

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON TUESDAY, 11TH FEBRUARY, 2020, 6.30pm

PRESENT:

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

Also in Attendance – Councillors: das Neves, Mitchell, Barnes, Hare, Hakata, Berryman, and Connor

151. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Leader referred to the notice of filming at meetings and attendees noted this information.

152. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Bull.

There were apologies for lateness from Councillor Hearn and she arrived just as item 3, urgent business was starting.

153. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business put forward.

154. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest put forward.

155. 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 exempt items on the agenda.

156. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 21st of January 2020 as a correct record of the meeting.

157. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

There were no matters referred to by Overview and Scrutiny as part of this item. The Overview and Scrutiny budget recommendations would be considered with item 9.

158. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

Deputation from Paul Burnham - Consultation on Service charges

Mr Burnham put forward representations concerning the 2020/21 Budget report and 2020 – 2025 MTFs, objecting to the proposed increase to the rent charges for the Council's 18 affordable rent tenancies within the Housing Revenue Account and further objecting to proposed increases in service charges as no consultation had taken place.

Mr Burnham commended the Council on its policy for supporting social rents rather than affordable rents and highlighted that there were still 18 properties with affordable rent tenancies, paying 80% of normal market rents and paying double the rate of Council rents. The deputation did not want these tenants to be forgotten and contended that they should be included in the Council rents scheme. The deputation expressed that the Mayor of London had created confusion on the definition of social rents and asked the Council to use the social rent formula as required by government guidance and not to set the rents at cap.

The deputation requested that the Council be open on how it sets every social rent in the borough, as this was the only way to provide certainty that they were charging tenants normal Council rent and no more.

Mr Burnham continued to object to the proposed services charge increases for tenants and leaseholders. He contended that the evidence was incontrovertible that something had gone wrong with converted properties cleaning service charges. The tenants were charged 12 months before the service began. He highlighted that there were tenant's charges for the leaseholder contribution in this financial year and Council tenants were set to pay leaseholder contributions for next year as well. This was while leaseholders were also paying contributions. In the deputation's view, this was a revenue driven service and they recommended that the Council deliver this particular service at nil charge to the tenants next year. The deputation felt that this proposal was justified, once Cabinet Members examined the figures.

The deputation highlighted that there was one service charge that had been consulted upon. This was the consultation was undertaken on estate parking. The deputation called on the Council to publish these findings. They contended that the results would demonstrate tenant's rejection of new and additional charges and would also reject the subsidy argument which was the main focus for the increase in charges.

The deputation asserted that tenants and leaseholders would not be spilt and were unified in wanting a say in the charges being put to them. There was £18m of proposed income arising from charges made to residents without a consultation.

The deputation concluded by asking the Cabinet to work with residents instead of against them, especially with the current government in place. The deputation called on the Cabinet to make the proposed changes put forward by them and offered to work with the Council to make these changes.

The Cabinet Member responded to the deputation, thanking them for the issues that they had raised which were noted.

It was the Cabinet Member's understanding that there was no requirement to carry out a consultation where only an increase in tenant service charge was proposed. There was no requirement even where a change is proposed in what services are charged for.

The Cabinet Member continued to advise that the existing policy provides that tenant's service charges are set at a level that recovers the cost of the service, and no more than that. The amount tenants pay increases where the cost of providing the service is anticipated to increase and reduces when the cost of providing the service reduces.

The Cabinet Member emphasised that in preparing the service charge for 2020/21, consideration was given to consultation, and the Council took into account its methodology for calculating the services charges and this was entirely consistent with its existing policy, on which there was consultation. Therefore, under the policy, there was no expectation or requirement to consult further.

The Cabinet Member expressed that the Council would not be consulting on this matter and further outlined that the proposed tenant service charges were in any case set to increase by an average of 1.1%. This was less than the rate of inflation and so represented a reduction in cost in real terms.

The Cabinet Member further responded to the issues raised on the 18 homes being charged affordable rents. He reiterated the Council's programme for delivering 1,000 Council homes at Council rents was founded on the idea that these will be new homes at true social rents and this was known in technical jargon as formula rents.

The Cabinet Member advised that existing Council homes, when they come up for re-letting, were let at these formula rents and it was not the current policy to convert any of the Councils homes to Affordable Rent or any other type of rent.

The Cabinet Member accepted that there was an anomaly that these 18 households are charged a higher rent than tenants who move into all these other Council homes and was sympathetic to the arguments made that these rents should be reduced. However, it would be premature to change this situation at this meeting.

The Cabinet Member outlined that Council stock had previously fallen into disrepair and pointed to the low level of decent homes due to historic decisions made by previous administrations to hold all rents down to a level that starved the HRA of the funds that it needed to reinvest in the stock. The move towards formula rents that was introduced by the last Labour Government's rent restructuring programme and the lifting of the HRA borrowing cap provided the means to change this situation.

The Cabinet Member underlined that the Budget report was making the funds available not just to finally bring stock up to the decent homes standard, but to make it fire safe and fit for the low carbon future. It was also funding a new generation of Council housing. All this was based on borrowing against the Council's rental income.

So to make any change to that projected rental income, without properly modelling the impacts on these hugely important investments would not be appropriate.

The Cabinet Member concluded by acknowledging the anomaly and providing assurance that he would instruct officers to urgently model the impact of this proposed change and, if it was viable for the HRA, the Cabinet Member committed to bring a report addressing this point back to the first Cabinet meeting where it was feasible to do so.

159. 2020/21 BUDGET AND 2020-2025 MTFS REPORT

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which sought approval to the proposals concerning the 2020/21 Budget and five-year Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). The budget aimed to provide a clear financial plan during this unprecedented period of uncertainty for Local Authority budgeting.

The Cabinet Member was pleased to announce that the budget gap of £0.6m, highlighted in the last budget report to Cabinet, had been bridged without needing to make any further reductions to Service budgets.

The Cabinet Member outlined two transposition errors within table 8.6 of the budget report for Cabinet to note

- In column 5 (31/3/23), the first line should read £1,270,764, not £12,709,764. The subtotal should read £1,285,516 not £12,724,516.
- In column 7 (31/3/25), the second line should read £8,221 not £82,211. The subtotal should read £1,525,796 not £1,599,786.

These errors were purely presentational, and the underlying figures which have been used throughout the Council's MTFS model were correct. They would be corrected in the final version of the report to Full Council. It was also noted that they were portrayed correctly in the Treasury Management Strategy Statement that had been considered at Overview and Scrutiny and has just been approved by Corporate Committee.

The Cabinet Member continued to outline how the budget was continuing to support the manifesto commitments and the progress made in relation to:

- The Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) which was extended to a maximum of 100% for least well-off families with children.
- Ongoing investment into a school meal pilot and a youth services programme, a large portion of which has been used to fund the Summer Holiday Programme which offered more than 150 activities with 19,602 young people taking part.
- A funding commitment of more than £4m to ensure that staff providing care services to adults through our partner organisations are paid at least the London Living Wage.

- Increasing apprenticeship numbers within the Council and across other organisations within the Borough.
- To invest £50m in our school buildings over the next 5 years.
- Secured more than £60m funding from the Mayor of London to support this housing programme.
- 750 additional trees to be planted in the next couple of years and are investing more than £6m in a School Streets programme aimed at reducing pollution around our schools.

The Cabinet Member was pleased to be able to propose a balanced Budget for 2020/21 which did not utilise any balances and enabled the Council to invest funds to continue to deliver the shared Borough Plan outcomes and make the Borough a place to be proud to live and work in.

The Leader invited Councillor Connor, Vice Chair of Overview and Scrutiny to further present the Scrutiny budget recommendations which were included at appendix 11 of the attached report.

Cllr Connor outlined that the specific budget scrutiny recommendations were mainly around risk of delivery and further noted the Cabinet's response to these concerns.

Cllr Connor was pleased that last year's recommendation to provide more detailed information on the capital programme was acted upon and it had enabled a clearer and more structured scrutiny process.

There were specific recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny Committee around the budget scrutiny process as a whole, including future Budget Scrutiny sessions being provided with information on the year-on-year position for savings proposals across the current MTFS period as well as the year-on-year ongoing position of the implementation of capital projects across each of the priority areas. This would allow Overview and Scrutiny to track the rolling budget positions rather than just the new proposals. The Committee also requested to receive the MTFS savings tracker that was submitted to Cabinet as part of future budget scrutiny papers.

It was also requested that future budget scrutiny reports to both Panels and the main Committee include the following information:

- Comment by finance officers on MTFS savings over 5 years
- Pressure on the Councils budget
- Also total growth
- Actual savings both new and ongoing for each of the five Scrutiny panel areas
- Information on Budget reserves both earmarked and un-earmarked
- An account of the position of the Housing Revenue Account
- Any particular pressures on the Councils position – for instance DSG
- Comment by finance officers on overall Capital budget over the five year MTFS

- Actual capital budget spend within each of the Scrutiny panel areas, both new and ongoing high level information
- Capital budget information already provided within the Treasury management report.
- Revenue Budget Implications already stated within TMR

Cllr Connor felt that having the above information was an important part of the budget scrutiny process as the scrutiny panels needed to be able to scrutinise their budgets in the wider context of the budget implications in their area. This context then allowed the savings proposed to be clearly set out and scrutinised. This would include both new and ongoing savings within the MTFS.

In understanding both sets of savings, meaningful recommendations from the panels to Overview and Scrutiny could be made. Also in having all the capital and revenue proposals clearly laid out supported compilation of the final recommendations to Cabinet.

Cllr Connor thanked finance officers for their support during this process and their agreement to these measures and the more detailed section under the heading 'General' on pages 153- 155 of the attached report pack, which would ensure both the capital and revenue budget scrutiny process continued to be strengthened.

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

- The report was forecasting that there could be a lower number of residents eligible for Council tax reduction scheme due to changes to the benefit system.
- Cllr Brabazon recommended looking at the implications of this.
- In relation to service charge increases for conversions and landscaping works outside properties, the Cabinet Member was concerned if Homes for Haringey were charging tenants for work not completed and would make enquiries to find out, if the case. If tenants and lessees did not want this work done, as outlined by Cllr Barnes, then it seemed unfair for them to pay for this. However, this issue required further examination and there would likely be contractual tenancy issues and leaseholder agreements, in order to ascertain if they contained maintenance obligations. Also when these types of works were carried out the charges would be set out and section 20 notice issued to leaseholders. Therefore, this was not an issue to be resolved at this meeting.
- With regards to the financial benefits of the commitment to provide London Living wage to staff providing care services to adults through the Council's partner organisations, essentially the costs were more initially but there were subsequent cost mitigations as it secured stable provision and supply of care which were essential to authority. Also, this facilitated a different relationship between Council and care suppliers. The report set out some of the service changes that were expected to be put in place such as better use of technology.

RESOLVED

1. To consider the outcome of the budget consultation as set out in Appendix 10, to be included in the report to Council. Having taken this into account this report does not propose any amendment to the Budget for 2020/21 nor to the MTFS 2020/25.
2. To approve the responses made to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommendations following their consideration of the draft budget proposals as set out in Appendix 11. Having taken this into account this report does not propose any amendment to the Budget for 2020/21 nor to the MTFS 2020/25.
3. To propose approval to the Council of the 2020/21 Budget and MTFS 2020/25 Budget Reduction Proposals as set out in Appendix 2.
4. To propose approval to the Council of the 2020/21 General Fund Revenue Budget as set out in Appendix 1, including specifically a General Fund budget requirement of £242,292m, but subject to final decisions of the levying and precepting bodies and the final local government finance Settlement.
5. To propose approval to the Council of the General Fund Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2020-2025 as set out in Appendix 1.
6. To propose approval to the Council that the overall Haringey element of Council Tax to be set by London Borough of Haringey for 2020/21 will be £1,372.55 per Band D property, which represents a 1.99% increase on the 2019/20 Haringey element and with an additional 2% for the Adult Social Care Precept amount.
7. To note the Council Tax Base of the London Borough of Haringey, as agreed by the Section 151 Officer under delegated authority (Article 4.01(b), Part 2, of the Constitution), as 78,543 for the financial year 2020/21.
8. To propose approval to the Council of the 2020/21 Housing Revenue Account budget as set out in Table 9.3.
9. To propose approval to the Council of the Housing Revenue Account Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2020-2025 as set out in Section 9.6 and Table 9.3.
10. To approve the changes to the rent levels for residents in temporary accommodation, Council tenants in General Needs, Sheltered/Supported, and Affordable homes reflecting the recent rent guideline requiring Councils in England to increase rent by no more than the Consumer Price Index (CPI) at

- September of the previous year plus 1% This will increase the average weekly rents as set out in Tables 9.1 and 9.2.
11. To agree the changes to service charges to tenants as set out in Appendix 8.
 12. To propose approval to the Council of the 2020/21 – 2024/25 General Fund capital programme detailed in Appendix 4.
 13. To propose approval to the Council of the 2020/21 – 2024/25 Housing Revenue Account (HRA) capital programme detailed in Appendix 7.
 14. To propose approval to the Council of the Capital Strategy detailed in Section 8 of this report.
 15. To propose approval to Council of the strategy on the use of flexible capital receipts to facilitate the delivery of efficiency savings including capitalisation of redundancy costs (Appendix 6).
 16. To propose to the Council the Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB) allocations for 2020/21 of £261.9m as set out in Appendix 9.
 17. To note the funding to be distributed to primary and secondary schools for 2020/21 based on the figures advised to Schools Forum and submitted to the Education Funding Agency in January 2019 set out in Section 10.
 18. To note the budgets (including the use of brought forward DSG) for the Schools Block, Central Services Block, High Needs Block and Early Years Block as per Appendix 9.
 19. To delegate to the Director of Children Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families, the power to amend the Delegated Schools Budget to take account of any changes to Haringey's total schools funding allocation by the Education and Skills Funding Agency.
 20. To delegate to the Section 151 officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, the power to make further changes to the 2020/21 budget proposals to Full Council up to a maximum limit of £1.0m.

Reasons for decision

The Council has a statutory requirement to set a balanced budget for 2020/21 and this report forms a key part of the budget setting process by setting out the forecast

funding and expenditure for that year. Additionally, in order to ensure the Council's finances for the medium term are maintained on a sound basis, this report also sets out the funding and expenditure assumptions for the following four years in the form of a Medium-Term Financial Strategy.

Alternative options considered

The Cabinet must consider how to deliver a balanced 2020/21 Budget and sustainable MTFS over the five-year period 2020/25, to be reviewed and ultimately adopted at the meeting of Full Council on 24th February 2020.

Clearly there are options available to achieve a balanced budget and the Council has developed the proposals contained in this report for determining levels of both income and service provision in this report. These take account of the Council's priorities, the extent of the estimated funding shortfall and the Council's overall financial position.

These proposals have been subject to consultation both externally and through the Overview & Scrutiny process. The outcomes from these consultations, which are expanded on in Section 11 and Appendices 10 & 11 to this report, have been considered by Cabinet. After due consideration, Cabinet considers that the issues raised are addressed in the budget put forward in this report.

160. BOROUGH PLAN 2019-2023 YEAR 2 DELIVERY PLAN

The Leader introduced this report which set out what would be delivered in the second year of the Council's four-year Borough Plan (2019-23), including resource and budget considerations. It also looked back at what had been delivered in the first year of the plan.

The Leader highlighted that the report focussed on what the Council had achieved so far, and what the Council needed to focus on in the year to come. There was a lot to be proud of. For example:

- On housing, the Council have restarted Council house building in Haringey and hired the people to deliver this ambitious programme; As of May, 350, of the first 1,000 planned Council homes will have started on site.
- From April this year, more care workers across Haringey would be paid the London Living Wage of £10.75 an hour – giving them the pay they deserve and further boosting spending power in our local economy.
- The real strides made to bring Council services in-house again.

The Leader noted there was still more to do, and that the Council was ambitious and optimistic about what can be achieved. The report demonstrated that real change was possible, that the Council was making real progress.

In response to questions from Councillors Hare, das Neves and Palmer, the following information was provided:

- Regarding recording base line satisfaction levels for park improvement, the Leader confirmed that the Council would continue to improve on that level, year on year.
- Regarding improving cycling infrastructure in the borough, the Leader noted this was the intention of the Council, however, consultation with residents was necessary on any proposed routes and that took time to complete. It was the aspiration of the borough to improve environmentally friendly transport options, such as improving cycling infrastructure. The Borough Plan outlined the steps the Council would take to becoming a healthier, active and greener place. Wherever possible, the Council would consult with residents to ensure that their views were considered in any proposals.
- Acknowledging the delay between the Fairness Commission's consultation events and its reports publication date, the Leader noted there was a set process that needed to be adhered to in the production of the Fairness Commission's report. That process included ensuring that those who participated in the consultation were satisfied with the report's outcomes. The Leader assured that residents would be consulted in the future on the Fairness Commission's progress as their views were integral.
- Regarding 1.6 – '*Ensuring an appropriate mix of new supply in terms of family sized homes and supported/specialist housing*' Officers apologised for the apparently missing information and would explore locating and providing this information.[It has since been clarified that the information against points 1.4 and 1.5 also applied to point 1.6 and that this was a presentational issue with the pagination of the report pack]
- Regarding the High Road West Scheme, the Cabinet Member for Strategic Finance and Regeneration noted the Council were in ongoing discussions with the Mayor of London to include more social homes. The Council had also been working with the local residents and businesses on the Scheme. The Cabinet Member noted there was a scrutiny review of the Scheme but that it was business as usual and the Scheme would continue to be worked on whilst that review took place. There had been a delay in the progress of the Scheme due in part to the recent Deputy Mayor of London (who the Council had been liaising with as this Scheme was part of the GLA's Affordable Housing Programme) having become an MP. A new Deputy Mayor had been appointed but had yet to assume their role and duties.
- The Leader noted that the Council had been developing a High Street Strategy which would look at improving all high streets within the Borough. The production of the Strategy would involve local businesses and Councillors and would be available soon.
- Regarding tree planting, the Leader confirmed that it was the intention of the Council to plant as many trees as it could in any one year. Officers noted that

the Council had been seeking external funding to assist in tree planting, such as from the GLA and recent success with that.

- The Director for Environment and Neighbourhoods would provide further information to Cllr das Neves on tree canopy targets. Cabinet Member informed that, as a result of the music band 1975 playing at Finsbury Park, 1,975 trees were to be planted in Haringey Hackney and Islington.
- The Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability assured that despite there being no direct budget for the Air Quality Action Plan, this would largely be delivered through other budgets. For example, the School Streets programme would be delivering better air quality.

RESOLVED

To approve the Year 2 Delivery Plans for each of the five Borough Plan priorities, set out in appendices 1 to 5 of the attached report.

Reasons for decision

To agree the delivery priorities for 2020-21, the second year of the four-year Borough Plan. This provides context for related decisions including on budget setting, engagement with residents and management of staff.

Alternative options considered

The alternative option would be not to set out delivery plans for each year of the Borough Plan. However, Cabinet agreed in July 2019, when it agreed the Borough Plan Year 1 Delivery Plans, that prioritisation of delivery on a yearly basis was important to help the Council understand where to focus its efforts and resources.

161. ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced the report which provided an overview of the Council's Asset Management Plan and would cover a five-year period from 2020-2025.

It was noted that the Asset Management Plan (AMP) was an important tool in achieving the Council's policy and service ambitions. The AMP is part of the capital strategy and is the context for capital investment decisions, setting out major initiatives and priorities for capital investment, as well as investment required for compliance and carbon management planning.

The Cabinet Member outlined that the plan's focus is how the Council uses its land and property assets to deliver its Borough Plan priorities. This plan provided this important overview and included a number of important principles and plans which were already in place. The plan also included the Council's new Disposals and Acquisitions Policy. The Cabinet Member advised that in some areas there is more to

do, so the outcome of further work and future decisions will be incorporated in the first annual review of the plan.

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

- There were no reduction in services arising from, potentially, locating a swimming pool on the Wood Green Library site.
- With regards to the consideration of fire safety in Council homes and inclusion of sprinklers as a potential addition and cost for future assets in the AMP, the housing revenue account business plan had set aside funding for fire safety measures in Council homes. The Council still needed to await outcome of the changes to building regulations following the Grenfell fire. It was not fully certain if it will be a requirement for buildings to have sprinklers. Also it would be important to await other potential additional recommended works as fitting in sprinklers would, in itself, be disruptive to tenants and leaseholders. If further regulations were issued for additional safety works, this could mean taking forward two lots of works. Therefore, there was a need to have clarity on this from the government before any action was taken. The budget included an allocation for a prudent sum to make changes when they come through but at the moment the Council could not second guess the changes to regulations in respect of fitting sprinklers.

RESOLVED

1. To adopt the Asset Management Plan 2020-2025 (“AMP”) summarised at paragraph 6 and as attached as the Appendices 1 and 2 of this report.
2. To agree the Acquisitions and Disposals Policy set out in Appendix 1 (main AMP) section ‘Acquisitions, Disposals and Void Property’ and as summarised at paragraphs 6.4 – 6.5.
3. To agree the strategic recommendations of the commercial portfolio review set out in Appendix 1 (main AMP) section ‘Commercial Portfolio’ and as summarised in paragraph 6.6 and 6.7.

Reasons for decision

In August 2018, the Chartered Institute of Public Finance & Accounting (CIPFA) published its Strategic Asset Management Framework guidance for local authorities. The proposal to adopt and publish an Asset Management Plan as part of the 2020/21 budget strategy to ensure that the Council uses its land and property assets effectively to deliver its service and Borough Plan priorities is an important part of ensuring that the Council complies with that guidance.

Alternative Options

If the Council does not publish an Asset Management Plan there will be a gap in the budget strategy for 2020/21 to 2023/24. The publication of an AMP is a requirement of CIPFA.

162. WARDS CORNER POLICY ADVISORY GROUP REPORT ON THE OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF THE SEVEN SISTERS MARKET - NON KEY

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration introduced this report which asked Cabinet to note the work of the Wards Corner Policy Advisory Group (PAG), which was established to review the options for the future management of the Seven Sisters Market in Tottenham Green Ward, in response to ongoing concern regarding the current management of the market.

At the outset, the Cabinet Member stressed that the Council had no ownership of the Seven Sisters Market and that the PAG's recommendations were not for the Council to implement. It was hoped that the key stakeholders would work together to ensure the recommendations were met.

The Cabinet Member informed that he had worked with Tottenham Ward Councillors to commission the independent review and enable this important conversation on the future management of the Seven Sisters Market to take place with key partners and stakeholders. As PAG, we have been very clear that we want the Seven Sisters Market, which includes the Latin Village, to be the best it can possibly be and recognise the social value that it brings to Haringey. That was why, even though the Council itself has no ownership or management role in the market, we recognise that the status quo was not working for all parties and we are committed to engaging with all the key stakeholders to find a sustainable solution for the future management and operation of the market that enables this important trading community to thrive in the future.

The Cabinet Member informed that, in recommending the Partnership Model as the proposed solution for future management and operation of this market, the review had considered the particular circumstances that the Seven Sisters Market finds itself in and balanced the importance of social value with the requirement for a viable operation. The PAG was confident, therefore, that the Partnership Model combined the benefits of an operator model with the right governance oversight from the key stakeholders.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that the approach was entirely consistent with the Community Wealth Building objectives of the Borough Plan which sought to build the strength, depth and wealth of our local economy and our Business Pledge to support SME businesses. And, it was vitally important that the key stakeholders came together to develop this model further to suit their combined requirements and aspirations.

The Cabinet Member was pleased this work had engaged with key stakeholders, including the majority of permitted traders as well as Grainger, TfL, the Mayor of London, the Assembly Member for Enfield and Haringey, Council Officers and Tottenham Councillors past and present in an effort to balance the needs and interests of all parties.

On behalf of PAG, the Cabinet Member paid a special thanks to the key stakeholders for their participation in this critical review and invited them to work collaboratively to implement all of the review's recommendations and ensure a successful Seven Sisters Market.

In response to questions from the Leader, Cllr Brabazon, Cllr Hare, Cllr Ibrahim, Cllr Chandwani, and Cllr Hakata, the following information was provided:

- The Cabinet Member informed that the Independent Market Expert had written to a number of key stakeholders, including the Tottenham MP who had not responded.
- The Cabinet Member clarified that the Council was not the owner of the site but had a role within the Section 106 agreement. It was anticipated that by Friday 14th February 2020, Grainger would appoint a new acting Market Facilitator. The Cabinet Member welcomed that step to ensure that there was someone to work with the traders to ensure the recommendations in the report were implemented.
- The Cabinet Member highlighted that the Market Facilitator and Market Operator were separate. It was expected that a permanent Market Facilitator would be appointed by April 2020.
- The Cabinet Member confirmed that Market Asset Management's (the Market Operator) lease with TfL in respect of the existing market was due to end in September 2020 and it was expected that lease would not be renewed. MAM would continue to be a key stakeholder in the partnership model until that lease came to an end. Therefore, for as long as MAM continued to be the Market Operator, that was the basis for which they would continue to be a key stakeholder.
- The Leader noted the Council fully supported the 15 recommendations (as outlined on pages 505 and 506) put forward by the PAG. The Leader also noted that on Grainger's website, they were committed to the Section 106 agreement, which included ensuring that rents did not go up by more than 2% a year for the duration of the temporary market and the first 30 months of the new market. The Leader assured that the Council was committed to ensuring that what was contained within the Section 106 agreement was honoured.
- The requirement, as set out in the Section 106 agreement, was to appoint a Market Facilitator.
- The Cabinet Member informed that the PAG had not looked at the historical aspects of Wards Corner but rather focussed on the future of the Seven Sisters Market. It was noted there had been a scrutiny review which had explored the historical aspects and Cabinet had responded to that review. The PAG looked

at how the Council could assist in using the influence available to it to ensure that the recommendations were actioned. The recommendations focussed on developing a viable operating model for the new market

- The Cabinet Member informed there had been no discussions between the Council and the traders of the market since the January 2020 Cabinet meeting.
- The Cabinet Member noted the Planning department had completed an internal piece of learning from the management of the Section 106, which it was monitoring.
- The Cabinet Member did not see a contradiction in what was written at paragraphs 4.2.2 and 4.2.4 of the PAG report. Paragraph 4.2.2 outlined the relationship between TfL and MAM. Paragraph 4.2.4 detailed there could be a future relationship between Grainger and MAM.

RESOLVED

1. To note the findings and recommendations of PAG's independent review of the future management models for the Seven Sisters Market.
2. To note that the Council has no role in the ownership or management of the market and therefore cannot implement the recommendations – it is for the key stakeholders to adopt and implement the recommendations of this review.

Reasons for decision

Members are being asked to note the findings and recommendations of the independent experts review.

Although the Council is not in a position to make a decision on the management and operation of the Seven Sisters Market, it has an important role to play in ensuring a sustainable management and governance model that has the support of all parties is agreed in order to secure a sustainable future for the Seven Sisters Market.

The Council also has an interest in the regeneration of Wards Corner and is in a development agreement with Grainger to bring forward this site.

Alternative options considered

As part of his review the independent market expert considered a series of market management model options before recommending a preferred model for further discussion with key stakeholders.

The review considered a shortlist of 12 market management models which were assessed against the following criteria agreed by PAG:

1. Ability to be affordable and self-financing
2. Have an effective management/operation structure with robust governance
3. Ability to be implemented within specified timeframes and resource/capability available
4. Ability to facilitate entrepreneurship, business support and growth
5. Ability to support social value by providing opportunities for local people
6. Ability to support and contribute to the place and offer

The review concluded that of the 12 shortlisted market models a total of 6 scored more than two thirds of the total weighted score. In accordance with the criteria agreed with PAG, the following 6 market models were provisionally accepted for further development and discussions with the key stakeholders.

1. Social Enterprise – Community Interest Company operates the market as a business with specific ethical focus
2. Cooperative – market owned and operated by the Traders for their cooperative benefit
3. Partnership – day to day management of the market by a third-party operator with strategic oversight delegated to a multi stakeholder board
4. Market Operator – market leased and operated by a third-party i.e. the current position
5. Arms-length – market operated by an ‘arms-length’ company of Grainger
6. Local Authority – market owned and operated directly by the LBH

The management and operational vehicle that is being recommended by the review is the Partnership Model. This model has been selected as, like all the 6 top scoring options, it can be implemented within required timescales and could be applied to any of the possible market locations, including the current Wards Corner development. Also, the model brings with it the expertise, knowledge base and resources that good operators with a proven track record can provide. Coupled with the additional oversight from the Board this will result in a highly effective solution that will address most of the key stakeholders’ issues, priorities and aspirations.

As current and future landlord TfL and Grainger are ultimately responsible for implementing the recommended management and operational model including the appointment of the operator.

163. ADMISSION TO SCHOOLS – DETERMINED ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2021/22

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced the report which outlined the statutory decisions required to determine the Council’s admission arrangements for the academic year 2021/22. The full range of reasons for agreeing the decision were set out from paragraph. 4.1 - 4.3 of the report.

RESOLVED

1. To determine the Council's admission arrangements for the academic year 2021/22 as set out in Appendices 1 – 4.
2. To agree the in-year fair access protocol (IYFAP) as set out in Appendix 5 to come into force from 1 March 2020.
3. To agree that the determined arrangements for all maintained primary and secondary schools in the borough are published on the Council's website by 15 March 2020 with an explanation of the right of any person or body, under the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Co-ordination of Admission Arrangements) Regulations 2012, to object to the Schools Adjudicator in specified circumstances.

Reasons for decision

The School Admissions Code 2014 requires all admission authorities to determine admission arrangements every year, even if they have not changed from previous years. Regulation 17 of the School Admissions Regulations 2012 also requires admission authorities to determine admission arrangements by 28 February in the determination year.

In addition, the Regulations require the admission authority (in this case the local authority) to publish on its website by 15 March in the determining year the determined arrangements of all maintained primary and secondary school and academies in the borough, advising the right to object to the Schools Adjudicator, where it is considered that the arrangement do not comply with the mandatory provisions of the School Admissions Code 2014.

The Council consults on its admission arrangements annually irrespective of whether or not there is a proposed change to the arrangements. This is to ensure transparency and openness on the contents of the admission arrangements and to allow all stakeholders to make representations which can then be considered as part of the determination of the arrangements.

Alternative options considered

This year we are not proposing a change to the oversubscription criteria for community and VC schools. While there are other ways admission arrangements can influence the allocation of school places set out in the Schools Admissions Code 2014 (e.g. designated catchment areas, identified feeder schools or giving priority in our oversubscription criteria to children eligible for the early years premium/ pupil premium), no alternative option is being considered at the time of writing this report.

164. THE FUTURE OF STAMFORD HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced this report which set out the result of the statutory representation period on the proposal to amalgamate Stamford Hill Primary with Tiverton Primary School.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that this report was the final in a series of reports that had been presented to Cabinet over the amalgamation of Stamford Hill Primary with Tiverton Primary. All required consultations had now taken place and the report sought the formal agreement of Cabinet to agree the amalgamation from September 2020.

RESOLVED

1. To note that no comments or objections were received during the 4-week representation period despite consulting widely with all relevant parties.
2. To note the revenue budget to operate Stamford Hill Primary School successfully in the future is severely diminished with the school's very low pupil numbers.
3. To note the equalities impact assessment at Appendix 4.
4. To approve the proposal to amalgamate Stamford Hill Primary School with Tiverton Primary School. This will mean the closure of Stamford Hill Primary School from 31 August 2020 with displaced pupils transferring to Tiverton Primary School at the beginning of the 2020/21 academic year.

The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny has agreed that the call-in procedure shall not apply to this decision as the action being taken is urgent and time critical and any delay in implementation caused by the call-in procedure would seriously prejudice the Council's or the public's interests. This is in accordance with Part 4, Section H, and Paragraph 18 (a) and (b) of the Council Constitution.

Reasons for recommendation

Following an 'inadequate' inspection judgement by Ofsted in November 2018, the Regional Schools Commissioner, on behalf of the Secretary of State and the Department of Education, placed a directive academy order on the school. Since April 2016, the Department has issued directive academy orders to maintained schools that Ofsted has rated as inadequate. Its aims for these schools to open as sponsored academies.

Significant concerns were raised about the long-term sustainability of Stamford Hill Primary School in terms of the vulnerability of its financial stability and its historic ability to attract pupils to the school. Based on the low level of demand for school places locally and the expected future declining demand, the Council considers that Stamford Hill Primary and other local schools will continue to face difficult financial challenges because classes won't be full. Schools are largely funded on a 'per pupil' basis i.e. how many pupils attend the school.

The Council has a duty of care to ensure children in its schools are able to receive a good education and to access the full curriculum. A school with a declining roll will be

challenged to do this effectively because of inevitable financial pressures from reduced funding.

Schools in the local area currently have a significant surplus of places and current school roll projections do not indicate any future demographic growth before 2026/27 and possibly beyond. In view of this, the Regional Schools Commissioner agreed for the Council to consider alternative options in parallel with the pursuit of Academisation.

The Council's preferred option and one that provides a long-term sustainable solution to local falling demand, is an **amalgamation** between Stamford Hill Primary School and Tiverton Primary. Tiverton Primary is a local school located on other side of Seven Sisters Road, within a 5-minute walking distance to Stamford Hill Primary. The proposal would mean the closure of Stamford Hill Primary with displaced pupils being accommodated by Tiverton Primary School, to create a single two form entry school operating from one site.

Full consultation has been undertaken over a period of six months including meetings with staff, governors, and parents, along with other interested stakeholders. On the 27 November 2019, Council's Cabinet agreed to publish a statutory notice commencing the statutory representation period, which was the last opportunity for people and organisations to comment on the proposal.

Alternative options considered

A number of options on the future of Stamford Hill Primary School were presented to local stakeholders during the consultation periods before the publication of the statutory notice.

All alternative options were rejected because they did not offer a viable solution in the context of falling demand. Local stakeholders were informed of the reasons these alternative options were less desirable than the Council's preferred option of amalgamation:

- A. **Keeping Stamford Hill open:** This option does not provide a long-term sustainable solution to falling local demand and leaves Stamford Hill and 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 again 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 reduced revenue from 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 the part of the earlier consultations.

Stamford Hill Primary will not be educationally or financially viable in the future with low pupil numbers and falling demand that is projected to remain static until 2026/27 and possibly beyond. There is a significant risk that the school will not be able to provide pupils with a rounded education that meets their academic, social and emotional needs. Keeping the school open would therefore have a negative impact on raising standards and narrowing the attainment gap and would not be in the best interests of educational provision in the area.

165. CLOSURE OF OSBORNE GROVE NURSING HOME PENDING REDEVELOPMENT

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced the report which provided feedback from the statutory consultation to close the home in order to enable a redeveloped improved facility with increased beds for this nursing home. The report included, the equalities impact assessment of the proposal, the analysis of the issues and the legal duties required make a decision on the proposal to close the Home.

The Cabinet Member referred to the Cabinet decision in July 2019, to build a new 70-bed nursing home on the Osborne Grove site, which demonstrated the Council's commitment to providing high-quality nursing care in the borough and represented a major investment in new facilities. As demand for nursing care continues to grow there was a need to increase the supply of residential nursing care places which the redevelopment would provide for.

The Feasibility Study had determined that the redevelopment of Osborne Grove would have implications for the current residents, in terms of health and personal wellbeing due to the inevitable disruption that would result from the building work and site preparation. Therefore an extensive consultation has been undertaken and this report sets out the findings and recommendations to proceed.

Following a question from Councillor Barnes, it was noted that residents of the care home had been moved to alternative 'good' or 'outstanding' provision.

RESOLVED

1. To consider and take into account the feedback from the consultation set out in section 6.

2. To consider and take into account the Equalities Impact Assessment undertaken at Appendix 1 which includes actions proposed to mitigate the impact of the proposed closure on protected groups.
3. Having considered the above, to agree to the closure of Osborne Grove Nursing Home to allow for the demolition works and construction of a new 70 bed nursing home on site.
4. To agree that the closure be subject to an implementation plan that includes:
 - a) engagement with all stakeholders including service users and carers;
 - b) the re-assessment or review of the care and support needs of service users with a view to identifying suitable alternative provision to meet assessed needs; and
 - c) Individual transition plan that is sensitive to the needs of service users, mitigates the impact of the closure, ensures the process of change is safely handled and the care and support needs of the service user continue to be met.
5. To agree that the closure is managed in accordance with the Managing Care Home Closures Good Practice Guide and Management Checklist approved by the CQC.

Reasons for decision

In June 2018 a decision was taken by Cabinet to stop the previously agreed closure of the Home, pending a feasibility study to be undertaken for the future development of the site. Part of this decision was that the existing residents should be allowed to remain in the Home if they choose, pending the outcome of the feasibility study report.

In July 2019 the feasibility report was presented to Cabinet and they agreed to endorse the preferred option: 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. The feasibility study considered the viability of the current residents in the home remaining on site during demolition and construction works. There were likely to be significant impact on their health and wellbeing. The highlighted impacts include but are not limited to: a) excessive noise levels; b) general health and safety; c) demolition and construction dust and air quality; d) security of the care home in a construction site; and e) the likely need to relocate residents twice. The development could not safely commence with residents on site given the level of disturbance. The Home would have to close and residents moved to suitable alternative accommodation that will meet their care and support needs. Therefore, in September 2019, Cabinet decided to consult residents, their family members and carers and other stakeholders for their views on the proposal to close the Home.

The consultation commenced on Monday 7th October, 2019 and closed on Sunday 5th January 2020. The feedback from the consultation are set out in section 6 of this report. There is support as well as opposition to the proposal to close the Home. There is concern about the suitable alternative accommodation to be provided to

residents and that a relatively new building is going to be demolished and that the beds should be filled. But there is also support for the proposed expanded provision.

The proposed closure will be managed in accordance with “The Managing Care Home Closures” Guidance which aims to ensure that, where temporary or permanent care home closure situations arise, there is a joined-up and effective response from all partners involved to minimise as much as possible the impact on people using services, their families, carers and advocates and to keep them as fully informed and involved as possible throughout the change. Thorough assessments of both needs and risks, on an individual basis and for individual plans would be developed. This will ensure that suitable alternative nursing accommodation is provided to residents. Also, that the transition to their new nursing homes are handled safely.

The health and wellbeing of the residents are a priority for the Council and their care and support needs will continue to be met. The proposed new expanded 70 bed nursing provision including the clinic site will significantly improve the provision for the elderly in the Borough. It will ensure that current and future needs for nursing home provision are met. It will maximise the whole use of the site. It will create services that are more flexible, are more personalised and give greater choice. The new provision will have better long-term outcomes for people at lower cost and would ensure that the Council is better prepared for an ageing population. The closure of the Home and move of residents to suitable alternative nursing home would enable these outcomes to be achieved.

Alternative options considered

The option to retain the current 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.

As part of the detailed feasibility study that was conducted, options for being able to accommodate the remaining residents on site were considered but this in itself would require a move to another part of the building and presented considerable risks to wellbeing and quality of life. Therefore this was not deemed appropriate.

The option of not consulting on the proposal to close the home and relocate residents to allow for the preferred development Option was considered and rejected. Fairness demands that residents, carers and other stakeholders are consulted before a final decision is made.

166. COMMUNITY EQUIPMENT CONTRACT

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced this report which considered the variation of the contract value with Medequip Assistive Technologies over the next 3 years.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that the provision of community equipment supported vulnerable people and their families to maintain healthy, safe and independent lives within their own homes, reducing the need for more complex and costly care, helping support the Council's budget position. It was therefore positive that demand and therefore the volumes of equipment provided have increased and the proposal in this paper will enable this to continue for the next three years.

RESOLVED

1. To approve variation of the contract value over the next 3 years, increasing it by £3.6million (£1.2m per year), from April 2020 to March 2023.
2. To approve a two-year extension of the contract from April 2021 to March 2023.

Reasons for decision

Cabinet originally approved a contract value of £5 million in February 2017 for the 4-year duration of the contract ending March 31st, 2021, with the option to extend for a further 1+1 years or 7.2m over the full term

Since then;

- Additional services have been granted permission to procure through this contract, namely Special Educational Needs & Disabilities (SEND), Paediatric Therapy Team at Whittington and Community Alarm Team (CAS) who procure their stock through the contract.
- Additional community equipment has also been made available to facilitate hospital discharges, prevent hospital admissions and to enable the residents of Haringey to remain in their home environment. Equipment includes, specialist Chairs, the Installation of key safes and manual Hoists.

All of the above contributed to a 22% increase in spend across the whole contract from £1.34 million in 2017-18 to £1.64 million in 2018-19. The current year 2019-20 has projected a further 10% an increase to £1.8 million.

Of the £1.64 million spent in 2018-19 only £614,000 was attributable to Adult Social Care with the remaining (£1.02 million) being re-charged back to other services namely;

- Haringey CCG - £839,000
- Community Alarm Services - £77,000
- Special Educational Needs & Disabilities - £62,000
- Whittington Paediatric Therapies - £47,000

The CCG figure of £839,000 represents an increase in spending of 16% from the previous financial year as opposed to just over a 1% increase by Adult Social Care. Therefore, it is expected that any increased spending will be attributable to the CCG and they will be recharged accordingly.

Given the reasons already highlighted, the original value will not suffice until the end of the contract.

Alternative options considered

The London Consortium completed an options appraisal where re-tendering was considered. However, given the price efficiencies, value for money and quality of delivery demonstrated it was concluded that this would not be beneficial option and would risk disrupting service provision.

167. AWARD OF CONTRACT TO A POSITIVE BEHAVIOURAL SUPPORT (PBS) PROVIDER FROM PBS FRAMEWORK

The Cabinet Member was delighted to present the report which enabled the Council to bring back into use two sites at Waltheof Gardens for day opportunities for people with a range of needs. The key focus of the report was the provision of care and support to people with complex learning disabilities and autism, potentially with behaviours that challenge, in a day opportunities setting to enable them to lead fulfilling lives.

The Cabinet Member advised that the Council were using the Positive Behaviour Support Framework because the people taking up this provision will have a range of needs which can be best supported by the tailored and specialist offer of a skilled positive behaviour support provider. This provider was a voluntary sector organisation delivering London Living Wage to all its employees and who would be working with the Council to enhance staff skills and capability in this area.

Further to considering exempt information at item 26,

RESOLVED

1. To agree an increase to the total value of the PBS Framework from £7,000,000 to £10,500,000; and
2. Pursuant to CSO 7.01 (b) (by selecting one or more contractors from a Framework) and CSO 9.07.01(d) (All contracts valued at £500,000 or more may only be awarded by Cabinet), to award a contract for PBS day opportunities services to the successful bidder for a period of four years (4) from 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2024 and a maximum value of £3,500,000 (three million five hundred thousand pounds) under the PBS Framework.

Reasons for decision

The PBS framework was let in 2017 at a value of £7,000,000 (seven million pounds) over a four-year period. Whilst take-up of the framework was slow at the start, there has been renewed interest as the Council has redeveloped three Council owned assets and brought two new and significant services into the borough: supported living

provision at Linden Road for people with very complex needs and day opportunities provision on two sites at Waltheof Gardens, again for people with complex learning disabilities and autism. The nature of the positive behaviour support (PBS) service offered is highly specialised to meet the complex and varied needs of the individuals involved. The fact that these services are coming on stream together means that the value of the framework needs to be increased, with the cost of the approach exceeding the original estimates. The framework did not guarantee any volume or value of work to the providers admitted to it. It remains the case that the scope of the framework will not change, and that the PBS service delivery approach will return cost efficiencies and assist the Council to meet its Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) savings targets.

All five framework participants were invited to tender. The tenderers' proposals were evaluated using a 50% quality and 50% price weighting and, on this basis, the recommended Provider is deemed to be the most economically advantageous tender representing the best value option to deliver the required service.

Alternative options considered

The option not to proceed was rejected as there is a strong local commitment to opening a new day opportunities service for adults with learning disabilities and autism at the Waltheof Gardens site.

Three (3) options were considered for delivering this specialist provision: A complete outsourcing model from the Council's existing framework, an in-house service also delivering to a PBS model, and a hybrid model combining a mixture of in-house and a specialist PBS provider service provision.

An options appraisal was completed to consider how best the service should be provided. It was recognised that in-house services can give the Council greater control over the care that is provided – delivering improvements and minimising risks. However, financial modelling showed that a pure in-house service was not ready to take on the highly specialist service at this point and therefore was not in a position to balance the cost and quality requirements against the available budget.

A complete outsourcing model was considered but the difficulty of leasing the building to the provider made this financially unviable as the cost of the lease was prohibitive for a service which would be starting from scratch, that would need time to scale up over time, whilst having to cover the cost of the lease.

The options appraisal recommended a hybrid model with an in-house service managing the building, thereby removing the necessity for a lease, with the care and support service separately procured through the PBS Framework.

The key benefit of the PBS framework is that it gives the flexibility to step down service users' packages of care over time. The payment model for a PBS provider on the Framework is outcomes related: 80% of the flat rate weekly fee will be paid monthly in arrears based on sustainment of placement and remaining 20% of flat weekly fee will be paid pro-rata, quarterly in arrears linked to delivery of basket of outcomes. When services are sourced using the PBS Framework, 15% of the care

and support costs will be paid by the Big Lottery, Commissioning Better Outcomes Fund.

The PBS framework is delivered by a highly skilled workforce and it is built in through the framework agreement that Haringey staff will benefit from direct input into their skills development. This includes training, sharing of best practice, shadowing both management and practice and building strategies and skills to deliver this model of care and support. Such an approach is aimed at ensuring that Haringey's directly employed staff are in a better position to carry out such specialist and highly challenging work in the future.

The opportunity to pass on and develop in-house skills is reflected in the approach undertaken here to commission this service for a fixed period. This supports the option for an in-house service to be developed.

168. CANNING CRESCENT MENTAL HEALTH RECOVERY CENTRE

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced this report which set out how the Council and NHS can contribute to meeting local need by bringing together a range of services in a single approach at Canning Crescent, recently acquired by the Council.

The Cabinet Member welcomed this proposal coming forward as part of the manifesto commitment to improving health and wellbeing in Haringey. The model of recovery services proposed for Canning Crescent have learnt from services and research around the world so would help provide the highest quality of services for residents.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that the Council was committed to the services being co-produced with residents who have lived experience of mental health conditions, building on the excellent work already happening at the Council's Clarendon Recovery College. Moving to Canning Crescent and integrating with other services, will allow the creation of more jobs and volunteering opportunities for residents living with mental illness.

The Cabinet Member noted that the services here were a key part of delivering on the vision for early intervention and would help to prevent homelessness, hospitalisation, relationship breakdowns and other harmful life events. The Council's proposal sustained the best of this award-winning building, in order to provide a therapeutic and attractive environment that would be accessible and inclusive for people with a range of needs and demonstrate our commitment to providing positive and quality spaces.

The Cabinet Member closed by noting this development offered a key contribution to the wider regeneration of Wood Green, bringing its benefits to residents who may be facing multiple challenges and demonstrated the Council's commitment in their inclusion in the community of Haringey.

RESOLVED

To agree the redevelopment of the Canning Crescent site for the costs set out in paragraph 6.6 of this report as an integrated, mixed use adult mental health recovery

centre for the purpose of accommodating the Clarendon Recovery college, a crisis support service (identified as the “safe haven” service in this report) and a crisis house/respite accommodation (identified as the “Recovery House” in this report)

Reasons for decision

Improving mental health in the borough is a Council priority and this scheme forms part of an approach to deliver excellence through integrating services across the Council, the NHS and other partners.

Whilst the current sites for the Recovery College and Recovery House were not purpose designed and would benefit from improvement, bringing the services together on this site offers a further and substantial opportunity to improve the models in both services and the facilities from which they operate. These changes will drive better outcomes and greater preventative benefit for residents and the Council, particularly in relation to prevention of need for adult social care and homelessness services.

There is a need to relocate the Council-run Clarendon Recovery College so its current site can be redeveloped, generating a capital receipt for the Council and contributing to the wider housing delivery which is also a priority for the Council.

The Council has been commissioned by NHS Haringey CCG to provide a new and much needed element of the mental health offer in Haringey, that is a ‘safe haven’ service for people requiring social support for a mental health crisis in the evenings and weekends. This service will be delivered by the Clarendon Recovery College and the Council has already secured £1.02m of capital funding from the Department of Health for development of suitable facilities for this service.

Including the Recovery House in the development offers significant opportunities to improve quality and outcomes from integrating Council services with NHS provision, and will release the scheme’s current building for alternative use or disposal.

Alternative options considered

The project team including Housing Development, Commissioning and their appointed architects, Ingleton Wood have been reviewing a range of options for the Canning Crescent site.

The shortlisted options were: -

1. Refurbish Canning Crescent to deliver the relocated Recovery College, the new Crisis Café, the short stay offer currently delivered at the Recovery House and a supported living scheme, which would have required an additional floor and extensions to the rear of the building.
2. Demolish the building and construct a new building for all the services in option 1.
3. Identify an alternative use for Canning Crescent and acquire another site for refurbishment or a new building for all the services in option 1.

4. Develop the Canning Crescent site for the relocated Recovery College, the new Crisis Café and the short stay offer currently delivered at the Recovery House only, seeking another site for the delivery of supported living.
5. Take a phased approach by opening the recovery elements together in Canning Crescent and building the supported living housing units in an extension in the courtyard.
6. Disposal of the property

Whilst all the options were viable and had merits, option 4 is recommended because:

- It maintains the overall design and architecture of the external building on the street side and reduces the loss of internal features of note within the building
- It facilitates the services provided by the Council and Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust to be operated through an integrated delivery model, reducing revenue costs, capital costs and improving the user experience.
- It speeds up delivery on the Canning Crescent site, so residents can begin to benefit from the services sooner
- It is the lowest capital cost option, at around half the cost of the alternative options (although the investment does not provide a supported living scheme)
- It is believed that an alternative site that can be purpose-built (or developed specifically) for supported living will be able to provide more homes of a better quality than if the scheme is also included into the Canning Crescent site.

169. 1-35 HEADCORN ROAD & 51-92 TENTERDEN ROAD - FIRE SAFETY WORKS

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced the report which sought approval for the award of a contract for the installation of Automatic Fire Detection (AFD) and associated works at 1-35 Headcorn Road and 51-92 Tenterden Road. This will be to ensure they are compliant with current fire safety requirements and regulations.

The Cabinet Member outlined that Headcorn and Tenterden blocks were timber framed buildings. Within these type of structures, it is very difficult to maintain full compartmentation throughout the life and use of the building. Following intrusive surveys of the structure, Homes for Haringey could not be assured that full current compartmentation meets current Building Regulation Standards or conforms to The Regulatory (Fire Safety) Order.

Following a fire engineering survey, a recommended solution had been developed to ensure that full simultaneous evacuation of the buildings can take place in the event of fire.

The Cabinet Member highlighted to colleagues that this report contained a recommendation for no recharge to leaseholders as set out at recommendation 5.

Further to considering exempt information at item 27,

RESOLVED

1. Pursuant to the Council's Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1(d), approve the award of a contract to the successful tenderer (named in the exempt part of the report) for the installation of Automatic Fire Detection (AFD) and associated works to 1-35 Headcorn Road and 51-92 Tenterden Road, in the sum of £604,755.54.
2. Under the Council's Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.3, to approve the issue of a letter of intent for an amount of up to, but not exceeding £60,475.55, which represents 10% of the contract sum.
3. To approve the total professional fees of £53,158, which represents 8.79% of the contract sum.
4. To note the total project costs of £657,914.
5. To agree that there will be no recharge of the cost of the works to the leaseholders of properties included in their scope, for the reasons set out in item 8.2.

Reasons for decision

Homes for Haringey requires Cabinet approval to award the contract for the installation of AFD and associated works to the timber framed buildings at 1- 35 Headcorn and 51-92 Tenterden Road. This will enable essential safety works to commence. This is following a tender process undertaken in conjunction with Haringey Council's Procurement team via Constructionline (which is a UK register of pre-qualified construction services database fully owned and managed by Capita) whereby contractors are invited to provide competitive e-tenders via the Delta e-Sourcing Portal.

The tender process was carried out in in line with Contract Standing Orders (CSO) requirements that incorporate price and quality. The successful compliant bidder scored the highest in relation to these criteria.

Alternative options considered

An alternative option would be for Homes for Haringey to use third party industry frameworks. Homes for Haringey sought support and advice from Haringey Strategic Procurement and determined that Constructionline was the optimum route to market.

The option of using Haringey Repairs Service (HRS) was considered. However this was discounted because of the urgency in delivering the scheme, the specialist nature of the works and they are currently delivering significant internal works programmes and as such could negatively impact on delivery in respect of the urgency of these works.

The option of not undertaking this work would leave Haringey Council open to legal challenge because the properties need to be improved to comply with current recommended fire regulations.

170. INSTALLATION OF AUTOMATIC FIRE DETECTION (AFD) TO SCATTERED VICTORIAN & EDWARDIAN DWELLINGS

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal introduced this report which sought approval for the award of a contract for the installation of Automatic Fire Detection (AFD) and associated works to converted scattered Victorian and Edwardian street dwellings.

The Cabinet Member noted that the Street Property Victorian Houses that were converted into flats in the late 1960s and 1970s, would not meet current Building Regulation Standards or conform to The Regulatory (Fire Safety) Order. Guidance recommended that where full compartmentation cannot be assured these types of properties would be best served by the installation of an Automatic Fire Detection system. This system with the appropriate upgrade of the fire doors and means of escape route would allow early simultaneously evacuation of the building in case a fire breaks out in any flat.

The Cabinet Member closed by drawing Cabinet's attention to the recommendations, including noting the full cost of the works. It was noted that the leaseholders would be charged for the works carried out.

In response to questions from Councillor das Neves and Barnes, the following information was provided:

- The Cabinet Member noted all wards in the borough were affected by the scattered Edwardian and Victorian dwellings.
- Regarding reference to the report stating Councillors had been consulted, Officers informed that they would check what involvement the Councillors had had in the process. The Cabinet Member added that the key decision had been listed on the Forward Plan for a significant period of time.
- Regarding the decision as to why the affected leaseholders in this report would be charged for the work carried out whilst those affected leaseholders at item 19 – '*1-35 Headcorn Road and 51-92 Tenterden Road – Fire Safety Works*' were not being charged for those works carried out, was because the latter was to do with the structure of the whole building, which the Council had a responsibility to ensure was maintained. Where leaseholders had exercised their right to buy and purchased their Victorian or Edwardian property, there would have been an assessment carried out which would have made those leaseholders aware that they could be charged in the future for such works.
- Officers noted that at Headcorn and Tenterden, works had been carried out in the past where leaseholders had financially contributed towards those works. It was arguable that those works should have included work either to improve the

compartmentation or fit the fire detection. It was also arguable that those works could have contributed to the problem.

Further to considering exempt information at item 28,

RESOLVED

1. Pursuant to the Council's Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.07.1 (d), to approve the award of contract to the successful tenderer (named in the exempt part of the report) for the installation of Automatic Fire Detection (AFD) and associated works, in the sum of £7,876,259.98.
2. To approve the issuing of a letter of intent for an amount of up to, but not exceeding, £787,625.99. This represents 10% of the contract sum.
3. To approve the total professional fees of £594,658, which represents 7.55% of the contract sum.
4. To note the total project cost of £8,470,918.

Reasons for decision

Homes for Haringey requires Cabinet approval to award the contract for installation of Automatic Fire Detection (AFD) and associated works to scattered Victorian and Edwardian street dwellings. This will enable the essential fire safety works to commence. This is following a tender process in conjunction with Haringey Council's Procurement team via the London Construction Programme (LCP) framework and processes.

The tender process was carried out in accordance with the framework requirements that incorporate price and quality. The successful bidder scored highest in relation to these criteria.

Alternative options considered

For Homes for Haringey to either use third party industry frameworks or an OJEU compliant tender process to deliver the works. Homes for Haringey sought support and advice from Haringey's Strategic Procurement team and determined the LCP (London Construction Programme) Major Works framework as being the optimum route to the market. This was due to the LCP framework being leasehold compliant, the speed of access to quality-checked contractors and companies that focus their resources in the local area.

The option of using Haringey Repairs Service (HRS) was considered. However this was discounted because of the urgency in delivering the scheme, the specialist nature of the works and they are currently delivering significant internal works programmes

and as such could negatively impact on delivery in respect of the urgency of these works.

The option of not undertaking this work would leave Haringey Council open to legal challenge because the properties need to be improved to comply with current fire regulations.

171. AMENDMENT TO LONDON COUNCILS TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE AGREEMENT

The Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability introduced the report which sought approval for delegation of authority to London Councils Transport and Environment Committee to vary a committee agreement which would enable TEC [Transport and Environment Committee] to exercise further functions under section 16 of the London Local Authorities and Transport Act 2013. This would in turn enable London Councils to develop a new electric vehicle co-ordination function and to carry out the additional functions to support boroughs in delivering uptake of Electrical vehicles.

In agreeing this variation, the Council will be supporting a London wide approach to Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure. The aim of this variation was to allow London Councils to deliver a Management organisation for electric vehicle charging. This was currently not permitted under the existing terms of TEC, hence this variation and the Council's agreement was needed. This new company had the potential to reduce costs for London Authorities, while creating a single point of contact for all electric vehicles charging needs. This could benefit the Council and residents and businesses. Once designed the Council can then decide to take up the offer to join this new company. This was also a positive step in delivering air quality objectives.

The following information was provided in response to questions from Cllr Barnes:

- The Council would only sign up to the company, if it met the borough's electric vehicle charging needs. The Cabinet Member was keen on uniformity and efficiency and having fast charging points for electrical vehicles in a place where they do not impede people's progression the pavement.
- The agreement to set up a company would include exploring the issues concerning the mode of EV charging in comparison to another, i.e. rapid charging or streetlamp charging. The company would likely consider these issues and hopefully put forward a consistent approach.
- The Cabinet Member agreed to provide Cllr Barnes a written response to her question on Haringey expanding its EV installation guidance to include further use of roads for future modes of travel, so to include change of use parking bays into dockless bays or park lets so a future proof design and implementation guide that can change as needs arise.

RESOLVED

1. To approve the delegation of authority to London Councils Transport and Environment Committee to exercise further functions under section 16 of the London Local Authorities and Transport Act 2013, to enable London Councils to develop a new electric vehicle co-ordination function and to carry out the additional functions to support boroughs in delivering uptake of EV's as set out in paragraph 4.6 in the report and Appendices A and B.
2. To delegate authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration, and planning to sign any necessary documents to give effect to the variation of the London Council's Transport and Environment Committee Governing Agreement dated 13 December 2001, as amended.

Reasons for decision

In 2016, the Go Ultra Low Cities Scheme (GULCS) funding bid submitted by GLA, London Councils, and TfL proposed the delivery of London-wide infrastructure and a 'management partnership.' The role of the management partnership was to coordinate and support electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure delivery, and to manage and maintain the infrastructure in the longer term. Some of its original functions have been delivered through the GULCS programme, specifically the GULCS Senior Lead at London Councils and wider project team at Transport for London (TfL). However, this support will no longer continue when the funding for the GULCS Senior Lead role ends in March 2020.

It is recognised that there is a need for London Councils to continue to coordinate and support EV infrastructure delivery in London after March 2020. This is supported by the findings of the Mayor's EV Infrastructure Taskforce, which has recommended that a new pan-London EV coordination function is created to facilitate and oversee charge point installation. London Councils has committed to take this recommendation forward.

A centralised approach would bring economies of scale, simplify the process for customers and operators and reduce the resource burden on local authorities, whilst allowing boroughs to retain control of the type, locations, and ownership of charge points. The delivery partnership would provide support to boroughs and undertake tasks delegated by the boroughs to the delivery partnership.

For London Councils Transport and Environment Committee (LC TEC) to take part in the development or management of a one stop shop coordination body, each of the 33 London local authorities participating in the TEC joint committee arrangements must agree additional functions and powers to the joint committee. This requires the TEC constitution (Governing Agreement, dated 13 December 2001 (as amended)) to be varied.

As set out in Appendix A (TEC Paper: EV coordination function final) and Appendix B (EV coordination function responsibilities), the proposed variation does not provide LC TEC with the power to act as a decision maker on behalf of the London local authorities and does not put any borough under any obligation to take part in any

proposed activity in this area. It simply allows LC TEC to take on a limited, collaborative role in relation to electric vehicle charging infrastructure. The amendment wording sets out the types of actions that a function managed by LC TEC could undertake. The reason the amendment is worded in this way is to ensure that further amendments to allow some development of the role would not be needed. But decision making would still need to be agreed by TEC and every London local authority would need to agree to participate in any proposed activity.

The new functions proposed for London Councils TEC can be summarised as follows:

- Act as a the key point of contact for London boroughs, the GLA, TfL, existing and new charge point operators, and other relevant stakeholders seeking information about charge point installation in London
- Facilitate sharing of best practice and other relevant information amongst London boroughs and other relevant stakeholders
- Collate and share information to encourage Londoners to switch to Evs
- Liaise with TfL to provide procurement and contract management support to London boroughs to support delivery of EV charge points
- Oversee delivery of GULCS programme to the end of 2020.
- Secure and distribute funding to London boroughs for the delivery of on-street charging points.
- Monitor and support data sharing between charge point operators, London boroughs, TfL and other relevant stakeholders
- Analyse charge point usage data. Share and promote key findings with relevant stakeholders.
- Collate and share locations of charge points delivered
- Monitor customer experience and charging behaviour
- Identify funding and partnership opportunities to continue the role of the coordination body from 2022

More details are set out in Appendix A (TEC Paper: EV coordination function final) and Appendix B (EV coordination function responsibilities).

Alternative options considered

Do nothing

Not agreeing to the LCTEC Agreement variation will impact London as a whole. Every London borough needs to agree to this delegation. So if Haringey Council did not agree, this would hinder other Councils' ability to undertake this work in this manner. This will mean fragmented charging point delivery, and require more resource from local authorities (legal and procurement) to undertake this role. It will also impede progress on the Mayor's Transport Strategy (2018), as increasing electric vehicle uptake is vital to improving air quality.

172. THE ACQUISITION OF THE FREEHOLD INTEREST IN ALEXANDRA HOUSE, STATION ROAD, WOOD GREEN

The Leader introduced this report which recommended the acquisition of the freehold interest in Alexandra House.

The Leader informed that the Council's accommodation needs had changed in the previous twelve months and the Council's strategic ambition for Wood Green had evolved meaning that Alexandra House now had greater importance to the Council than before.

The Leader highlighted there had always been a strategic case for acquisition to support the redevelopment of the area along the axis of River Park Road/ Station Road but the separate ownership of Alexandra House presented significantly lower risk to this long term vision when Alexandra House was owned by Workspace whose stated intention for Alexandra House was for it to remain as employment space. Now that the alternative is residential development of a nature that could not be supported for strategic reasons, there was a much stronger argument for acquisition on both operational and strategic land use bases.

The Leader closed by noting that, in considering whether to acquire, the Council needed to base a decision on operational and strategic reasons supported by an assessment of the cost implications. Officers had looked at several aspects of this including considering the costs the Council would face if the building was not acquired.

Further to considering exempt information at item 29,

RESOLVED

1. To agree to the acquisition of the freehold interest in Alexandra House, 10 Station Road (as outlined red in the plan in Appendix A) on terms set out in Part B.
2. This resolution is set out in exempt part of the report
3. To give delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning after consultation with the Lead Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration to approve the final Heads of Terms and all other documentations required to give effect to the acquisition.
4. *This resolution is set out in exempt part of the report*
5. *This resolution is set out in exempt part of the report*
6. *This resolution is set out in exempt part of the report*

Reasons for decision

The Council has the opportunity to acquire the freehold of Alexandra House, currently in use as office space by the Council under a business lease that is due to expire in mid- February 2021. The reason for the acquisition is in the first instance operational, to provide the Council with flexible office accommodation over the coming years whilst the medium-term accommodation strategy is approved and implemented, and in the short term to manage decant and works to River Park House.

A number of reports and studies undertaken in the last six months about the Council's current office accommodation have shown that the Council has a greater requirement for office accommodation in the short and medium term than previously understood, supporting the need to retain Alexandra House for operational reasons. The property is currently under contract to be sold and the new purchaser has indicated that they would oppose a new lease should the Council request one once the existing lease expires in February 2021.

The current purchaser has lodged an application for permitted development rights to develop Alexandra House as residential units (studio flats).

The acquisition is also being recommended for strategic reasons, to consolidate the Council's land holdings in the area and promote its ability to deliver long term redevelopment of the Station Road corridor, and to take control of the future development of this site, along with other Council sites, so that it can support the Council's vision for this area as expressed in its Borough Plan and other plans about the Wood Green area.

The recommendation is that the Council now, in agreement with the current purchaser, step in to acquire Alexandra House on the basis of completing the transaction during March and based on the structure set out in the Heads of Terms in Part B of this report.

Alternative options considered

The alternative option is not to buy the freehold interest in Alexandra House. The consequence of this would be that the Council would need to vacate the building if the Council failed in its application for a new lease with a risk now that there would be insufficient temporary accommodation available to facilitate that on time due to recently identified works being required at River Park House.

The need for additional accommodation for staff could potentially be met in other ways. These alternatives are described in detail in the background section and have been considered both in terms of the risks to business continuity and in terms of cost in comparison with the recommended option.

A further possible consequence is that the scheme proposed in the permitted development application might succeed and this would affect the longer term development of this area. The scheme proposed at present would, if implemented, retain Alexandra House for that purpose over a period of c25 years, with future redevelopment only coming forward should demand for this type of accommodation drop making alternative development an option.

An options appraisal has been carried out. The appraisal includes the costs the Council would face if it decided not to buy Alexandra House. Given the Council's requirements and the analysis of the options, the recommended option is to acquire.

173. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES

RESOLVED

To note the Cabinet Member signing minutes for 17th and 20th of January 2020.

174. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

175. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

176. AWARD OF CONTRACT TO A POSITIVE BEHAVIOURAL SUPPORT (PBS) PROVIDER FROM PBS FRAMEWORK

As per item 167 and the exempt minutes.

177. 1-35 HEADCORN ROAD & 51-92 TENTERDEN ROAD - FIRE SAFETY WORKS

As per item 169 and the exempt minutes.

178. INSTALLATION OF AUTOMATIC FIRE DETECTION (AFD) TO SCATTERED VICTORIAN & EDWARDIAN DWELLINGS

As per item 170 and the exempt minutes.

179. THE ACQUISITION OF THE FREEHOLD INTEREST IN ALEXANDRA HOUSE, STATION ROAD, WOOD GREEN

As per item 172 and the exempt minutes.

180. EXEMPT MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the exempt minutes of the 21st of January 2019 meeting as a correct record

181. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

NONE

CHAIR: Councillor Joseph Ejiofor

Signed by Chair

Date