

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY, 9TH JULY, 2019, 6.30pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Joseph Ejiofor (Chair), Zena Brabazon (Vice-Chair), Charles Adje, Kaushika Amin, Mark Blake, Gideon Bull, Seema Chandwani, Kirsten Hearn, Emine Ibrahim and Sarah James

Also Present Councillors: das Neves, Barnes, Davies, Tucker, Gordon, Rice and Demir.

171. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

172. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

173. URGENT BUSINESS

The Leader advised the meeting that there were no new items of urgent business. However, there was an item of late business to consider relating to item 14, the budget report and MTFs update, which he had accepted as urgent business. The reasons were set out in the published supplementary pack and tabled papers. In summary, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had held a special meeting on the 4th of July to consider and comment on this report and in particular the invest to save proposals for Children's services. This was after the publication of the Cabinet agenda and therefore these comments could not be available at the time of publication. They had now been compiled and were included as an addendum to be considered with the report.

There was also a late item of business to consider with item 18.

This report was considered by the Regulatory Committee on 1 July 2019, after publication of the Cabinet agenda for 9 July 2019 and their comments and resolutions were included in the supplementary pack.

It was noted that the terms of reference for Regulatory Committee, set out in Part three section B - of the Council Constitution, required the Cabinet to consider informal recommendations on local development documents, development plan documents, the local development framework and any other planning policy matter.

174. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declaration of interest put forward at this point of the meeting.

175. 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.

176. MINUTES

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 18th of June 2019 were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

177. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

A deputation had been received from the Haringey Friends of Parks Forum in relation to item 9 of the Agenda – the Borough Plan – and in relation to the objective of protecting and improving parks, open spaces and green space, as well as promoting community use.

Mr Dave Morris, Chair of Haringey Friends of Parks Forum, was invited by the Leader to put forward his deputation to Cabinet.

Mr Morris introduced the Cabinet to the deputation pack of documents. Mr Morris began his representations by highlighting that the Forum were the Council's key partner in the running of the Borough's green spaces. The Forum represented 45 or more Local Friends of Parks Groups and spoke for park users and local communities. Mr Morris highlighted that the Forum raised millions of pounds for improvements and annually added thousands of hours of volunteering to improve parks.

Mr Morris emphasised that green spaces were unique resources for all ages and sections of communities for a whole range of benefits, which were either statutory outcomes the Council were trying to achieve or the Council policy commitments. Mr Morris noted that the Forum wanted all the Council departments to recognise the central importance of parks for all of the outcomes that they aimed to achieve.

Mr Morris pointed out that there was a growing underfunding and understaffing crisis in the Parks Service, which emanated since budgets were cut by 50% in 2011. Mr Morris noted that the situation was deteriorating year on year and referred to the Evidence Sources in bullet points within the deputation pack of documents. Mr Morris argued that failure to reverse the underfunding would lead to growing anti-social

behaviour, collapse in usage, and a colossal effort and huge costs at a later stage to try to restore the situation.

Mr Morris asserted that solutions that been identified and put forward that the Forum called for:

- The Cabinet to implement in full the 2018 recommendations of the Council's Scrutiny Committee on Parks, many of which had been agreed or partially agreed by the Cabinet
- The Cabinet to implement its manifesto commitments to invest more in parks; and
- Adequate funding levels to be provided to the Parks Service so they could achieve those commitments.

Mr Morris mentioned that the Cabinet had agreed in principle to protect all of Haringey's parks 'in perpetuity' and increase the number of those reaching Green Flag standard; however, inappropriate uses of parks would compromise and undermine such aims, such as organising or allowing huge disruptive and controversial commercial events which would cause detriment and exclude local residents from their park during the Summer.

Mr Morris noted that the most important part of the proposal was that the Forum called for the Cabinet to initiate a full investigation into how the Parks Service could get access to appropriate sources of funding from a whole range of sources from planning gain (CIL and s106), Transport for London travel budgets, public health, other departments, capital pots, and appropriate outside sources. Mr Morris provided an example of the public health budget of £28 million a year to promote public health, and suggested that the Council could fund out of the public health budget for 30 health rangers that could work in the parks, which would double the ground staff for only a million pounds a year out of that 28 million. Mr Morris concluded his deputation by asking Cabinet to convene an investigation of a whole range of funding sources that could stave off the gradual collapse of the Parks Service.

Following the deputation, the Leader invited Cabinet Members to ask questions.

Cllr Bull queried whether there had been any conversations with Friends of Parks at other local authorities that were facing a similar situation as the Council, and whether there was a Friends of Parks Group that covered North London that would allow cross borough conversations, whereby ideas could be tapped into. In response Mr Morris noted that there was a national movement of 7000 Friends of Parks Group. Mr Morris mentioned that he had an understanding of what was going on in the country as he was Chair of the National Federation of Parks and Greenspaces, which represented the Friends of Parks groups. Mr Morris acknowledged that there was a general problem of massive cuts to public services, and that the Forum had not called for money to be taken out of other services. Mr Morris noted that parks needed to be managed properly as they provide an essential service. Mr Morris further explained that money needed to be invested into the Parks Service to ensure the statutory outcomes of other services could be achieved. Mr Morris requested that the Cabinet

initiate action immediately to stave off the growing crisis. Mr Morris pointed out that last summer the litter became an unmanageable problem and since then the Council lost accreditation for Green Flags in a number of cases. Mr Morris mentioned further that the Green Flag judgment of the Council's Green Flag parks was that they were struggling to achieve minimum standards that every park should achieve for its local community. Mr Morris hoped that the Cabinet took this issue very seriously and highlighted that the Forum proposed a sensible and urgent course of action.

Cllr Brabazon thanked Mr Morris for the deputation and praised the work of Friends of Parks. Cllr Brabazon then referred to page 3 of the Scrutiny report in the deputation pack, which referenced match funding, and queried whether the Forum had any meetings where match funding ideas had been put forward, and whether the Forum had any discussions with Officers about lottery bids or other bids where match funding would apply. In response Mr Morris explained that match funding, outside sources of funding or internal sources of funding from other departments were essential to the survival of the Parks Service. Mr Morris highlighted that Friends Groups were partners in lottery bids, but those were additional projects and didn't deal with the fundamental ongoing revenue needed to manage parks in the Borough. Mr Morris explained that the Mayor of London's policy promoted healthy and safe routes for walking and cycling, and parks were the perfect source. Mr Morris further explained that as the Parks Service had no budget to maintain its paths effectively, the Transport for London budgets could be channelled in that direction, as well as the Community Interest Levy from planning gain, s106, public health, and other capital pots. Mr Morris requested Cabinet to urgently convene an immediate investigation into all the pots, some of which could be used to stave off the immediate crisis and some that could be discussed as part of a long term strategy, which Mr Morris noted was being done in partnership with Council Parks officers.

Cllr Amin asked about lobbying for more funding for parks and queried what the Forum had done to ensure better funding from Central Government. In response Mr Morris highlighted that all levels of government needed to take the issue seriously. Mr Morris noted that every Council in the country needed to be able to grapple with this from within their budgetary means and areas of influence. Mr Morris asserted that there needed to be pressure on the Government and highlighted that there was a concerted lobbying effort. Mr Morris noted the Cabinet could sign the Charter for Parks, which 24 significant national organisations had already signed. Mr Morris explained that the Charter called for parks to be a properly funded statutory service throughout the country, which would help put pressure on the Government to release more funds to the public services and ring fence funding for parks.

The Leader noted that parks were a non-statutory service, and that a number of Councils were deprioritising parks and some Councils made their parks self-financing, whilst Haringey Council had been committed to putting some money into parks. The Leader queried how the Forum felt the Council should prioritise parks in a time of difficult budget, and whether it would be unreasonable for Councils to sought to try to make parks pay for themselves. In response Mr Morris noted that parks could not pay for themselves. Mr Morris highlighted that the point was not to be in competition with other essential services, but to work together to get the maximum benefits. Mr Morris

acknowledged that parks were not designated as a statutory service but reiterated that parks provided all kinds of statutory outcomes in terms of health and well-being, transport routes, social cohesion and crime reduction. Mr Morris noted that there was no ring fence funding for parks to ensure it could fulfil its mandate to achieve those outcomes. Mr Morris mentioned that it was down to Cabinet to make sure that parks, as a non-statutory service, were provided the funding it required to deliver the statutory outcomes and the Council policy commitments that the Cabinet had made.

The Leader invited the Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability to respond to the deputation.

The Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability thanked Mr Morris for the deputation. In response to the representations, she made the following points:

- The Council were committed to maintaining a range of good and excellent parks. The Cabinet Member noted that since the issues the Council faced last year with the parks the Council had worked very hard to bring the parks to a good standard. The Cabinet Member was hopeful that the results of the examination by Keep Britain Tidy would be positive.
- In terms of funding, the Cabinet Member noted that the Council had struggled to maintain parks funding since 2011 when the Council faced extraordinary cuts, which included cuts to the parks budget. Last year the Cabinet Member managed to protect the budget, but the Cabinet Member pointed out that this would be extremely difficult due to cuts of £18 million. The Cabinet Member asserted that the Council would need to develop a strategy on how the Council could externally fund the Council's parks as much as it could. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that the challenge would be that the Council would have to give something back when external funding is sought, for example the Transport for London funding for cycling and walking routes through parks would have an implication for the nature of the parks in themselves. In consideration of the challenges, the Cabinet Member was committed to working with officers to look at what could be found by way of funding. The Cabinet Member agreed that there were some streams the Council could look into further. The Cabinet Member noted that the Council had a capital funding budget of about £12million this year, which the Council were developing a work programme for in consultation with Friends of the Parks, as well as looking at other needs, such as things that needed repairing. The Cabinet Member asserted that the Council were aware of the importance of parks as well as dealing with climate change. The Cabinet Member believed that there were many ways to further look at bringing more funding for parks. The Cabinet Member pointed out that it was very difficult to defend parks when there were cuts to social care for individuals. The Cabinet Member concluded that other funding streams would be looked into with officers to determine where the Council could maximise in getting in funding into the Council's park, but the Cabinet Member acknowledged that this would not be easy.

The Leader thanked the Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability for her response , and thanked Mr Morris for the deputation.

178. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - FIRE SAFETY SCRUTINY REVIEW

The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny, Cllr das Neves, introduced the Scrutiny Review on Fire Safety which had been initiated early last year in the aftermath of Grenfell as it was felt important to understand what was taking place in the borough on fire safety in blocks. Many local authorities have high rise blocks and there was understandable serious concern that many of the issues that led to the tragedy might not be unique to Grenfell Tower. The Committee was pleased to hear about the level of response from Haringey to Grenfell, particularly by Homes for Haringey. The review nevertheless performed the important function of closely examining the response as well as looking how other local authorities had responded for the purpose of learning. It identified a number of areas where it felt that additional action was necessary or improvements required

The Committee had met with residents, officers , Homes for Haringey staff, technical experts, other borough officers which had completed similar reviews and considered sources on fire safety, providing a varied evidential base to enable key recommendations to be compiled,

The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny further advised that the Scrutiny Review performed an important function on how the Council should respond to Grenfell and continued to outline the themes underpinning the recommendations:

Communication was identified as vitally important, especially residents knowing what to do when a fire takes place and was vital for decreasing the risks. The Committee also focused on what the Council provides in the environment to mitigate fire risk. It was noted that there was a significant proportion of leasehold properties outside of the realm of communication lines with the Council and this was a challenge in respect of mitigating risks . The key mechanism was enabling reporting on a timely manner essential to ensuring residents were safe.

The 'stay put' policy was discussed at length by the Committee and compartmentalisation was considered to be useful mechanism. However, if breached then this can make it no longer valid. There was discussions about how to deal with evaluating breached compartmentalisation.

In relation to the fitting of sprinklers, the Committee did not draw a final standpoint on this, noting that this was an interim Scrutiny report published prior to the Hackitt review can give views on this .It was likely to be an issue that was covered in either the implementation plans for the Hackitt review or when the Public Inquiry was completed. Therefore, it was probably be best to return to this matter at the appropriate time. There would likely be costs associated with any such recommendation for Councils.

The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny felt strongly that residents were at the heart of fire safety and should be able to come forward to the Council when they have concerns. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee would be returning to this matter when the Hackitt review has reported. The matters highlighted would also be further pursued by the Housing Scrutiny Panel who would keep a rolling brief on this matter.

The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny concluded her presentation and hoped that the Scrutiny review stimulated a good response.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal responded to the review findings, welcoming the input of Scrutiny in developing this policy. She further reflected that 2 years had passed since the tragedy at Grenfell and the Council's thoughts were with the families and residents affected by this tragedy which had further shook all local authorities' consideration of housing issues. She felt that it was right to put the safety of residents first and a critical part of the Borough plan was to drive up quality of housing.

The fire at a recent block in Barking demonstrated that local authorities should continually be considering how buildings are built and the Cabinet Member looked forward to working with the Scrutiny colleagues as the Council moved to the next stage of the report when the Implications of the Hackitt review were fully considered by the Council.

The Cabinet Member was impressed with the recommendations which were all marked for agreement, apart from the recommendation concerning ensuring that residential care homes were complying with relevant statutory guidance and making fire safety information available to residents and visitors. This was partially agreed as the care quality commission has a role to play in this. In relation to the areas of Council responsibility, the Commissioning Unit would identify any shortcomings in the fire safety information available to residents and visitors and confirm whether care homes were compliant.

In response to questions from Councillor, Brabazon, Barnes and Amin, the following information was provided by Cllr das Neves and Cllr Ibrahim:

- In relation to the timing of implementing clearer roles and responsibilities on the design, this was a question of 'how' this can be implemented and related to the structures being in place to allow this. Further information was included on page 69 of the attached report. Assurance was provided that the Council will implement the actions outlined before this becomes an issue and will not wait.
- In relation to the timescale for establishing the working group to consider how to most effectively address the shortage of professional and technical staff within the Council through developing pathways to train and develop new staff as well as incentives to attract suitable individuals, the Cabinet Member would follow this up and add a date.
- Noted the high number of Housing Association blocks in the borough and the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny agreed to consider including at least a large

Housing association and a small Housing Association block in the next stage of the review as a case study.

- Following a recent assessment of some buildings, the security connected with compartmentalisation did become an issue. This was where residents are completing interior works themselves or fitting grills to doors and windows. Homes for Haringey were seeking a further wider understanding of the level of the impact of these individual works across the board and making sure residents can escape safely should there be a need to.

RESOLVED

1. To consider the Overview and Scrutiny Review of Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks (attached as Appendix 1).
2. To agree the responses to the Overview and Scrutiny report recommendations (attached as Appendix 2).

Reasons for decision

On 25 March 2019, Overview and Scrutiny Committee approved the Scrutiny Panel Review of fire safety in high-rise blocks.

In developing its report, the Panel held a number of evidence gathering sessions and took evidence from Council officers as well as a range of experts and local stakeholders. The Panel then made a number of recommendations, which were adopted by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 25 March 2019.

The recommendations made in the report can be used to help guide the ongoing development of fire safety policy for the Council's housing stock, particularly in respect of the 54 high-rise blocks. While the report does not set out a detailed list of explicit objectives to be delivered to a given timescale, many of the recommendations are either currently being incorporated into the Council's approach to fire safety in housing, or will be considered once proposals for implementing the recommendation of the Hackitt review and Grenfell Inquiry, are known. Specific reasons for each recommendation response are given in Appendix 2; the draft responses to recommendations.

Alternative options considered

To refuse to accept the recommendations

This option was rejected because the recommendations are clearly of benefit to residents and will provide helpful guidance in putting in place plans to ensure that Council homes are safe.

179. BOROUGH PLAN 2019-2023 YEAR 1 DELIVERY PLAN

The Leader introduced this report which set out the key aims and delivery plans for year 1 of the Borough Plan. The Leader stated the Borough Plan was challenging but would provide a greater sense of shared purpose and increase the overall success of the borough.

The Leader informed the Borough Plan was the vehicle through which the Council set its strategic vision that would shape the policies and decision-making over the course of the following three years and contained aspirational objectives which covered all aspects of Council services.

The Leader noted the LGA peer review team had praised the ambition of the Council but felt that more success would be achieved by focusing on a smaller number of key objectives.

The Leader sought for a broad conversation on the Borough Plan to be had and informed that various stakeholders within the community would be consulted on its contents, including the voluntary sector.

RESOLVED

1. To note that one the highest priority recommendations from the recent Corporate Peer Challenge carried out in February 2019 by a team of local government peers, and facilitated by the Local Government Association, related to prioritisation within the Borough Plan. The peers suggested that the Council sets out an annual delivery plan for each year of the life of the Borough Plan 2019-23, and that these delivery plans are aligned to the Medium Term Financial Strategy.
2. To approve the year one delivery plans for each Borough Plan priority as set out in appendices 1 to 5, of this report.
3. To note that the delivery plans for year 2 of the Borough Plan will be considered alongside the Medium Term Financial Strategy and Budget reports in February 2020.

Reasons for decision

To agree delivery priorities for the year to provide context for related decisions, including on budget setting, engagement with residents, and management of staff.

Alternative options considered

The alternative options considered by Cabinet in February when considering the adoption of the Borough Plan 2019-23 were

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

It was not considered feasible to pursue option A, as the Council's Corporate Plan ended in 2018, which means a new Plan was needed. The Council is required to agree an overarching strategic document, which sets the parameters in which all other strategies operate. The Borough Plan plays this role, both for the Council and for the wider partnership.

It was not considered appropriate to extend the governance period of the previous Corporate Plan, as this did not reflect the administration's priorities; did not reflect of the strength of partnerships across the borough, which contribute to the delivery of the Plan's outcomes; and did not reflect changes to the political and financial operating context, including at local, regional and national level.

180. LGA CORPORATE PEER CHALLENGE RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS

The Leader introduced this report which sets out the Council's response to the recommendations from the Corporate Peer Challenge carried out in February 2019 by a team of local government peers, and facilitated by the Local Government Association

The Leader noted the Local Government Association (LGA) had been invited earlier in the year to carry out a corporate peer review of the Council. The peer review process was part of an important approach to local government-led improvement and mutual support. This had been an opportunity to establish the current position of the Council and to show how far it had come since the last peer review in 2014. The peer review detailed the various challenges faced by the Council and further advised what it needed to do to ensure it was in the best position to be able to deliver its ambitious plans.

The Leader stated it was important to celebrate the positive role that Councillors, staff, partners and residents played in making Haringey such a positive place to live and work. The Leader was mindful of the key challenges set out in the report and stated the Council had taken active steps to address its financial position and the delivery of the borough plan objectives.

The Leader closed by welcoming the findings set out in the report and thanked the peer review team for their hard work and honest feedback. The Leader noted the Council was committed to addressing issues raised in the report.

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

- The creation of the Head of the Leaders Office was not a new role but rather the renaming of a former role. The previous holder of the post had left the Council and the role had since been advertised with a re-profiled job descriptor and job title.
- Assured that the Council sought to be aware of all challenges it might face in the future as early as possible. However, it was difficult to fully prepare for services where demand was unpredictable. The Council had a statutory duty to provide for certain services and the peer review would help the Council prioritise its budget accordingly to ensure that it was able to meet its obligations. This was not a unique situation to Haringey Council and other

Councils faced the additional pressures of providing for unpredictable demand-based services.

RESOLVED

1. To note that the highest priority recommendation put forward by the peers related to the budget. The report recommends that the Council agrees “a sustainable Medium-Term Financial Strategy by October 2019 with a clear decision-making pathway.” Progress on this is the subject of a report elsewhere on this Cabinet agenda, titled “Budget report and MTFS update”.
2. To note that the second highest priority recommendation related to prioritisation within the Borough Plan, with a suggestion that the Council sets out an annual delivery plan for each year of the life of the Borough Plan 2019-23, and that these delivery plans are aligned to the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The year one delivery plans for each Borough Plan priority are set out in a report elsewhere on this Cabinet agenda, titled “Borough Plan 2019-2023 year 1 delivery plan”.
3. To endorse the action plan in response to the remaining findings of the LGA Corporate Peer Challenge as set out in appendix B.

Reasons for decision

There is no requirement to formally respond to Peer Challenge reports, but it is considered good practice to publish the findings in the form of the LGA’s formal report, and to set out the Council’s plans to respond to any recommendations for improvement.

In addition, the risks of not responding effectively to the LGA’s highest priority recommendations in relation to the budget are very significant. The report states that the Council’s financial position is “very challenging”, and that the “policy ambition of the Council makes this position even more challenging.” There is an urgent need to address the requirement for significant savings in 2020-21. The report states that to facilitate decision-making by Councillors “a clear decision-making pathway through to autumn 2019 is required,” and that, “Failure to take this action would result in the further depletion of reserves and a precarious future for the Council and its services.”

Alternative options considered

The option not to respond to the Peer Challenge with a formal report was considered. The decision has been made that it would be better to publish the report, and the Council’s response to it, so that the Council can be held to account on its improvement plans.

181. COUNCIL OWNED SITES IN WOOD GREEN

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration who set out proposals to make best use of Council owned sites in Wood

Green which were appropriate to facilitate a town strategy in order to develop civic functions, maximise the town centre, deliver new homes and jobs. The Council had been working with residents and businesses to develop a strategic framework for Wood Green through delivery of highly accessible places in Wood Green, the only remaining metropolitan town centre in London.

This was the first key decision on Woods Green, focusing on Council accommodation to enable footfall to the areas in Wood Green and unlock buildings and sites for other uses.

In response to questions from Cllr das Neves and Cllr Barnes, the following information was noted:

- There were a number of pieces of work completed by Officers, reviewing Council buildings in Wood Green, including the Civic centre, George Meehan House and River Park House, concentrating on maximisation. The Civic Centre was now a listed building and limited in its use and information on this was contained at paragraph 6 of the report. The Kingfisher site, in the Cultural centre was further considered for maximisation and the Wood Green library site considered as a main site and as a building for co – location of services. Further background information on this was contained in paragraph 6.
- Haringey was not unique in terms of using buildings, such as libraries, for multiple activities. In the main library, it was hoped that the proposals will enable better acoustic environment. Also locating Council services in close walking proximity had the resident in mind and provided improved provision of services in one area.
- In relation to focusing business locations on Station Road rather than the library site, this approach was taken further to considering which sites have the capacity and their attractiveness to potential businesses. There were strong commercial values associated with this approach and this was also based on professional advice.

RESOLVED

1. To agree to the principle of consolidating Council accommodation in Council owned sites in Wood Green to a reduced number of sites to deliver a better and more accessible service, realise cost savings, and provide a more effective working environment for staff, while also releasing land for other uses which will benefit the community and the town centre.
2. To note the results of the Council Accommodation Site Appraisal set out in section 4 and agree that further work should proceed on two options only: (1) the delivery of the Council Accommodation entirely on the Library site and (2) a split site solution which would include both the Library site and the Civic Centre site, recognising that alternative land use options for the remaining sites will also be developed.

3. To note that the next stage will involve engagement with stakeholders including Members, staff and service users bringing together existing workstreams, including the 'New Ways of Working' programme, to develop a vision and objectives for how the Council should deliver services in the future.
4. To note the potential opportunity to co-locate a Leisure Centre, which would include a swimming pool, with new Council Accommodation, and which could provide a wide range of benefits for the community, Council employees and partner agencies, and agree to the next stage of work to include further analysis of this opportunity.

Reasons for decision

Principle of consolidating Council owned sites

There is a clear business need for consolidating Council owned sites in Wood Green. Haringey Council owns nine buildings in Wood Green totalling more than 45,000m² (GIA), and currently occupies eight of those buildings for its own accommodation. The area being used for Council accommodation purposes far exceeds the amount, which should be required by modern office standards.

There are significant operational costs associated with having Council accommodation in eight separate buildings. By consolidating the Council accommodation located in these sites, the Council has the potential to reduce office costs and release land, which can be used to deliver new community infrastructure, housing and employment on Council, owned sites as set out in the Borough Plan, and/or provide the Council with sources of capital and revenue funding.

The current office buildings along Station Road, at the Library Site and the Civic Centre are no longer fit for purpose or are in poor condition; they are inaccessible to some members of the public and need significant investment to improve health & safety, environmental and energy performance. Face to face, services to customers are provided over different buildings and none is particularly well designed, making for fragmented services and an unsatisfactory customer experience.

As such, the current offices do not support a modern working environment that promotes flexible workstyles, space for collaboration between Council staff, residents and partners or high levels of productivity. The consolidation of Council owned sites is an opportunity to enable all services to become fully accessible and create modern and fit-for-purpose facilities for staff, Members, customers, clients, and visitors. This optimal use of resources will both reduce spending on Council accommodation and improve efficiency in delivering services resulting in improved value for money for the Council.

Council Accommodation Site Appraisal

The principle of consolidating Council owned sites in Wood Green to save on the Council's revenue costs, reduce the amount of space the Council occupies, and its carbon footprint was first presented to Cabinet in October 2016.

The existing Council accommodation was considered to be deteriorating, expensive to run and no longer fit for purpose and as no one building was of sufficient size to accommodate the requirements of the Council in the future the aim was to have one main Council office for the majority of staff to act as a focal point for the public and Council facilities.

The vision was to create a new Council Accommodation building with a variety of modern, fit for purpose and cost-effective workspaces and facilities to enable staff to work more effectively, flexibly and collaboratively with colleagues and partners.

Under the previous administration, the intention was to rationalise the existing office estate from (then) 12 sites to two sites; this included a proposal to vacate the Civic Centre. This vision was partially realised through the refurbishment of George Meehan House (formerly Woodside House) which now accommodates the Council's ceremonial and registrar functions.

The Borough Plan sets out a commitment to use Council land and assets to promote improved outcomes for residents and with this commitment, combined with Historic England's decision to Grade II list the Civic Centre, the Council has taken a step back from previous proposals to consider all its Wood Green assets to identify the best location for the new Council Accommodation.

A Council Accommodation Site Appraisal has been carried out which considers the suitability of four sites in Wood Green in terms of their capacity to accommodate all the Council functions, financial feasibility and against a set of qualitative criteria relating to deliverability, accessibility and contribution to the town centre.

The option, which scored the overall highest, was the one, which puts all Council accommodation on the Library Site. The second highest scoring option was a 'split site' solution using the Library Site and the Civic Centre site. The recommendation to Cabinet is that further feasibility work is carried out on these two options only; further separate studies will also be carried out to establish the best strategy for the remaining sites.

New Ways of Working (NWoW) Transformation Programme

In October 2016 Cabinet approved funding to develop The Future Ways of Working Programme with delivery streams 'People', 'Process', 'Place' and 'Technology' to support the delivery of the Corporate Plan and the Council of the Future, providing a skilled, agile workforce, aligned to the Council's values. The programme vision was that *"Our People will be empowered to work from anywhere with streamlined Processes, improved Technology and a Place to collaborate with colleagues and partners in order to deliver improved, more responsive and high-quality services."*

Currently, The Future Ways of Working Programme, now the New Ways of Working Programme, is one of several transformation programmes being delivered across the Council which together aim to enable a more flexible and effective approach to how staff deliver services, where they deliver them from and to ensure that the new Council Accommodation is efficient, fit for purpose and aligned to the future size of the Council.

Part of the current stage of the NWOw programme includes the detailed design and initiation of a series of Pilot Projects which will take place with full engagement with stakeholder groups to understand how the programme can deliver fit for purpose and cost-effective workspaces that enable staff to work more effectively, flexibly and collaboratively with colleagues and partners.

The next stage will bring together existing workstreams, including the NWOw transformation programme and will involve engagement with Members, staff and service users to develop the vision and objectives in line with the new Borough Plan priorities.

Leisure Centre

The delivery of a new leisure centre with a 25-metre main pool and smaller teaching pool is the top strategic priority of Haringey's 'Indoor Sports Facility Strategy', which is supported and signed off by Sport England and Swim England and is also due to be formally adopted by Cabinet this month.

A well-located Leisure Centre in the heart of Wood Green will undoubtedly attract previously inactive and partially active local adults and children to adopt a more physically active lifestyle. This will lead to improvements in health and wellbeing that in turn will deliver much social and economic benefit.

In addition to the health and social value benefits, a leisure centre will also drive footfall into Wood Green, with the visitor numbers to a leisure centre, based at the library site, estimated at 638,000 per annum. Improving the leisure offer in the town centre will help to revitalise the town centre and improve its competitiveness and economic growth prospects.

The Library site has been identified as both the best location for the Council Accommodation (through the Council Accommodation Site Appraisal) and the Leisure Centre (through a separate Leisure Centre Study) and so the opportunity to co locate these two facilities has been considered and should be explored further in the next feasibility stage.

Alternative options considered

All options have been set against a "do nothing" option which is the cost that the Council currently incurs running the eight buildings. These costs include all management, maintenance, utilities, rates and other costs in occupying these buildings including a provision for major cyclical repairs such as lifts / roofs etc.

Remaining in current buildings and not investing in Council owned sites in Wood Green would be detrimental to Wood Green town centre. The poor quality of the existing buildings is impacting on the wellbeing and productivity of our workforce, as well as the Civic pride in the borough. Buildings on Station Road currently provide minimal contribution to the town centre at ground floor level, and by occupying key employment sites the Council is actively restricting economic growth.

A range of redevelopment options have been explored through several studies and they have been assessed against quantitative and qualitative criteria. As well as considering redevelopment, officers have considered the option to stay in the existing buildings and options to reuse existing buildings through a programme of refurbishment.

The Council Accommodation Site Appraisal scoring matrix methodology is described in paras 6.10 – 6.35.

The option of remaining in River Park House has been considered through the financial feasibility studies which include refurbishment scenarios. River Park House was acquired from BT, and was not designed to house the current number of occupants, or to cope with the range of visitors that a Council may receive. In particular, the main entrance is not fit for purpose, and cannot be redesigned except at great cost. Because of its poor design it causes an unwelcoming experience for guests and creates security problems for building users.

The option of redeveloping the River Park House site to build new Council accommodation has not been considered further because this site is one of the most accessible sites in the borough and should new office space be built on this site it has the potential to attract major new employers, it is not considered to be the best use of the land to build new offices for the Council on this site.

The option to secure a new Leisure Centre on an alternative site not in the Council's ownership was considered in the Leisure Centre Feasibility which has identified that the costs of either acquiring a site from a third party or funding the annual costs of leasing a site would create an additional financially unsustainable cost over and above the financing of a new centre.

182. RESULTS OF THE NON-STATUTORY CONSULTATION ON THE OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF STAMFORD HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL AND ITS POSSIBLE AMALGAMATION WITH TIVERTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced the report which presented the outcomes of the preliminary stakeholder consultation (prestatutory) relating to the proposal to establish a new primary school through the amalgamation of Stamford Hill and Tiverton Primary schools from September 2020.

The Cabinet Member informed that in March 2019, a report was brought to Cabinet setting out the options for Stamford Hill Primary School. Approval was given from Cabinet to commence a pre-statutory consultation. This report presented the results of that pre-statutory consultation. It proposed that the school was amalgamated with Tiverton Primary School. The consultation lasted for 6 weeks and received 52 responses with the governors of both schools having been consulted extensively.

The Cabinet Member noted that there were issues regarding the long-term sustainability of both Stamford Hill Primary School and, to a lesser extent, Tiverton Primary School, with both schools having seen a falling number of admissions.

This report sought for approval to proceed to commence a six-week statutory consultation on the proposal to close Stamford Hill Primary School with the displaced pupils being accommodated by Tiverton Primary School from September 2020. The Cabinet Member informed that this was the preferred option and that the amalgamation would have the best long-term results.

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

- Regarding the future usage of the Stamford Hill Primary School building, the Cabinet Member noted that a report which detailed the options available would be presented to Cabinet at the appropriate time. The Cabinet Member stated it was anticipated the building would continue to be used for educational purposes.
- Regarding the leadership structure of the proposed amalgamated Tiverton Primary School, the Cabinet Member confirmed that there would be an amalgamated leadership with one head teacher but that the further leadership structure was still being discussed.

RESOLVED

1. To consider the outcome of the pre-statutory consultation on the proposals to close Stamford Hill Primary School with the displaced pupils being accommodated by Tiverton Primary School as set out in Section 6 of the Report; and
2. To agree to proceed to commence a six-week statutory consultation on the proposal to close Stamford Hill Primary School with the displaced pupils being accommodated by Tiverton Primary School from September 2020.

Alternative options considered

A number of alternative options were presented to local stakeholders as part of the pre-statutory consultation. Stakeholders were also informed of the reasons why these options were less desirable than the Council's preferred option of an amalgamation:

- A. Keeping Stamford Hill open: This option does not provide a long-term sustainable solution to falling local demand and leaves other local schools vulnerable because demand for school places are falling more widely in the locality.
- B. Federation: Federation is an option that focuses on improving educational delivery by allowing the governing body to use budget, resources and staff across a federation to improve the educational outcomes for all pupils. This option would need another school to federate with Stamford Hill Primary. Also, under a federation, schools would remain as separate organisations and this would not address the decline in numbers on roll at Stamford Hill (and other local schools) or the financial challenges that other schools are facing. This option is therefore less desirable than amalgamation.

- C. Amalgamation with split site: This would involve Tiverton Primary School having two permanent sites and would not be desirable because it would involve the overheads of permanently running two sites in a context of falling demand for school places.
- D. Closure of Stamford Hill Primary with pupils moving to other local schools (including Tiverton Primary): This would involve closing Stamford Hill Primary School and giving parent/carers the opportunity to apply for a school place at any other Haringey primary school (including Tiverton) and in other local authorities. This option provides a less outcome focused solution to those parents with children currently at Stamford Hill Primary and doesn't provide a mechanism for ensuring cohorts of children are, as far as reasonably possible, kept together, which is an outcome some parents expressed as part of the pre-statutory consultation.

Local stakeholders were asked as part of the non-statutory consultation survey what their preferred option would be if they were not in favour of the proposal of an amalgamation. The consultation survey and the FAQ document containing the above alternative options are attached as an Appendix to this report.

183. OSBORNE GROVE NURSING HOME FEASIBILITY STUDY

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced the report which set out the outcome of the Feasibility Study, carried out to assess the future development of Osborne Grove Nursing Home and seeking agreement to Option 4 as the preferred option of the Feasibility Study. This option was to demolish the current building and rebuild a 70 bed nursing provision including the clinic site, ensuring that the use of the site overall was maximised.

The Cabinet Member reported on the significant consultation undertaken on the proposals with the co-production group which included key stakeholders such as the families of residents at Osborne Grove, trade unions, staff and public health partners. The Cabinet Member was pleased to recommend option 4 for approval.

There were questions from Councillors Barnes and das Neves, and the following information was noted:

- There would be a further report to Cabinet in September on proposals for consultation to close the Home (for the purpose of the development and other reasons) and relocate existing residents to suitable alternative accommodation that will meet their needs and promote their wellbeing. As part of this process, residents and families would be consulted and assurance provided that no moves would be taken forward hastily.
- In relation to including sprinklers in the design of the new build, it was noted that the Council were not excluding this but exploring what this would mean and keeping this option open.
- In noting that the current care home premises was not suitable for nursing care and that the original design was for respite care, the feasibility study was

welcomed and the depth and seriousness of the work commended. The Cabinet Member agreed that it was important to future proof any new design according to the services needed.

- The Cabinet Member re-iterated that the Council would be accommodating the existing residents and there would be careful risk assessments and mitigations around the move. The wishes of existing residents and their families would be covered in consultation process. It was also noted that the families of the residents have been participating in co-design group and have approved the option 4.
- Assurance was further provided that with the changing financial climate in local government funding, the site was preserved for nursing home use and there were mitigations in place to counter any change of use. The Cabinet Member emphasised that this was a significant investment in public services and the capital cost was reflected in the report. It was hoped that the seriousness of the intent to provide nursing care and nursing beds was recognised. The site provided an opportunity for greater number of nursing beds to be available to the borough for people who need this in the future. This was a public partnership and the Council would look at the delivery options with the support of the NHS for the clinical expertise to ensure this facility was provided.

RESOLVED

1. To note the outcome of the Feasibility Study carried out with regard to the future development of Osborne Grove Nursing Home;
2. To agree to endorse Option 4 as the preferred option of the Feasibility Study: that is, to demolish the current building and rebuild a 70 bed nursing provision including the clinic site, ensuring that the use of the site overall is maximised;
3. To note that Option 4 allows for a number of uses, identified as examples in s. 6.2.8, aligned to the delivery of nursing care for older people to be accommodated on the site for which further design work is needed and delegate the oversight of this work to the Assistant Director of Commissioning in consultation with the Lead Member for Adults and Health;
4. To note that none of the future development Options including the preferred Option 4 can be safely commenced with the current residents in situ;
5. To note that a further report will be presented to Cabinet in September 2019 on proposals for consultation to close the Home (for the purpose of the development and other reasons) and relocate existing residents to suitable alternative accommodation that will meet their needs and promote their wellbeing;

6. To continue to support the active engagement of a range of stakeholders including the OGNH Co-Design Steering Group, partners, nursing care providers and officers;
7. To note the ongoing work by officers with partners in the NHS, with the care sector and with neighbouring local authorities to develop a sustainable partnership approach to future delivery of care at Osborne Grove.

Reasons for decision

The detailed Feasibility Study, concluded on 31st May 2019, demonstrates that this land offers significant opportunity for development, increasing provision to a 70-bedded nursing unit. The feasibility study provides the Council four potential development options for the future of the site at Osborne Grove.

Further reviews of activity and demand for nursing care in Haringey and across North Central London have restated the continued need for increased nursing bed capacity in the area. The site, owned by the Council, offers considerable potential for expansion of nursing care capacity which would help to meet the increased demand for nursing care in the borough.

The proposed approach aims to develop a high quality provision to improve outcomes for residents through a model of nursing care which is responsive to need. The existing site is demonstrably not fit for purpose with a number of design issues making the provision of high quality care particularly challenging for an increasingly frail resident population. The approach to quality will be developed to better address future demand, whilst also mitigating the quality of care issues that led to the previous decision to close the home under current management by the local authority.

The feasibility study, as requested in the brief, includes a plan demonstrating how the current residents (now two in number) could be rehoused on site during the construction by phasing the redevelopment. However, the design team have identified that it would not be advisable for the residents to remain on site during the development given the levels of disturbance, including noise and dust, that demolition and subsequent construction would inevitably have, particularly on vulnerable residents who have significant health needs.

Alternative options considered

The option to close the Home and not to revisit an options appraisal for future use of the site was identified but discarded early on as the Home is an asset of great value to local residents and to the Council.

A detailed feasibility study was considered to be the most effective way to explore all viable options for the site. The alternative options are explored in detail in the Feasibility Study and in this report, which now seeks Cabinet approval to implement the preferred design option.

The option to retain a 32 bed dual registration residential/nursing home on the site was considered but rejected, primarily because it would not increase the registered

nursing capacity within the borough and because it would not address a number of fundamental design issues with the current building which prevent it functioning effectively as a nursing home and which could not be fully addressed due to structural limitations of the building.

184. BUDGET REPORT & MTFS UPDATE

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced this report which provided:

- an update on the impact of the provisional General Fund (GF) 2018/19 outturn on Council finances (section 7)
- a summary of the 2019/20 budget position at period 2 (May) including delivery of agreed savings (section 8)
- an update on local changes to the MTFS assumptions outlined in the February report including an update on the National economic picture and local authority funding (section 9)
- an update on progress with the “live budgeting” agenda, the business planning process to deliver a balanced 2020/21 budget and refreshed MTFS. It provided detail of the proposed Invest to Save Programme in Children’s Services and also sets out further budget changes now proposed to be incorporated into the future MTFS (2020-2025) (section 10).

The Cabinet Member detailed the report as set at pages 301-315 and highlighted sections 9.2, 9.5, 9.6, 9.8, 9.10, 10.8, 11 and 12 of the report.

The Cabinet Member noted the positive in-year position currently forecast was better than at the same time last year which reflected the impact of the budget realignments undertaken as part of the 2019/20 budget build.

The Cabinet Member welcomed the progress and ambition that Children’s services were showing in bringing forward a suite of Invest to save proposals which would have a positive impact on delivering the MTFS as well as beneficial outcomes for children and young people in the Borough, in line with the agreed Borough Plan objectives.

The Cabinet Member noted that regarding the Spending Review 2019, this was anticipated to take place in summer 2019 but it was now expected this would not be carried out. This meant that the most likely scenario was that the 2019/20 Local Government funding position would be used as the basis for a shorter-term settlement for 2020/21 at least and potentially for 2021/22.

The Leader highlighted section 11 of the report which stated adherence to strong and effective financial management will enable the Council deliver its stated objectives and priorities.

In response to questions from Councillors Barnes, the following information was noted:

- Regarding details of the Alexandra Palace & Park Trust (APPCT) dispute, the Cabinet Member stated this was exempt information and could not be made public.

- Regarding the decrease in funding to Alexandra Palace & Park Trust (APPCT), discussions were still being had between Officers and the Trust staff over the effects this would have.

Cllr das Neves was next invited to introduce the addendum which included the Overview and Scrutiny (OSC) Comments and recommendations on the Children's invest to save items. Cllr das Neves highlighted the following

- Grateful to officers within the Children's services for looking to identify savings through invest to save and that it was clear officers were working hard to find ways balance the budget. The officers were also looking to invest in staff and their training, the quality of the services and, in some case, bringing services back in house to try and provide them in a more efficient way.
- As these were new proposals, it was important that clear review points and targets be reviewed by the Children's Scrutiny Panel moving forward.
- Regarding investing in foster carers and, specifically around housing, the OSC recommended that careful consideration be given as to whether these would be a worthwhile usage of public funds and that the adequate legal processes be in place to protect the public purse.
- Regarding the family centre, the OSC welcomed bringing a service in house and the investment in staff. However, it felt there was the potential for the service to fail if appropriate quality was not maintained. Therefore, Cabinet must assure itself that the processes were in place to ensure that a quality service was being delivered.
- Regarding the edge of care service, there was concern that based on the proposal, some recipients of that service might feel they are being left out. The OSC was reassured this would not be the case but felt that Cabinet should reassure itself that there was an offer that covered that transition period once individuals came out of that service.
- There were items the OSC had concerns about and did not feel it had adequate information available to make recommendations on. This included the pause programme. There were questions if that programme would achieve its desired outcome for individuals and also questions around the ethics of the programme.
- Regarding SEND and transport, the Committee felt strongly that the voice of users should be at the heart of that service and that it should be co-designed, where possible. The Overview and scrutiny Committee had concerns around the outsourcing of that contract. It sought for Cabinet to reassure itself that outsourcing was the only feasible option available.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families responded to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommendations. The Cabinet Member firstly welcomed the recommendations and highlighted the following:

- The Cabinet Member praised the process of the OSC review.
- The Children's services were the first to put forward invest to save bids.
- Regarding the family centre, this was not a new model. It was a well - established model for dealing with mothers whose children were likely to be taken into care if there was not a process of intervention. Care proceedings were expensive and this was a model through which the Council attempted to

- avoid costly care proceedings. The project helps to keep children out of care, where possible.
- Regarding the financial investment for foster carers, this would begin with those foster carers who were tenants of homes for Haringey. The Council would therefore be investing in its own properties for foster carers willing to take on more children. Being in foster care and not in external care would save the Council money.
 - The insourcing of certain projects and schemes meant that there would be 27 new roles within the Children's Service.
 - Regarding the Pause programme, the Cabinet Member noted that this was when a woman, who had lost a number of children to care previously, was assisted to ensure that this did not happen with their future children. The Cabinet Member assured that women only entered this programme with informed consent. Through working with those women to change their lives, the Council could prevent children from being taken into care.

Further to considering exempt information at item 28 and noting the comments and recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee,

RESOLVED

1. To note the forecast revenue outturn for the General Fund (GF) at Period 2 (May 2019)
2. To note the forecast delivery of agreed 2019/20 savings at Period 2 (May 2019)
3. To note the updates to the local and national budgetary position
4. To agree the budgetary changes in Section 10.3 to be incorporated into the future MTFs (2020-2025)
5. To approve the revenue budget variations associated with the Children's Services Invest to Save Programme in Paragraph 10.7 and Appendix 3; and
6. To delegate to the Director of Children's Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children & Families future decisions on the Invest to Save Programme (except for SEND Transport) subject to the outcomes of any necessary Equalities Impact Assessment and consultation and any other relevant consideration
7. To note the contractual dispute between the APPCT and a contractor set out in paragraph 8.9 and in the recommendations in part B report.

Reasons for decision

A strong financial management framework, including oversight by Members and senior management, is an essential part of delivering the Council's priorities and statutory duties. The Council has a statutory duty to set a balanced budget each year

and having a clear financial strategy and the maintenance of a medium-term financial plan which is reviewed and updated regularly are critical in delivering this statutory duty. Accordingly, the report proposes changes now to be implemented in year and incorporated into the future MTFS (2020-2025).

Alternative options considered

The Council has a legal responsibility to set a balanced budget and have a medium term financial strategy. Financial planning is a complex process and requires regular review of current and forecast spending and funding assumptions at both local and national level in order to update financial planning models in a timely fashion to ensure budgetary decisions are made with the fullest information available. Accordingly, no other options have been considered.

185. UPDATE ON THE COUNCIL HOUSING DELIVERY PROGRAMME

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report, which provided an update on the Council housing delivery programme since May 2018, including the delivery of new homes funded through the Greater London Authority's (GLA) Building Council Homes for Londoners programme, and progress on sites, which have previously been approved.

The Cabinet Member underlined that investing in Council Homes saved lives and produced safety of tenure in order to enable residents in the borough to thrive. The report provided an update to Council colleagues and residents on the Council's latest position to deliver 1000 homes by the end of this administration.

The Cabinet Member outlined the challenges around land, money, and capacity to deliver on this commitment. She referred to the list of Council owned sites which was the first phase of the Council's direct delivery programme and was pleased to have started meeting with ward Councillors to consult on existing identified sites and to seek information on any site additions to the programme. In relation to money and funding the building of the homes, the huge contribution of the GLA was referenced. The Council was pleased to accept £60m of funding for the housing delivery programme and a further half million has been granted to support increased capacity. This additional funding would help ensure the Council have the right people with a range of expertise to deliver this programme. There was great enthusiasm to deliver this programme, which would be a huge challenge. Although, many other local authorities were in this position.

In response to questions from Councillors Bull, Barnes and Davies, the following was noted:

- Further to setting up meeting with White Hart Lane ward Councillors, there were further ward meetings to be scheduled and opportunities for other ward Councillors to put forward suggested sites for usage. The Cabinet Member welcomed correspondence containing suggestions for sites, keeping in mind that not all suggestions would be taken forward, if they were investigated and found not appropriate to do so. It was noted that there would be a wider consultation on proposed sites and opinions were welcomed.

- With regards to the acquisition of homes from developers for use as Council homes, the Cabinet Member was pleased to have the opportunity made available for private land to be converted to public land and saw municipalisation as a positive outcome. Although, this was not a low cost method, the Council was in a better position to invest in the homes. There was also a clear benchmark followed when the homes were purchased and which would need to pass best value and best consideration tests.
- It was noted that all the Council tenants had been decanted from Tangmere block at Broadwater Farm and the Council were in a negotiation process with the remaining leaseholder.
- It was clarified that there would be wide consultation involving residents as the sites were across the borough and would also include key housing stakeholders. A Communications and Engagement Strategy was being drawn up which will set out how all engagement on the housing delivery programme will be carried out. This will be incorporated into the Development Procedures to ensure that consultation is carried out across all types of housing schemes at the right time and at the correct levels.
- In relation to the capacity of the Council to deliver the programme, the first priority had been to get the project management skills into the team rather than to focus on e.g. architects or other professional skills, which would initially be commissioned from external firms. Currently, there were 18 staff in the housing delivery team and some already had experience of delivering schemes in the housing association sector. Less experienced staff would be learning from experienced members of their team to fulfil this project management roles in the future. It was noted that all local authorities were in the same position in trying to deliver housing programmes and build up expertise and capacity.

RESOLVED

Council housing delivery programme

- a) To note progress to date on the Council housing delivery programme, including the capital and revenue funding, the capacity being built within the Council, the processes and systems being put in place, including those for consultation and engagement and progress to date on the previously approved development sites – as set out in paragraphs 6.1 to 6.36.
- b) To approve the Council entering into a funding agreement with the GLA to access £546,000 revenue funding, which has been allocated to the Council from the GLA's Home Building Capacity Fund – as set out in paragraphs 6.37 to 6.41.
- c) To approve the new sites, as set out in paragraphs 6.42 to 6.49, which have been identified as potentially appropriate for new build development to be brought forward in the Housing Revenue Account, including approval to progress design and consultation work associated with these sites.

Hornsey Town Hall

- a) To approve total project costs and the acquisition of up to 11 affordable homes at the Hornsey Town Hall Development of £2,065,249 - of the total scheme costs, the acquisition will cost £1,890,594; and give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, in consultation with the Director of Finance and after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal to agree the final mix and number of affordable homes, the final heads of terms of the acquisition and the final contract. This is detailed in paragraphs 6.50 to 6.55.

Cranwood

- a) To approve an increase to the total cost of land assembly at Cranwood agreed by Cabinet on 11 September 2018 by up to 10%, to take account of fluctuations in the market since then. The Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, after consultation with the Director of Finance, has been delegated authority to agree the purchase and the terms of the acquisition. This is detailed in paragraph 6.59.

Reasons for decisions

The Council's recently adopted Borough Plan commits to delivering 1,000 Council homes at Council rents by 2022. This report invites Members to note and comment on progress towards meeting this target, both in terms of outputs achieved to date and the capacity and processes being put in place to deliver the programme. It also sets out the key milestones that should be achieved in the coming year towards meeting the 1,000 homes target, including the 500 homes where planning consents are expected to have been achieved and the 345 homes that should have started on site. As such, it provides Members with information to hold the Council to account for this delivery as well as to help shape that delivery.

The GLA's Home Building Capacity Fund will make a valuable contribution to these aims, as this will be used to support the capacity the Council needs to put in place to deliver the 1,000 Council homes. The monies that have been allocated to the Council will fund the revenue costs, which support the housing development process, including the recruitment of key support staff, training and development.

The identification of new sites for the Council housing delivery programme is essential if the Council is to build a sustainable pipeline of sites going forward into the next administration and the next GLA funding round. Most of the sites identified in the report's Appendix are at an early stage of development. However, this is the first of three stages at which Members have the opportunity to take formal decisions in relation to any given site in the programme. The next stage would be when a site comes forward for planning, at which point members on the Planning Sub Committee would make a decision. Finally, all sites will come back to Cabinet before any contracts are let to build or to purchase homes. This would also be the point at which any decision to formally appropriate any site from the General Fund into the Housing Revenue Account would be taken. Therefore, this decision is the first of three stages in a triple lock, ensuring Members have full oversight of the delivery programme. In addition, Ward Members will be engaged on all sites in their ward

before any detailed proposals are worked up or any consultation is undertaken with the public, and will be kept informed about the project's process through to delivery.

The acquisition of up to 11 affordable homes on the Hornsey Town Hall site will allow the Council to maximize the benefits of the existing development partnership and s106 agreement with Crouch End FEC by securing the delivery of Council owned homes. It is intended that these homes will be used to provide much needed housing for adults with learning difficulties and funding is being sought from the GLA's Specialist and Supported Housing Fund to support this acquisition.

Alternative options considered

The alternative to the Council building Council rented homes itself, on its own land, would be to dispose of the sites and for another organisation to deliver homes instead. This was the model adopted in the Cabinet decision of 23 January 2017; to dispose of sites to Sanctuary Housing Association. That decision was revoked at the Cabinet meeting on 13 November 2018, which also determined that the Council should set up its own housing delivery programme to deliver the Borough Plan target of 1,000 Council homes.

The alternative option for delivery would be for that development to be delivered through the General Fund via a Wholly Owned Company (WOC). The setting up of a WOC was approved on 17 July 2018. However, the need for a WOC to deliver the housing programme no longer exists following the Government's decision to lift the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) borrowing cap. As a result of this, the Cabinet decision of November 2018 was that the Council housing delivery programme would be focused on delivering Council rent homes via the HRA.

The WOC will instead primarily be used to hold the types of homes that the Council cannot hold in the HRA, such as private rented housing and forms of intermediate rented housing, should the Council determine it wishes to deliver these types of homes. The WOC will be set up in due course to undertake this role.

The other option considered would be for the Council not to develop these sites at all. This would undermine the Council's own Borough Plan target to deliver 1,000 Council homes, as well as its ability to hit its overall housing targets and to tackle the needs of over 10,000 households on the housing waiting list.

The alternative option to accepting the GLA Home Building Capacity Fund would be not to accept it. However, this would both hinder the Council's ability to deliver on its housing commitments and damage the Council's wider financial position. This is because, without this funding, the speed of delivery is likely to be reduced as less resources may be available to the programme, while wider revenue budgets would be put under unnecessary pressure.

The alternative options to identifying sites for the housing delivery pipeline would be either to rely solely on purchasing affordable homes available under s106 agreements, rather than the Council building out its own sites, or to postpone identifying new sites until new funding is announced. The former would not be acceptable, as purchasing homes from developers, rather than the Council building them itself, means that controls over quality, cost and certainty of delivery are weakened and the new homes would not always be additional affordable homes for the borough. Waiting to identify further sites until there is more funding announced could result in the Council not being in a position to put forward a credible bid, which may result in a significantly smaller share of the available funding than it was

awarded in the current GLA funding round.

The alternative option to the Council acquiring the 11 affordable homes at Hornsey Town Hall would be for a Registered Provider (Housing Association) to acquire the 11 homes instead. In this alternative the Council would still retain nomination rights to the homes but would not have ownership of these homes, would not benefit from the rental income stream, would not be able to set rents at Council rent levels, and would not be able to ensure they are the type of supported housing now intended for the scheme.

186. LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY (LFRMS)

The Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability introduced this report which explained the need for a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) for Haringey as well as to agree the LFRMS. The report recommended agreeing and adopting the LFRMS for Haringey.

The Cabinet Member noted that the Council had a duty to produce a LFRMS and that parts of the borough were on flood planes and prone to flooding. It was therefore important to assess flood risks and prepare for these as best the Council was able to.

In response to questions from Councillors Barnes and Cllr das Neves, the following information was noted:

- Officers noted that the strategy set high level aspirations which stated the Council would maintain its assets. Businesses pouring fat down drains was not specifically covered in the report as that would be highways enforcement action.
- Regarding the local levy, Officers confirmed that this was funding that all members of the Thames regional flood authority contributed to. This helped create developments that would prevent flooding. Haringey contributed £100,000 to the project, as did other partners.
- As part of the LFRMS, Officers confirmed a design guide had been developed which required certain requirements being met by any potential developments. There was an officer who worked within the drainage team who provided comments on whether planning applications met the drainage requirements set by the Council. Large planning applications had their own environment impact assessments carried out, which included the potential for flooding.
- Regarding community engagement, a key part of the LFRMS was about how it could be communicated with the community. Officers had been looking at ways to engage with the community so that they were aware of what to do in flooding events, this included working with schools.
- Regarding the number of responses to the consultation, Officers confirmed this was 15, which was in line with responses to other local authorities.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the adoption of the Haringey LFRMS for the Borough; and

2. To authorise officers to publicise the report on the Council's website and to notify all groups having a particular interest in it.

Reasons for decision

To comply with the Council's legal duties set out by Central Government in the FWMA. It is also a statutory requirement that this document be published to help engage residents and other stakeholders in flood risk issues.

Alternative options considered

Cabinet could decide not to adopt the LFRMS for Haringey and not to make it available on the Haringey's website. In this case Haringey would not be meeting the statutory requirements of the FWMA, and non-compliance would have to be reported to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). DEFRA are considering financial penalties for non-compliance, including reducing eligibility for flood grants. It is therefore, not considered necessary to consider other options.

187. EXPANSION OF CAR CLUBS

In introducing the report, the Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability, was opposed to the current high number of cars on the roads but recognised the need for residents to access to cars where accessibility was an issue. The car-sharing scheme offered a hybrid driving car solution for particular circumstances. The report recommended a waiver of tendering requirements as permitted under CSO 10.01.2(d) and the direct award of contracts to DriveNow UK Limited (DriveNow) and Zipcar (UK) Limited (Zipcar) for the provision of floating car club services in Haringey for a period of three years.

In response to questions from Cllr Barnes, the following was noted:

- There was not an electric car provider that could be utilised to provide a higher proportion of electric cars. However, within the report, there was information about the intention to provide a fully electric fleet by 2023 and the number of electric cars had been increasing over time
- In relation to parking congestion and clustering, the Council can decide the operating area for the car clubs, currently there were places in the borough where users cannot physically lock the car or end their journey. So this would be the main roads, i.e. match day of Tottenham CPZ and a small area of Stroud Green near Finsbury Park events. The Council did not receive many complaints on DriveNow provision although there have been issues on clustering around Highgate station. The Council were in contact with resident associations and had made part of the road, a no parking area. There was a balance to be struck and it was prudent to work with the car clubs to make sure there was not an over concentration of cars in one area. Officers cautioned against banning areas and better managing clustering and congestion through the contract.

- The reason for taking the decision on car clubs prior to a decision on dockless bikes was related to the floating cars contract ending and timing for renewal. The Council was in contact with dockless providers and working with Hackney and Islington Councils to find out how the provision was working in these boroughs .The intention to have dockless bike providers was to be included in the cycling and walking plan to be released later in the year . The commitment was there and officers were waiting to see how this works in other boroughs before launching into a trial.

RESOLVED

1. To waive the tendering requirements of Contract Standing Order 9.01.1 as allowed under CSO 10.01.2(d)(i) (the nature of the market has been investigated and is such that a departure from the requirements of Contract Standing Orders is justifiable); and
2. To award contracts to DriveNow UK Limited and Zipcar (UK) Limited to operate floating car club services in Haringey as allowed under Contract Standing Order 9.07.1(d), for a duration of three years from the date of the contract.

Reasons for decision

Car clubs are important to encourage more journeys in Haringey to be made by sustainable modes. This is supported in the Council's adopted Transport Strategy. Entering into contracts with DriveNow and Zipcar has no cost to the Council and will enable a floating car club scheme to operate in Haringey and ensure that the service providers operate in a way, which will not negatively impact our highway network.

Zipcar and DriveNow are the only two operators providing floating car clubs in London, which justifies the procurement waiver. Introducing two car clubs into Haringey will provide choice for the users ensuring the users have better access to a variety of cars and hiring options including a range of hiring costs.

Alternative options considered

The other options considered were to not expand the project and DriveNow who is the incumbent service provider would cease operations, or to enter into a contract with a single provider. However, the proposal supports the priorities in the Borough Plan and 2018 Haringey Transport Strategy and therefore, the other options were not considered appropriate. Competition is healthy for residents in the borough and will enable more residents in Haringey access to mobility.

188. ADOPTION OF CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR BRUCE CASTLE, TOTTENHAM CEMETERY, TOWER GARDENS AND PEABODY COTTAGES

The Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability introduced this report which sought Cabinet's approval for the adoption of four draft conservation area

appraisal and management plan documents covering Bruce Castle, Tottenham Cemetery, Tower Gardens and Peabody Cottages Conservation Areas (attached at Appendices 4-7).

The Cabinet Member noted that the draft conservation area appraisal and management plans had been revised following a consultation. The purpose of the four draft plans was to ensure any future action taken at those locations would preserve the historic buildings and natural areas. The plans gave details of what could or could not be done in those areas to inform any future decisions.

Further to noting Regulatory Committee's comments,

RESOLVED

1. To note the comments received to the consultation, and how these have been taken in to account in finalising the draft documents (described in paragraphs - 6.9-6.19 and set out in detail in Appendices 1 and 2).
2. To note the comments of the Regulatory Committee in relation to this report included at Appendix 10.
3. To approve the adoption and publication of the finalised Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans as attached at Appendices 4-7.
4. To authorise changes to Conservation Area boundaries detailed in Appendix 3.

Reasons for decision

The Council has a statutory duty to ensure that Conservation Areas are preserved or enhanced, and publish policies for the implementation of the same (Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Part II). The Council's adopted Local Plan policies support the conservation of the significance of the Borough's heritage assets (SP12, DM9), and require decision makers to have regard to appraisals and management plans when considering the impact of proposals on the historic environment (DM9 C).

Tottenham Cemetery, Tower Gardens and Peabody Cottages Conservation Areas do not have adopted appraisals. The current appraisal for Bruce Castle Conservation Area has not been updated since 2009, and is considered out of date, while the new document provides an updated survey, management plan and design guidelines. It is important that the Council adopts these appraisals and management plans in order to support the implementation of the Council's Local Plan policies and ensure that the significance of the Conservation Areas is preserved and enhanced. A summary of the special interest of each Conservation Area is provided at paragraph 6.7 below. A summary of the content and structure of the new appraisal documents is provided at 6.6 below.

Up-to-date Appraisals will provide a sound basis for development management decisions and will serve as a useful guide for property owners and those bringing forward heritage projects and development proposals as to how best to preserve and

enhance each area's character. In some cases, the character of these Conservation Areas has been harmed or is vulnerable to harm through inappropriate (often small-scale) development. These documents will be a valuable tool in addressing this.

The appraisals include a comprehensive review of each Conservation Area's boundary, with small changes to the boundaries of Bruce Castle CA and Tottenham Cemetery CA. It is important that the Council revise the boundaries to ensure that the Conservation Area designations are warranted, meaningful, and in line with statutory requirements and national policy. There is a statutory duty to review conservation area designations from time to time (Planning, (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, 69) and the Council must ensure that designated Conservation Areas are of sufficient special architectural or historic interest, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 186) and Historic England guidelines. The proposed boundary changes are described in 6.8 below.

Alternative options considered

The Council has a statutory requirement to "...formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of any parts of their area which are conservation areas" under Section 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The existing Conservation Area appraisal for Bruce Castle was updated in 2009, and is considered out of date. The area has undergone some changes since then, and best practice guidance for Conservation Area appraisals has evolved. Tottenham Cemetery, Peabody Cottages and Tower Gardens do not have adopted appraisals. Continuing to manage these areas without up-to-date documents in place is not considered advisable.

The document includes recommendations for alterations to the boundaries of two of the Conservation Areas. The option of leaving the boundaries as they currently are has been considered and is not recommended. The National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 186) states that "When considering the designation of Conservation Areas, local planning authorities should ensure that the area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest". In cases where there is no discernible special character, the designation is unhelpful.

189. ESTATE CONTROLLED PARKING SCHEME RENEWAL - APPROVAL TO UNDERTAKE FORMAL CONSULTATION

Cllr Bull and Cllr Chandwani declared personal interests on this item as leaseholders living in the borough.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal was proud to introduce the proposal to bring the estate controlled parking scheme inhouse, making this consistent with the Council's parking service which was the only borough Parking Service not outsourced in London. She added that bringing this estate service back inhouse was important to residents living in estates run by Homes for Haringey as

some were currently subsidising a service that they were not using. It was appropriate for Homes for Haringey to consider this value for money option.

It was noted that the new scheme would deliver an improved service to over 280 estates across the borough which are home to over 12500 Tenants, Leaseholders and their families.

Improved parking controls would ensure that those estate residents who need it most will get the benefit of the available parking, especially the most vulnerable. A new estate parking management scheme would provide the powers and income needed to achieve wider strategic aims around promoting active travel choices, reducing the use of carbon emitting vehicles and achieving channel shift to digital options.

In response to questions from Cllr Barnes, the following was noted:

- The scheme will not be an all-encompassing as parking issues will be different per ward. The intention was consult on the wider scheme and to ensure any final policy proposal is reflective of local needs the consultation results will be analysed by estate/ward and by diversity strands.
- The aim was to pilot the scheme in July 2020 subject to any learning, and to fully roll out by the end of that financial year.
- In relation to the financial contributions of the current scheme, from considering financial data in 2016, there was a surplus of £44k and this had reduced to a deficit figure by 2019.

RESOLVED

1. As set out in section 8 of the report, to approve the development of a new estate parking management scheme with the preferred option being a Traffic Management Order based scheme. This is in accordance with the powers provided to Local Authorities under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
2. As set out in section 9, to approve the proposal to consult all affected residents on the development of a new estate parking management scheme.
3. As set out in paragraph 9.6, to delegate finalisation of the consultation pack to the Director of Housing, Regeneration & Planning and Managing Director of Homes for Haringey in consultation with the Cabinet Members for Housing & Estate Renewal and Neighbourhoods.
4. To note the intention that consultation results will be considered by Cabinet in January 2020, informing a proposed new estate management parking policy for approval and adoption.

Reasons for decision

In relation to recommendation 1

The current Estate Controlled Parking Scheme (ECPS) is no longer financially viable or enforceable. As a result, residents subsidise the scheme, via the Housing Revenue Account, regardless of whether they use a vehicle or live on an estate with parking controls which is unfair. The ECPS cannot be improved to address the financial and enforcement issues within the current legislative framework for parking control on Council land. A Traffic Management Order based scheme using powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 has been selected as the preferred option because it is the only option that satisfies all of the aims, outlined in paragraph 7.1, as well as being the Department of Transport's recommended solution and a tried and test option in operation across various London boroughs.

In relation to recommendation 2

The adoption of a new estate parking management scheme will trigger the requirement for a formal consultation of Secure Tenants under Section 105 of the Housing Act 1985. Best practice is to consult all affected residents (i.e. Leaseholders and non-secure tenants) before changing a core housing service to ensure any improvement meets their needs, where possible. This approach supports the Your Council priority of the Borough Plan 2019-23 by ensuring both Haringey Council and Homes for Haringey engage effectively with residents and design services based on their needs.

In relation to recommendation 3

The consultation pack will be designed in accordance with the requirements of Haringey Council's Section 105 arrangements and outline the issues with the current scheme, the proposal to develop a new scheme including the preferred option, the alternative options, what is sought from residents in response and how their responses will be used to design the final proposal for Cabinet approval.

In relation to recommendation 4

This approach supports the Your Council priority of the Borough Plan 2019-23 by ensuring both Haringey Council and Homes for Haringey engage effectively with residents and design services based on their needs. Adopting any new estate parking management policy will affect more than 2 wards in the borough and is therefore considered a Key Decision requiring Cabinet approval to proceed.

Alternative options considered

An alternative to conducting consultation has not been considered. Unless a decision is taken to retain the current service unchanged a formal consultation of all secure tenants under section S105 HA85 will be a statutory requirement. In addition, consulting residents to understand their needs in order to develop an effective service offer supports the Your Council priority of the Borough Plan 2019-23. Please see comments of the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance in paragraph 11.2 for further details of the statutory requirements.

The option to discontinue all parking controls has been considered and discounted for several reasons 1. Residents have consistently presented their expectation (through complaints, enquiries and other feedback) that parking will be managed for their

benefit, 2. Failure to control parking represents a health and safety risk as emergency access routes cannot be maintained and 3. This option would not support the Place priority of the Borough Plan 2019-23 to implement Controlled Parking where residents want controls or promote low emission vehicle use and modal shift to zero emission transport options.

The option to do nothing and continue with the current Estate Controlled Parking Scheme (ECPS) has been considered and discounted. Continuing the current arrangements would require residents to subsidise an ineffective service via the Housing Revenue Account regardless of whether they use it or live on affected estates, which is inequitable. In addition, this option would not support the Place priority of the Borough Plan 2019-23 to promote low emission vehicle use and modal shift to zero emission transport options.

The option to adopt housing roads as part of the public highway may have to be used on a small number of roads which cannot be classified as off-street parking places. However, it is not a viable option borough wide as it requires Secretary of State Approval as well as significant capital investment to adjust the land to public highway standards. In addition, this option would still require the implementation of controlled parking zones to deliver the parking controls that residents have indicated they expect.

The option to replace onsite enforcement by officers with remote or automated controls has been considered and is deemed of limited application. Automated controls such as barrier gates and CCTV recognition are only viable on a small number of sites with entrances that could allow access to be controlled in this manner. It is, therefore, not an option that can be considered borough wide and can only support a wider system of on the ground enforcement. In addition, the level of investment required to deliver each installation is prohibitive. This option will be reconsidered for specific sites that are deemed suitable if the new estate parking management scheme generates a surplus for reinvestment.

190. BED BASED INTERMEDIATE CARE NURSING HOME BEDS

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced this report which sought Cabinet's authorisation for a direct contract award under Contract Standing Order 9.01.2 (g) negotiation without publication of an advertisement to The Supplier outlined in the exempt appendix for the provision of 10 Intermediate Care Nursing beds.

The Cabinet Member noted Intermediate Care Nursing beds helped to alleviate the issue of delayed hospital discharges and inappropriate admissions which could lead to lengthy stays in hospital. The use of a block contract for 10 Intermediate Care beds would help to plan, care more efficiently and help to avoid unnecessary hospital stays. This would help residents remain and regain independence quicker.

The Cabinet Member closed by commending the recommendation to Cabinet.

Further to considering exempt information at item 29,

RESOLVED

To approve the award of contract under CSO 9.01.2 (g) for intermediate nursing care beds to the Supplier named in the exempt appendix for a period of eight (8) years, commencing from 1st August 2019 at a value of £4,400,000 with an option to extend for a further period of up to two (2) years, for an estimated total value over the life of the contract of £5,600,000

Reasons for decision

Intermediate nursing care beds are an essential component of Haringey's intermediate care pathway, providing enablement to patients that cannot be supported within extra care facilities or within their own homes due to the complexity of their health needs. Intermediate care beds differ in nature from standard nursing care as the purpose of Intermediate care is to improve a resident's level of independence, predominantly through activity based therapies. A nursing care setting is appropriate for some people due to the complexity and medical nature of their needs, as well as the high levels of activity required of the service provider to safely mobilise residents.

These beds are a component of Haringey's wider intermediate care provision and are supported by a dedicated community health multi-disciplinary team (MDT) comprised of occupational therapy, physiotherapy, nursing and social work for example, which was established following a multi-agency review of the intermediate care offer. It is commissioned outside of this contract and funded through Haringey's Better Care Fund. The MDT works across two bed based intermediate care services in Haringey and is critical for ensuring efficient bed flow and therapy input to achieve better outcomes for individuals and reduce long term care costs and ensures that Haringey's intermediate care pathway meets the NICE guidance definition of intermediate care. Moreover, in-borough delivery of this contract is in the Council's overall interest. The MDT service is provided by community health professionals and the referral criteria for community health is based on the location of a patient's GP – they can, therefore, only provide a service to those both residing and registered with a GP in borough. Nursing home residents outside of the borough would not be registered with a Haringey GP and therefore would not be able to receive services from the MDT which is at the heart of the success of this type of provision – limited or no access to the MDT will significantly reduce the effectiveness of the service.

The use of a block contract will mitigate the significant risk that local nursing beds will otherwise not be available when needed which would lead to a delay in transfers of care within acute care and a reduced opportunity to support residents to return to their previous levels of mobility and independence. The remaining capacity will be used by LBH in lieu of spot purchasing step up and step down nursing beds. In order to further alleviate the risk of void beds we will be able to make the beds available for use by partners across North Central London, where the full costs will be recharged to them

There is a paucity of nursing home provision within the borough with only 2 Care Quality Commission registered nursing homes (one of these provisions currently has an embargo on new placements). Haringey's commissioning service intends to secure block contracts with this service provider for differing levels of nursing care to ensure access to local nursing is protected for Haringey residents. Notwithstanding a Cabinet decision on the future of OGNH, it is expected that capacity locally will not exceed that of the local demand. This award of contract will therefore enable the Council to continue working with a local provider to deliver intermediate care nursing bed service in Haringey.

This contract will be partly funded from existing resources within Adults Social Care and funded from a combination of:

- NHS Continuing Health Care, Individual client funding
- North Central London Partners, Individual client funding
- Systems Resilience Funding

The Home (see exempt appendix) run by the Supplier delivered an Intermediate Care Nursing Bed Service between two winter periods (September 2017 and March 2018) and (September 2019 and March 2019). The initiative was highly successful in supporting:

- Hospital discharge, demonstrating clear commitment to partners to resourcing reduction in delayed transfers of care (DTocS). Haringey's intermediate care provision has supported Haringey to achieve a 21% reduction in delayed transfers of care in 2018/19.
- Development of the trusted assessor pilot.
- Achievement of the 90% CHC assessment target.

For the reasons outlined above it was considered that a direct award under s.32 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 was the most appropriate method to secure an already scarce provision, along with the added benefit of the MDT, on the basis that there was no competition, i.e. there is no other currently available nursing provision in borough, and certainly none with MDT input. The MDT element is the main requirement for Intermediate care provision and would not be available to residents if they were placed out of borough. Moreover intervention of this type is short and intense to enable residents to avoid hospital readmission, reduce or mitigate against delayed hospital discharge and costly long-term care. It also would not be an option to decant vulnerable, aged, residents to alternative out of borough placements if a tender was undertaken.

Alternative options considered

Do nothing

This would result in Haringey having no nursing beds as part of our intermediate care pathway and being solely reliant on spot purchasing. Due to the limited availability of nursing bed provision within the borough this would likely lead to out of borough provision, significant delays to discharge and the loss of the benefits of rehabilitative input from the MDT.

Go out to tender

The Council considered undertaking a competitive tender process in line with the Public Contract Regulations 2015. However, as the Home is the only CQC registered nursing home rated Good in the borough it would have been necessary to obtain quotes from nursing homes outside the borough. This was considered problematic as there would not be the same access to the multi-disciplinary support in place at the Home. Out of borough provision would result in the loss of the benefits of rehabilitative input from the MDT and diminish the effectiveness and value of the service. Moreover, residents were already insitu and it would not be a viable proposition to remove elderly, vulnerable residents to another establishment if one were available.

Deliver in-house

This was rejected as the only other nursing home in-borough is the Council managed service at OGNH. However, it is currently being considered for redesign and development to meet future demand and is presently unsuitable for the provision of intermediate care.

191. TEMPLETON HALL & GARAGE SITE REDEVELOPMENT - CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARD TO DEVELOP 11 COUNCIL RENTED HOMES

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the Cabinet report which marked an important point in the Council housing delivery programme. The report requested Cabinet approval of the first major construction contract for new Council homes, for the development of eleven Council homes at Council rents on the Templeton site in Seven Sisters. These homes would allow eleven individuals, couples or families to live in well built, well designed and well maintained homes, at Council rents. Templeton was originally going to be given to a Housing Association to be developed entirely for shared ownership and the Cabinet Member was pleased that the Council have instead been able to develop this site.

Further to considering exempt information at item 30,

RESOLVED

1. To approve the appointment of Kind Diamond Consortium Ltd to complete construction works to develop 11 Council rented homes for a total sum of £3,050,163.
2. To approve the issue of a letter of intent prior to the formal contract signature for £305,016, 10% of the total contract sum.

Reasons for decision

The Templeton site has been identified as a site for the direct delivery of new Council homes by Haringey Council. The scheme has been granted planning consent and is

ready to progress to construction. Following a competitive tender process, a contractor has been identified to undertake these works.

Alternative options considered

The authority procured the contract through the London Construction programme (LCP) Major Works 2014 Framework Agreement. The authority considered the use of alternative frameworks but to deliver the quickest and most effective route to market, it was decided to proceed with the LCP.

192. RED HOUSE YARD, 432 WEST GREEN RD, N15 3PJ

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which recommended the disposal of the Council's freehold interest in The Red House, 423 West Green Rd N15, to Magic Living Ltd, part of Paul Simon Magic Homes Group (PSMHG), and the acquisition by the Council of the freehold interest in two blocks of property comprising 46 new-build homes within the proposed site development, as well as open green space. The report set out the agreement by the Council to acquire homes within the site redevelopment for retention as social rented Council housing towards achieving the priority of 1000 new Council homes over the Borough Plan period.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that the wider project on the site would also deliver private homes in support of the Council's overall obligation to meet housing supply targets set for the borough under the Mayor's London Plan. The heads of terms would allow for profit share (overage) payment to the Council if the private sale units exceed sales prices assumed in the Planning viability study.

The Cabinet Member informed the meeting that Officers had worked within benchmarks for affordable housing provision and was pleased to note that the social housing was supported by the Mayor of London's affordable housing programme grant.

The Cabinet Member noted the scheme would not only count towards the Council's 1,000 social rented housing priority but would also help tackle the housing long waiting list and create savings in the cost of providing temporary accommodation to families as well as assist in tackling homelessness in the borough. The scheme was compliant with the Council's Budget and Policy framework as set out in part 4, section E of the Constitution, and the housing funding element of the project is part of the Council's budget setting process which was the subject of a Council decision in February 2019.

In response to questions from Councillors: Gordon, Davies, das Neves and Barnes, the following information was noted:

- Regarding how quickly the homes could be built, the Cabinet Member confirmed that these would be completed within 3 years, by 2022.
- In relation to the revised terms of the agreement, the Cabinet Member noted this allowed the Council to acquire the 46 properties intended for Council rent with the freehold of the land for these properties and the green space. The previous scheme had included only 30 units under shared ownership terms.

- With regards to the value of the land, this normally decreases when adding social housing.
- In response to the potential for the developer land banking, Officers advised that the terms on which the Council agree to sell the land would include clauses such as longstop dates for completion of the homes and binding the developer to develop directly, thus protecting the Council from land banking or onward sale of the land to another party.
- Regarding the procurement, the Cabinet Member advised that this was in the exempt part of the report and that this could not be commented on in the public meeting.
- In relation to the gates being included in the development, Officers advised that these would only be used at the request of Metropolitan Police and were not a Council requirement. Officers confirmed that it was possible that public pedestrian routes into the scheme could be closed at night as was clear in the scheme approved at Planning Committee. This was at the discretion of the police and if they required this so not a Council decision. In addition, this feature was also being considered for schemes in the past and future in Wood Green as well as Tottenham so not unique to this project.
- Officers clarified that the previous agreement with Paul Simon Magic Homes in 2015 for disposal of the land had expired in September 2018. There had not ever been a planning consent for the previous scheme.
- Officers advised that with every disposal of land that the Council made, it is legally obliged to get a Best Consideration of a report from a valuer. This would confirm that, based on the use of the land and the market value of the land, the price that the Council disposes of it would be the best use of public resources.
- Given the proportion and type of affordable housing that was being developed on the land in accordance with the planning application and consent, the price that the Council was selling the land for was the appropriate price and best consideration.
- Officers further provided more information on how the values relating to this development had been reached and were value for money. It was noted that there were two value calculations involved in this transaction, the appropriate price in disposing of the freehold of the land to the developer. This first calculation which is supported by, professional advice from an independent valuer, reflects the tenure and the amount of affordable homes that are intended to be built on the site. The second calculation is based on cost considerations for the homes when the Council buys these back from the developer for use as Council homes. It was noted that the benchmark test will be applied to test the affordability of those homes within the overall HRA business plan and this currently shows that any rental income that will come in from the homes covers these costs. Officers were therefore, satisfied that the agreed price for acquiring the completed homes was within the benchmarks that have been set in the housing delivery programme.
- The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal later added that many of the Council's housing estates had a concierge service who assisted residents in and out of their premises.
- Officers advised that the possible unfavourable consideration by the owners of church and pub to the possibility of an alternative Council-led development rather than the current Paul Simon Magic Homes scheme included an element

of conjecture but was reasonably based on the long running discussions with these parties dating back to 2012 and a judgement on their appetite to wait still further a different Council led scheme.

- in relation to the option of leasing the site to developer, there would be constraints with a procurement process and tendering policy.

Further to considering exempt information at item 31,

RESOLVED

1. To agree to the disposal of the Council's freehold interest in the Red House Site, 423 West Green Rd, N15 (land identified in the attached plan at **Appendix A**) to Magic Living Ltd (Paul Simon Magic Homes Group) for a sum as provided in the exempt **Part B** of the report, under Heads of Terms which are also attached in **PART B**, with the land receipt to the Council to be hypothecated against any repayment of a NHS grant in respect of the former Red House care home, should such a payment to the NHS be required; and
2. To agree to the acquisition by the Council for housing purposes of the freehold interests in two blocks of flats, comprising a total of 46 social rented homes, to be constructed by Magic Living Ltd (PSMHG) on sites B and C on the attached plan, for a maximum sum of provided in **Part B** of the report plus the Council's acquisition costs, and according to the terms which are also set out in the Heads of Terms document attached as the annex A in **PART B**, the exempt part of this report; and
3. To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, in consultation with the Director of Finance to agree the final contracts; and
4. To agree that the Council should make financial provision as detailed in **Part B of the Report**, including Council on-costs for the project, provision for which exists within the Council's Housing Revenue Account, and thereby making use of the housing grant the authority has been allocated by the Mayor of London's affordable housing programme; and
5. To agree to the acquisition by the Council for a consideration, as set out in **Part B of the report**, of green space shown green at **Site D** on the attached plan at Appendix A, following the completion of the development, in order to provide for the creation of new public open space in the St Ann's area which will be managed by the Council.
6. To agree to transfer, for a sum provided in **Part B**, the exempt part of the report, of the Council's freehold interest in the small strip of land (identified as **site E** on the attached plan at Appendix A) fronting the church to the owners of the DHCA church, in order to enable the church to participate fully in the development of the overall Red House site and in accordance with the proposed planning application. This transfer is to be on condition that the owners of the DHCA church remains party to the wider site development

partnership with Magic Living (PSMHG) and makes use of this land in support of the scheme as granted under the future planning determination.

7. Recommendation 7 is fully contained in PART B, the exempt part of the report.

Reasons for decision

The disposal of the freehold of The Red House site will enable the development by Magic Living (PSMHG) of a wider site, which incorporates adjacent land ownerships of the church and the former pub. This development will deliver 46 affordable homes, which the Council will be able to acquire on completion of the developer's scheme. The new homes will then be managed by Homes for Haringey as social tenure homes for Council rent and enable the provision of further new private homes in the wider scheme. In addition, a new community space and new public open space will be created.

This project responds to the Borough Plan commitment for the delivery of 1,000 homes at Council rent in Haringey and contributes to the wider housing supply targets set for the borough by the Mayor of London under the London Plan. The development by Magic Living (PSMHG) is subject to the grant of a planning consent, and is expected to start on site in 2019 with completion in 2021.

The disposal of the Red House site will enable this site to be developed together with the adjoining sites to make a much more comprehensive development than were it to be able to be developed on its own. 88 homes, of which four are for the clergy use by the DHCA organisation, are to be constructed as part of the wider project. As part of this wider project 72 homes are to be developed on the Council's Red House site itself of which 46 (64%) will be acquired by the Council as new affordable homes, meaning that along with the transfer back of green space, 53% of the Council's existing land by area will come back to the Council. The project delivers the completed Council rent homes at least two years faster than would be possible were the Council to set aside this ongoing relationship with the developer and instead seek to develop the Red House site on its own. The housing programme investment by the Council will result in this private led housing scheme delivering more than fifty percent of the homes as affordable, which would not otherwise have been possible through planning requirements alone. As well as contributing to the Council's target of 1,000 Council rent homes the wider project promoted by the developer will also deliver private homes in support of the Council's overall obligation to meet housing supply targets set for the borough under the Mayor's London Plan.

Alternative options considered

Option A: The Council could provide grant funding to a Housing Association in order to deliver affordable homes on the Red House. This option would involve the Council providing grant funding to secure the delivery of lower cost affordable housing. This option was discounted on the basis that the Council's newly adopted Borough Plan prioritises the delivery of Council owned homes on its own land, in order to maximise the delivery of affordable homes of the right type and tenure for the local community.

Option B: The Council could decide against proceeding with acquiring homes on the Red House site and default to the original scheme proposed by the developer under the now defunct disposal agreement. The developer's original scheme was submitted in the belief that it was fully compliant with planning policy. However, this has been rejected in favour of the recommended option because the Magic Living (PSMHG) proposed scheme on its own, without the Council as purchaser of the affordable homes, would have delivered only 30% affordable housing on the site, comprising 25 homes at London Affordable Rent and no Council rent homes.

Option C: The Council could decide not to proceed with the disposal of the site to Magic Living Ltd (part of PSMHG) and instead seek to promote a scheme on its own land, commissioning a contractor to build the units directly on behalf of the authority.

Whilst this direct development by the Council is possible given the Council's housing strategy and the new capacity being built up in the Housing team to deliver directly, taking forward our own scheme has several disadvantages for several reasons:

- i. Timing: It could take at least eighteen months - and most likely as long as two years - for the Council to work up an alternative scheme and achieve planning a consent. The start on site for a direct delivery route may therefore not be until 2022 and completion of Council rent homes would not be until 2024. This compares with a potential start on site in 2019 (depending on when planning is granted) for the Magic Living (PSMHG) scheme and practical completion anticipated 2021.
- ii. Planning Risk: A Council-led scheme would carry a planning risk, because the planning status (DPD) of the site requires that the church be brought together into a single development with the former Red House site. Were the Council to promote a scheme on its own land in such a way, there is no guarantee that the Council's planning officers could be in a position to recommend such a scheme for approval. There are major challenges in assembling the whole site and reaching an agreement with the pub and church owners and so it is likely that the Council would only be able to pursue a scheme on its own land if it wanted to expedite the development and start on site.
- iii. Fewer Homes: An alternative Council scheme only on the Red House site, even if it were to be permissible in planning terms, is unlikely to be able to achieve anywhere as near that many residential units as the current development proposed by the Magic Living (PSMHG). This is because issues such as rights-to-light and access challenges from neighbouring users would need to be factored into the design of the scheme, reducing the overall density of a stand-alone development on Red House alone. There is no guarantee that the owners of the church and the pub would wish to collaborate directly with the Council in submitting a scheme for planning given that they have a settled position with the developer dating back many years. The Church has a right of way and a right to park over the existing car park so the car park land would effectively be outside of the curtilage of the Council's alternative development scheme, resulting in far fewer units achievable on the Red House. Even were the Council able to promote its own scheme, not all of the homes on the Red House site would be Council rent because there would not be sufficient viability

- in such as scheme without some form of cross-subsidy from private sale housing.
- iv. No community space: Even were the Council to promote its own scheme on the Red House without the church and achieve a planning consent, the scheme would not achieve an improved church building, community space, café and nursery provision which the Magic Living (PSMHG) scheme will achieve. The green space at area D on the plan would also not become green space, being needed to improve the Council's development platform, given the constraints presented from existing and neighbouring users (below).
 - v. Temporary Accommodation: There is a cost of keeping those on the housing waiting list who are in temporary accommodation – for these households/families and for the Council's budget. A two year wait for the Council rent homes to be delivered over the private developer route of delivery would cost £288,000 plus the cost of temporary accommodation staff and other Council costs in supporting these households (as further set out in the value for money section below).

193. BUILDING AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

In introducing the report, the Leader of the Council outlined the importance of clean, safe, well-maintained buildings, public services in Haringey to meet the needs of residents. The proposal represented the determination to improve facilities management in Haringey, for the good of all residents.

The Leader added that how buildings were run had a wider significance. It affected the productivity of staff, the wellbeing of service users and it represented the civic pride in the borough. He referred to climate change becoming a deepening concern, therefore having greener, more energy efficient buildings was becoming ever more important. Having direct control of this vital service allowed the Council to deliver on these objectives.

The Leader referred to the manifesto pledge of considering bringing services back in-house where it was prudent to do so and was delighted to strive to achieve this with Facilities Management, improving the conditions of employment of around 100 staff and providing a better service at a lower cost.

Further to considering exempt information at item 32,

RESOLVED

That Cabinet approves the following strategy for recommissioning the Council's FM services:

1. That the Council should work with Homes for Haringey and internal services to create a Hybrid in-house model for FM services;

2. That a phased approach is taken to transitioning to this model;
3. That the Council immediately initiates works to secure a Computer Aided Facilities Management (CAFM) system as the key technical underpinning to the service;
4. To note that a transformation fund of £627k is made to facilitate the successful adoption of this strategy; and
5. That the Council takes up the further option set out in paragraph 1 of the exempt report.

Reasons for decision

For the reason set out in paragraph 2 of the Exempt report, a commissioning review was undertaken by officers to identify the Council's future needs in relation to facilities management and to consider what supply arrangements would be most appropriate.

The overarching finding of the review is that there is a strong case for change, to meet the evolving needs of the Council to develop and improve the management of its facilities, within a constrained cost envelope and to deliver wider social benefits. See further findings set out in paragraph 2 of the Exempt report including further details on the preferred option, the Hybrid Model with Homes for Haringey.

Computer Aided Facilities Management (CAFM) system

A CAFM system is the key technical underpinning to the service. It enables the management of the Council's property data in one place, and supports key aspects of the service, such as the Helpdesk and scheduling of tasks.

Transition Funding

The cost of the transition team and other enablers for the proposed recommissioning strategy is set out in paragraph 2 of the exempt report. This will support the project management, IT costs and purchase of equipment and delivery of training to ensure the preferred option is successfully introduced.

Alternative options considered

Seven other options were considered in the Commissioning Study

- Extending the Council's existing Total Facilities Management (TFM) contract with Amey Community Ltd ("Amey") for a further 2 years was rejected as the contract is not delivering the desired outcomes.
- Bringing the service fully back in house was discounted as it cannot be safely delivered in the required timescale.
- The option to commission Homes for Haringey (HFH) to fully provide the service was discounted as HFH lack capability in key areas.

- Entering into a shared service agreement with another authority was rejected as shared service arrangements do not provide the control necessary to guarantee performance.
- Creating a joint venture with another body was discounted as this arrangement could not be mobilised in a timely way.
- The option of letting a new TFM contract was explored but proved not to be in the Council's overall interest. This option was demonstrated to be likely to lead to higher costs, while being unlikely to deliver the Council's desired outcomes for the service.
- Letting a series of contracts for separate parts of the service was discounted due to the length and complexity of the procurement process.

A further consideration is set out in paragraph 2.4.2 of the exempt report.

194. HIGHWAY AND STREET LIGHTING TERM CONTRACTS

The Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods introduced this report which sought the approval to award a Street Lighting Term Contract, in accordance with CSO 9.07.01(d) for an initial term of four years, with an option for two further two year extension periods; thereby the maximum term of the contract being eight years.

The Cabinet Member noted street lighting made communities safer, reduced risk of crime and ensured that the Council was energy efficient. Further, it was the Council's responsibility to provide high quality maintenance for highway and street lighting across the borough. Officers had undertaken a competitive tendering exercise in relation to a Highways and Street Lighting term contract.

In response to questions from Councillors Barnes and Tucker, the following information was noted:

- Regarding the contract and the clauses within, the Head of Procurement advised that there are significant differences between the clauses in the existing contract and the one under consideration. There was an escalation process within the contract under consideration which meant it could be terminated if the contractor failed to perform its duties as set out in the contract.
- With regards to the roll out of LED lighting, the Director for Environment and Neighbourhoods confirmed a business case was being created to look at rolling out LED lighting across the borough. Such a proposal would enable energy saving and maintenance cost savings. Once proposals had been formulated within the next 4 months, they would be consulted on with the relevant Cabinet Member before being brought to Cabinet.
- Responding to the issue of not delivering the Highway and Street Lighting in-house, the Leader emphasised that the first preference within the Labour Administration's manifesto was a commitment to deliver services in-house where it was prudent to do so, where it did not impact on service quality and where the Council had the capacity to deliver.
- Regarding the length of time it would take to develop this service in-house, the Cabinet Member noted this would take between two and three years. The

- contract would enable the Council to address the logistical matters such as the equipment it would need, the number of staff it would require and what training would be required, before it considered bringing this service in-house.
- The four year term of the contract under discussion was a reasonable amount of time for the Council to explore the possibility of bringing this service in-house at a later date. Islington Council's Highways contract was compared to for context which had a lock in clause for 25 years.
 - The Cabinet Member stated the current contract had issues surrounding performance management.
 - The Cabinet Member responded that the APSE report was a draft report and not complete so it should be considered in that context and not associated with the resolutions at hand.

Further to considering exempt information at item 33,

RESOLVED

That Cabinet approves:

1. Pursuant to CSO 9.07.01(d) the award of a contract for Street Lighting Term Contract to Bidder SL 1 (identified in the exempt part of the report), for an initial four (4) year term, with an option to extend (at the Council's absolute discretion as contained with the terms and conditions of the Contract) for two further two year extension periods.
2. The withdrawal of Lot 1 (Highway Maintenance and Minor Highway Improvement Works) from the procurement process, resulting in no award for Lot 1, for the reasons set out in exempt section (Part B) of this report.

Reasons for decision

Officers have undertaken a competitive tendering exercise, in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015, in relation to a Highways and Street Lighting term contract. Through this process Bidder SL 1 submitted the Most Economically Advantageous Tender in respect of the Street Lighting Term Contract, and therefore, in compliance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015, can be awarded the Street Lighting Term Contract.

The delivery of highways and street lighting works, both planned and reactive, contribute to the delivery of a number of Council priorities, as well as supporting the Council in complying with its statutory duties arising out of the Highways Act 1980 and Traffic Management Act 2004.

Alternative options considered

In 2018 the Council drafted a Highway Commissioning Strategy which investigated eight options as to how the Council should provide its Highways and Street Lighting services over the next eight years. These options included the full or partial insourcing of the service. They were:

- a) Continuing with the existing London Highways Alliance Contract (LoHAC);

- b) The use of other existing contracts;
- c) The use of the London Borough of Ealing term contract (open to all boroughs);
- d) A new term contract;
- e) A new multiple operator framework agreement;
- f) A new design and build contract;
- g) Externalising the complete highways function;
- h) Bringing construction works in house (in full or part).

Each option was subjected to three tests before being considered further. Those three tests included the following considerations that the approach:

1. Had the capacity to deliver the Councils requirements;
2. Could meet the performance requirements of the Council;
3. Could be achieved in the timeframes the Council was working to.

Options passing the initial testing were scored against several other criteria. Procuring a new term contract (Option d)) passed all three initial tests and scored highest in the second part assessment. In-house provision of these services was excluded, as it failed to meet the required timescale.

Our benchmarking also confirmed that none of the 75 members of the APSE Highways service delivery group or other North London boroughs were delivering, or would consider delivering, a totally in-house service. This has been confirmed recently that no metropolitan borough is providing the whole of a highways service in house. The reason for this is that some elements of work would be inefficient and cost prohibitive to directly deliver these types of works (i.e. planned resurfacing 9 weeks work c. £1Mn).

195. LINDEN HOUSE ASSISTED LIVING ACCOMMODATION REFURBISHMENT - CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARD

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced the report which set out proposal to convert Linden House into a 4-flat adapted supported living unit to enable residents with complex health and care needs – notably a learning disability and/or autism and behaviours that may challenge – to live more independently in the community, including a number of residents currently living in hospital settings and therefore falling within the Transforming Care cohort.

Further to considering exempt information at item 34,

RESOLVED

1. To approve the appointment of Contractor E to deliver the refurbishment of Linden House for a contract sum of £888,900.00;
2. To authorise Haringey Legal Department to issue a Letter of Intent prior to the formal contract signature for the sum of £100,000.00 as allowed under the Council's Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.3 to allow work to start on site as soon as possible; and

3. To vire £420,000 from scheme 208 Supported Living Schemes to Linden House Adaptations scheme 212.

Reasons for decision

The authority procured the contractor through the London Construction Plan (LCP) Framework. This procurement route was a decision made after consultation with Strategic Procurement regarding the options open to us for a project of this size and type.

Alternative options considered

An option not to proceed was considered but rejected on the grounds that there is a pressing need for local provision for this cohort of vulnerable people.

196. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

197. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

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

198. BUDGET REPORT & MTFs UPDATE

As per item 184 & the exempt minutes.

199. BED BASED INTERMEDIATE CARE NURSING HOME BEDS

As per item 190.

200. TEMPLETON HALL & GARAGE SITE REDEVELOPMENT - CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARD TO DEVELOP 11 COUNCIL RENTED HOMES

As per item 191.

201. RED HOUSE YARD, 432 WEST GREEN RD, N15 3PJ

As per item 192 and the exempt minutes.

202. BUILDING AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

As per item 193 and exempt minutes.

203. HIGHWAY AND STREET LIGHTING TERM CONTRACTS

As per item 194 and exempt minutes.

204. LINDEN HOUSE ASSISTED LIVING ACCOMMODATION REFURBISHMENT - CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARD

As per item 195.

205. EXEMPT CABINET MINUTES

RESOLVED

To agree the exempt minutes of the 18th of June 2019.

206. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

None

CHAIR: Councillor Joseph Ejiofor

Signed by Chair

Date