Options considered**

### Option A:

The Council could choose to lease the premises to the third party private health company identified by the GPs on a long lease of 125 years, which would then fit out the building for the Health Centre and lease directly to the GPs. This would, in effect, be a property disposal by the Council and only provide the Council with a capital receipt. The GPs selected MedicX/Octopus, a major US healthcare company. MedicX/Octopus also offer a range of other medical services in the private health market and are rapidly expanding into the NHS sector providing space for GPs and private hospitals. Were this route to be considered, the Council would need to negotiate a lease with this private company which would then become the landlord to the GPs and sub-let the space to them for 25 years. The company would then have the benefit of the long lease for the remaining 100 years.

Officers considered this option and concluded that it would not provide value for money, would entail virtual disposal of the asset on a long lease to the private property and medical company and make it more difficult for the Council to manage the delivery of the GP hub with the housing project in the upstairs space. It would also mean that the benefit of a long-term revenue stream from the rental of the space would not be available to the local authority.

### Option B (Direct Delivery - Preferred Option):

In this option, the Council will directly lease the space to the GPs for a rent to be set by the DV and then for the Council to complete the fit out directly using directly appointed contractors and a specialist health facilities management company. A draft options analysis is provided at **Annex D** attached (exempt item) comparing this direct delivery option with the original private intermediary option. There are two variations of this option. B(i) would be for the NHS to provide a bullet payment to the Council to cover and procure the fit-out costs, thereby meaning that the GPs would only pay the Council rent at shell-and-core market value for the full term of the lease. The other variation (Bii) is for the CCG/NHS to directly appoint and fund contractors and facilities management directly on behalf of the GPs were it to find a mechanism which does not involve a third party company holding an interest in the property between the Council and the GPs. Until we have final figures from the NHS/CCG and the District Valuer it is not possible to determine which of these variations on direct delivery is both best value and would maximise the best primary health care solution at this location.

### Option C:

Another option would be for the Council to lease the space to an alternative health or care operator under the terms of the restrictions in the planning determination. Whilst an annual commercial market rent could be achieved that is greater than the rent to be paid by the GPs, no market occupier could be secured for a 25 year term and taking into account void periods between lettings the revenue potential may be less than that achieved through a long term arrangement with the GPs. Putting the property onto the market would risk leaving Muswell Hill without adequate GP premises given that the CCG and GPs spent over two years looking and failing to find other locations.

**105. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES**

None

**106. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS**

**RESOLVED**

To note the delegated and significant actions taken by directors in September.

**107. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None

**108. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED**

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

**109. AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR INTEGRATED HARINGEY ADULT SUBSTANCE MISUSE TREATMENT AND RECOVERY SERVICES**

As per the exempt minutes and item 100.

**110. THE ACQUISITION OF THE FREEHOLD OF CANNING CRESCENT HEALTH CENTRE**

As per item 101.

**111. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR MECHANICAL VENTILATION IMPROVEMENTS (PHASE 2) TO NORTHOLT, KENLEY, STELLAR HOUSE & KENNETH ROBBINS HOUSE**

As per item 103.

**112. LEASING OF THE GROUND FLOOR AT 54 MUSWELL HILL - MUSWELL HILL HEALTH CENTRE**

As per the exempt minutes and item 104.

**113. EXEMPT MINUTES**

**RESOLVED**

To agree the exempt minutes of the meeting held on the 11<sup>th</sup> of September 2018.

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

None.

CHAIR: Councillor Joseph Ejiofor

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....