

**Matter being dealt with by**

Richard Burbidge

**Tel**

020 8489 2923

**Fax**

020 8881 26605218

**Email**

richard.burbidge@haringey.gov.uk

01 June 2011

To: All Members of the Cabinet  
c.c. All other persons receiving Cabinet agenda

Dear Member,

Cabinet - Tuesday, 7th June, 2011

I attach a copy of the following reports for the above-mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda:

**8. FINANCIAL OUTTURN 2010/11 (PAGES 1 - 24)**

(Report of the Director of Corporate Resources – To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Carbon Reduction): To report the outturn for revenue and capital spending for 2010/11 and approve any carry forward requests.

**9. RECOMMENDED BUDGET SAVINGS DECISION - ADULT SERVICES PROPOSALS IN 2011 - OLDER PERSONS' DROP-IN CENTRES, JACKSONS LANE LUNCHEON CLUB AND CYPRIOT ELDERLY AND DISABILITY PROJECT (PAGES 25 - 80)**

(Report of the Director of Adult and Housing Services – To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Services): Revised Appendix 1 – Please substitute for the copy previously circulated.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Burbidge  
Cabinet Committees Manager

This page is intentionally left blank



Haringey Council

Agenda item:

**Cabinet****On 7 June 2011**

Report Title. <b>Financial Outturn 2010/11</b>	
Report of: <b>Director of Corporate Resources</b> Signed :  <b>Kevin Bartle</b>	
Contact Officer : <b>Kevin Bartle, Lead Finance Officer</b> <b>Telephone 020 8489 5972</b>	
Wards(s) affected: <b>All</b>	Report for: <b>Key Decision</b>
<b>1. Purpose of the report</b>  1.1. To set out the provisional revenue and capital outturn for 2010/11 and to consider revenue and capital carry forward requests.	
<b>2. Introduction by Cabinet Member for Finance &amp; Sustainability (Councillor J Goldberg)</b>  2.1 Staff are to be commended for their hard work, efforts and achievement for bringing our net General Fund expenditure within the budget with a small surplus of £51k. While it would not be normal to celebrate such an achievement this has been no normal year. We have seen unprecedented cuts to budgets in the region of £17m and severe additional demand pressures on some of our services especially in managing homelessness and supporting children's safeguarding.  2.2 It was these budget cuts and pressures which precipitated the warning of the projected £10m overspend early in the financial year and why we took action to constrain spending, and to actively manage our non-service revenue accounts to ensure we were able to protect the most critical services.	

- 2.3 Had we gone into the current year with an overspend this could have been crippling to the Council especially with the government continuing to deny us the same flexibility as private sector organisations enjoy when they restructure. Specifically, and reflected herein, being allowed to finance just £780,000 of our redundancy bill from capitalisation (i.e. through longer term loans) is creating and adding unnecessary levels of risk to budgets and ultimately to frontline services.
- 2.4 While when I set the budget, with the agreed Medium Term Financial Plan at February's Full Council, I had assumed we would end the year with a balanced budget, the reality is that at that point we were still looking at a £2.4m projected overspend.
- 2.5 While we remain absolutely opposed to the size and scale of central government cuts to our budget, not just because of the damage they inflict on much valued, loved and needed services, but because of the damage they are doing to the economic recovery, the achievement of a balanced budget represents prudent management of our resources, giving us freedoms to make choices for the people of Haringey in future years, and to prevent frontline services from deeper cuts than is necessary, and a resolve to drive our borough forwards despite being starved of a fair level of resources to do so.
- 2.6 This is because while we have managed to face up to the double squeeze of budget cuts alongside rising demands, both pressures are not set to go away, and over the current financial year we will need to deliver on the £41.1m cuts to our budget being imposed by the nature of the Coalition's financial settlement for Haringey. This out-turn report should give confidence to residents, colleagues on both sides of the Chamber, and staff that the Council has the strength to steward and navigate the impacts of these Coalition's ideological agenda.
- 2.7 The capital outturn shows less slippage than had been reported at Period 11 with a final under spend of £14.8m equating to 8.7% of the approved programme. The explanations for the variances are set out in Appendix 2. It is recommended that approval of the capital carry forward requests, as set out in Appendix 3, is delegated to the Chief Financial Officer, in consultation with me.
- 2.8 The HRA is showing a surplus for the year of £0.3million which is an improvement on the projected position in Period 11 due to lower than anticipated capital financing and insurance recharges.
- 2.9 The Council's draft Statement of Accounts for 2010-11 is currently being finalised. This draft will be subject to audit which is due to be completed in early September. The final audited accounts will then be submitted to Corporate Committee in late September for approval.
- 2.10 I commend this report to the Cabinet for approval.

**3. State link(s) with Council Plan Priorities and actions and /or other Strategies:**

- 3.1 This report is in line with Council priorities set out in the Council Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy.

**4. Recommendations**

- 4.1 To note the provisional general fund revenue outturn of a £51k surplus for 2010/11.
- 4.2 To note the reasons for variations and to approve the planned transfers to reserves detailed in Appendix 1.
- 4.3 To note the provisional Housing Revenue Account (HRA) outturn surplus of £0.3m.
- 4.4 To note the provisional capital outturn of a £14.8m programme net underspend and the reasons for variations set out in Appendix 2.
- 4.5 To note capital carry forward requests of £12.6m set out in Appendix 3.
- 4.6 To delegate to the Chief Financial Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance & Sustainability, the approval of capital carry forward requests and their associated method of funding. The approved schemes will be reported to the July meeting of the Cabinet.
- 4.7 To note the outturn of a £1.8m overspend for schools that decreases schools' balances to £2.6m at the end of 2010-11.
- 4.8 To note that the Council's draft Statement of Accounts for 2010/11 will be approved by the Chief Financial Officer by 30 June 2011. The accounts are subject to audit and the final audited accounts will be presented to the Corporate Committee on 27 September 2011 for final approval.

**5. Reason for recommendation(s)**

- 5.1 This report allows Cabinet to consider the financial outturn position against the approved budget and to approve transfers to/from reserves.

**6. Summary**

- 6.1 This report sets out the Council's provisional outturn for 2010/11. The year-end general fund surplus is £51k (0.02% of the approved revenue budget) excluding the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). A detailed analysis of the variances between outturn and the approved budget are set out in Appendix 1.
- 6.2 The report also sets out the capital outturn position, which shows a net under spend of £14.8m (8.7% of the approved budget). A detailed analysis of the variances between outturn and the approved budget are set out in Appendix 2. Carry forward

requests of £12.6m are submitted for consideration and are set out at Appendix 3. The positions on the HRA, non-schools and schools DSG and Collection Fund are also reported.

- 6.3 In overall terms the general fund revenue outturn shows a £1.6m improvement compared with the Period 11 projections and a £10m improvement compared to the projections earlier in the financial year when the government announced its in-year cuts in funding. The gradual improvement over the past nine months is a reflection of the management action taken to reduce expenditure, particularly through the staff recruitment controls and curtailment of the Area Based Grant funded service programme.

## **7. Head of Legal Services Comments**

- 7.1 The Head of Legal Services notes the report and confirms that all statutory and constitutional requirements are met.

## **8. Equalities & Community Cohesion Comments**

- 8.1 Equalities issues are a core part of the Council's financial and business planning process.

## **9. Consultation**

- 9.1 Consultation on the preparation of the Council's revenue and capital budgets has been undertaken with residents and business community representatives.

## **10. Use of appendices /Tables and photographs**

- Appendix 1 - Explanation of significant revenue variances.
- Appendix 2 - Explanation of significant capital variances.
- Appendix 3 - Capital carry forward proposals.

## **11. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- SAP outturn reports; and
- Final accounts working papers.

For access to the background papers or any further information please contact Kevin Bartle, Lead Finance Officer, on 0208 489 5972.

## 12. Background

- 12.1 This report sets out the provisional financial outturn position for the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account, Dedicated Schools Budget, Collection Fund and the Capital Programme. The Statement of Accounts will be prepared in accordance with the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2011 and the draft accounts (which will be subject to audit) will be approved by the Chief Financial Officer before 30 June.
- 12.2 The external audit of the accounts will commence in July. The auditors will submit a report on the findings, and issue their formal opinion, at Corporate Committee on 27 September 2011.

## 13 Outturn – Revenue General Fund

- 13.1 The general fund revenue outturn is summarised in the following table. There is a net general fund surplus of £51k after planned transfers to reserves: the variance represents 0.02% of the net approved budget. The variances are explained in more detail in Appendix 1. This figure in total is a £1.6m improvement on the Period 11 outturn projection. The main reasons for the improvement are set out in paragraph 13.2 below.

*Table showing the general fund revenue outturn summary*

Directorate	Approved revenue budget	Variance from budget
	£'000	£'000
Children and Young People	70,557	7,755
Adults, Culture & Community	78,590	(240)
Corporate Resources	6,071	(743)
Urban Environment (excl HRA)	56,862	(76)
Policy, Performance, Partnerships & Communications	1,722	(106)
People, Organisation & Development	(729)	(750)
Chief Executive	999	(95)
Non-Service Revenue	31,523	(5,796)
<b>Total – General Fund</b>	<b>245,595</b>	<b>(51)</b>
Children and Young People Non-Schools DSG	0	(1,274)
Children and Young People Schools DSG	0	1,808

- 13.2 The main changes since Period 11 are lower than anticipated cost accruals for outstanding social care commitments (reduction of £400k), transfer of redundancy costs to the Transition Reserve (reduction of £360k), further net savings on Area Based Grant (ABG) expenditure (reduction £450k), lower than anticipated North London Waste Authority costs (reduction £300k) and other miscellaneous budget variances (reduction of £90k).
- 13.3 The main budget variances throughout 2010-11 have been an overspend in Children and Young People (CYPS) and an underspend in Non-Service Revenue (NSR). The overspend in CYPS has been driven by the high number of Looked After Children, a position which has been recognised in the 2011-2014 Medium Term Financial Plan through approved growth in this service budget of £7.4m.
- 13.4 The Non-Service Revenue budget consists of four main elements, Treasury (interest earnings and debt financing costs), contingencies and provisions, the Council's contribution to Alexandra Palace and Park, and payments to levying bodies (e.g. Lee Valley, North London Waste Authority and London Pensions Fund Authority). The underspend on NSR is mainly attributable to:
- Area Based Grant funding which was not allocated to service areas to mitigate the impact of reductions in other government grant funding;
  - savings in debt financing costs through the use of internal cash balances in lieu of borrowing; and,
  - unallocated contingency.

The Council received £3.6m in Performance Reward Grant which was accounted for through NSR and has been transferred to reserves (see paragraph 14.3 below). This is part of an overall £4.2m transfer from NSR to reserves which includes a contribution towards future redundancy costs resulting from the implementation of the Council's savings programme and a provision for the Council's share of the deficit on the Collection Fund.

- 13.5 The provisional outturn for the Alexandra Park and Palace Trust shows a deficit of £2.3m, compared with a budgeted deficit of £2.0m, causing an overspend of £0.3m mainly due to the Ice Rink project. This variance is included in the non-service revenue net under spend. There is also an outstanding expenditure item of £16k relating to the Master Plan budget which will be met from contingencies in 2011-12.

#### **14 Transfers to Reserves**

- 14.1 Transfers to reserves are made at the end of each financial year in line with the approved financial strategy. The most significant call on reserves in 2011-12 will be redundancy costs although a request to capitalise these costs is currently under consideration by Communities and Local Government (CLG).



- 14.2 The tables in Appendix 1 show the planned transfers to reserves that will be made as part of the accounts closure process. These include transfers for capital financing and to meet the redundancy costs resulting from the implementation of the Council's savings programme and are in accordance with previous reports to Members.
- 14.3 The overall level of General Fund reserves has increased by £10.6m since the approval of the Medium Term Financial Plan. The main reasons for this variance are:
- The Performance Reward Grant (PRG) of £3.6m which was confirmed in March 2011. This includes £1.0m payable to the Police and NHS as part of our strategic partnership;
  - Additional NHS funding to support the Council's investment in adult care reablement services of £1.1m. Again this funding was confirmed in March 2011;
  - Housing Benefit Grant Claim provision of £1.0m. (Each year the Council submits a substantial housing benefits claim which is in the region of £290m. As in previous years, it is proposed additional estimated grant above budget should be added to the reserve taking a prudent approach in the event that there are any issues arising from the subsequent audit of the subsidy claim);
  - A provision of £1.6m to cover the Council's share of a £2m deficit on the Collection Fund (see Section 18 below); and,
  - Capital programme slippage, allied to a reduced call on reserves through use of capital receipts (see Section 15 below).
- 14.4 The table in paragraph 13.1 shows an outturn for schools of a £1.8m overspend which will decrease school reserves to £2.6m at the end of 2010/11.
- 14.5 Section 17 below sets out the reasons for a £3.2m increase in HRA reserves.

## **15 Outturn - Capital**

- 15.1 The final approved capital programme for 2010/11 was £169.7m. The provisional net underspend is £14.8m as set out in the following table (8.7% of the approved budget). The level of underspend was £2.2m less than had been anticipated at Period 11. This movement was mainly within Children's, Urban Environment and the HRA.

Directorate	Approved Budget	Outturn	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Children & Young People	79,719	71,298	(8,421)
Adults, Culture & Community	9,079	7,186	(1,893)
Corporate Resources	8,337	5,566	(2,771)
Urban Environment – General Fund	17,531	15,887	(1,644)
Urban Environment – HRA Housing	55,033	54,966	(67)
<b>Total</b>	<b>169,699</b>	<b>154,903</b>	<b>(14,796)</b>

- 15.2 Detailed explanations of the variances are set out in Appendix 2 but substantially relate to schemes not being completed to time for various reasons and thus slipping into the next financial year. However, £5.6m of the under spend relates to BSF capital contingencies which were not required in 2010-11 and form part of the £12.6m carry forward request (see Section 16 below).
- 15.3 The Council's agreed capital programme for the period 2010/11 to 2013/14 was partly based on achieving usable capital receipts of £7.7m in 2010/11 (excluding Compulsory Purchase Orders). This total was achieved although through a slightly different mix of property sales.
- 15.4 The capital receipts reserve for 2010/11 has a balance at the year-end of £4.7m after financing spend on capital receipts funded projects as outlined below:

	£000
Opening balance at 1 April 2010	2,590
Net Usable receipts generated in 2010/11	8,591
Used for financing in 2010/11	(6,455)
Closing balance at 31 March 2011	<b>4,726</b>

- 15.5 However, a number of projects have slipped and are the subject of carry forward requests. It is recommended that these schemes are reviewed by the Chief Financial Officer and Cabinet Member for Finance and Sustainability based upon available resources and contractual commitments.

## 16 Capital Carry Forward Proposals

- 16.1 The Council's financial regulations stipulate that Cabinet will determine any carry forward sums in respect of budget variations at the year-end.
- 16.2 Capital carry forward requests are included for consideration amounting to £12.6m and are detailed in Appendix 3. At this stage, it is recommended that authority to approve the carry forward requests is delegated to the Chief Financial Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Sustainability.

## 17 Housing Revenue Account (HRA)

- 17.1 The provisional HRA outturn for the year is a surplus of £0.3m against a target of a £2.9m deficit, a variance of £3.2m. The working balance, therefore, is increased to £8.0m as at 31 March 2011, as shown in the following table.

Item	Revised Budget	Outturn	Variance
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Income	(113,510)	(108,978)	4,532
Expenditure	116,381	108,682	(7,699)
<b>Net deficit / (surplus)</b>	<b>2,871</b>	<b>(296)</b>	<b>(3,167)</b>
Working balance b/fwd 1 April 2010		(7,664)	
Working balance c/fwd 31 March 2011		(7,960)	
Planned closing balance as at 31 March 2011		(4,793)	
<b>Variation in closing balance</b>		<b>(3,167)</b>	

- 17.2 The main variances were lower than budgeted Housing Subsidy Income of £2.9m which was more than off-set by reduced capital costs (£4.0m) as a result of significantly reduced external borrowing in the year, insurance and other property costs (£1.2m), bad debt provisions (£0.4m) and net service charges (£0.5m).
- 17.3 One of the actions from the original repairs improvement plan was for the Haringey Repairs Service to relocate to Broadwater Farm. £175k of Reserves was earmarked in 2010/11 for this purpose. However the move did not take place and will now happen in 2011/12.

## 18 Collection Fund

- 18.1 The provisional outturn on the collection fund is showing a £2m deficit relating to Council Tax income for 2010-11. Although the in-year collection rate of 96.1% is already above the overall target of 96%, this improvement has been more than offset by a higher than anticipated level of discounts and exemptions. The discounts and exemptions reduce the net sum collectable. Any deficit will need to be met by the Council (79%) and the GLA (21%) in proportion to the respective elements of the total council tax charge.
- 18.2 At this stage £1.6m has been transferred to, and earmarked in, reserves for the Council's share of the deficit.

**19 Provisions and Contingent Liabilities**

- 19.1 Under accounting requirements the Council is required to consider any areas where it feels there is a potential future liability. Depending on the certainty of this liability and information on the value of the liability, the Council will either raise a provision for this liability or disclose a contingent liability in the notes to the accounts. All areas for provisions and contingent liabilities are in the process of being reviewed. These will be considered in the near future and finalised and reported as part of the Statement of Accounts.

**20 Recommendations**

- 20.1 To note the provisional general fund revenue outturn of a £51k surplus for 2010/11.
- 20.2 To note the reasons for variations and to approve the planned transfers to reserves detailed in Appendix 1.
- 20.3 To note the provisional Housing Revenue Account (HRA) outturn surplus of £0.3m.
- 20.4 To note the provisional capital outturn of a £14.8m programme net underspend and the reasons for variations set out in Appendix 2.
- 20.5 To note capital carry forward requests of £12.6m set out in Appendix 3.
- 20.6 To delegate to the Chief Financial Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance & Sustainability, the approval of capital carry forward requests and their associated method of funding. The approved schemes will be reported to the July meeting of the Cabinet.
- 20.7 To note the outturn of a £1.8m overspend for schools that decreases schools' balances to £2.6m at the end of 2010-11.
- 20.8 To note that the Council's draft Statement of Accounts for 2010/11 will be approved by the Chief Financial Officer by 30 June 2011. The accounts are subject to audit and the final audited accounts will be presented to the Corporate Committee on 27 September 2011 for final approval.

## APPENDIX 1

Revenue		Variation £000's + / ( - )
Outturn 2010/11- explanation of variances from budget		
<b>Total General Fund outturn 2010/11</b>		<b>(51)</b>
<b>Children &amp; Young People Services</b>		
1	<b>LAC Placements</b> - 2010-11 saw a further increase in the number of children taken into care. The total number of children in care (including unaccompanied minors) as at March 2011 has risen to 618 from 591 in March 2010 (and from 492 in March 2009).	5,701
2	<b>First Response and Safeguarding salary costs</b> - Within First Response and Safeguarding Services there has been an increase in staff costs due to the high level of referrals to the service on safeguarding and child protection issues. These historical additional costs have been addressed in the 2011/2012 budget setting.	2,052
3	<b>No Recourse to Public Funds /Asylum</b> - There has been a continued increase in costs on clients with No Recourse to Public Funds and for which Home Office grant is not available. Recent recruitment of a specialist worker from the Home Office is expected to bring these costs down in 2011/2012.	1,921
4	<b>Legal expenses</b> - the overspend in this area is primarily a reflection of the increased numbers of children being taken into care.	1,705
5	<b>Leaving Care/Children in Care salary costs</b> - the overspend in this area has arisen primarily because of the need for increased staff necessary to accommodate the caseload associated with higher numbers of Children-in-Care and those receiving services from the Leaving Care Team. Agency premium costs are also a factor in these areas where the increase in workload has been accommodated through the use of this type of staff.	924
6	<b>Leaving Care Service</b> - this area is seeing increased costs relating to higher levels of support to young people in semi independent accommodation and care leavers in further education. This budget also accommodates naturalised asylum seeking children disallowed in the 18+ grant claim and those recognised under the 'Southwark judgement' which entitles them to a full leaving care service.	707
7	<b>Contact costs</b> - between LAC, their families of origin, and others who have played an important part in their lives, have increased significantly. This reflects the overall increased numbers of Children in Care and also conditions being imposed through the courts.	463
8	<b>Special Guardianship Allowances</b> - this is due to the change made to pay the Kinship rate rather than the Special Guardianship rate following the legal challenge on the L B of Lewisham.	197
9	<b>Maximisation of Specific Grants</b> - the use of grants has been reviewed to ensure that where external funding is available this has been utilised in the first instance; this has released core funding as a strategy for managing pressures elsewhere.	(2,254)
10	<b>Additional grant - Safeguarding</b> - specific additional resources in support of the Council's safeguarding services were received primarily from the DfE. These resources offset, in part, the additional costs in Children and Families identified above where overspending is apparent. .	(1,041)
11	<b>ABG Grant Savings</b> - within the ABG programme resources were identified in further support of safeguarding services and the under spend against this grant programme therefore offsets the additional costs and associated overspend in safeguarding services identified above in this table.	(1,500)
12	<b>Participation Savings</b> - the relaxation of the rules in two major grants in this area, Youth Opportunity Fund and the Think Family Grant, enabled a review to take place and has released funding to offset pressures. Also the scale and scope of certain activities for Young Carers has been reduced and the Children's rights service has been commissioned in an alternative way.	(511)
13	<b>Supplies &amp; Services</b> - this results from the embargo on non-essential spending within the service.	(609)
14	<b>Catering</b> - the accumulated deficit on the Catering trading account (i.e. taking into account the trading position in previous financial years) a strategy is in place which will recoup the deficit over future years trading activities.	183
	<b>Total - Children &amp; Young People Services</b>	<b>7,938</b>
15	<b>Transfer to reserves</b> - the transfer of the accumulated deficit on the Catering trading account in accordance with accepted accounting practices.	(183)
	<b>Total - Children &amp; Young People Services (Including transfer to reserves)</b>	<b>7,755</b>
<b>Children &amp; Young People Services (DSG)</b>		
16	<b>Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)</b> - unspent DSG resources prior to the part financing of the BSF programme from revenue resources as previously agreed by the School's Forum.	(1,274)
17	<b>Transfer to Reserves</b> - the agreed revenue contribution (RCCO) towards the capital BSF programme.	500
18	<b>Transfer to Reserves</b> - this reflects the carry forward of unspent DSG reserves, which can only be used in support of the schools budgets, into future years. The sum represents resources agreed by the School Forum to support safeguarding processes directly associated with schools.	774
	<b>Total - Children &amp; Young People Services (General Fund and DSG).</b>	<b>7,755</b>

**APPENDIX 1**

<b>Revenue</b>		<b>Variation £000's + / ( - )</b>
<b>Outturn 2010/11- explanation of variances from budget</b>		
	<b>Adults, Culture &amp; Community Services</b>	
<b>19</b>	<b>Adults</b> - pressures in Mental Health care purchasing, largely due to reviews of PCT funded service users (£1,446k), offset by over achieved income (£509k), vacancies held to absorb pressures (£245k), over achieved external recharges (£500k) and an under spend against the Transforming Social Care Grant (£211k). Small variances comprise the balance. A late receipt of £1,104k from NHS Haringey will be transferred to Reserves.	(1,043)
<b>20</b>	<b>Recreation Services</b> - significant income shortfalls in this area total £598k. These have been contained in part by staffing efficiencies and other expenditure reductions but the residual income pressure of £313k remained at the year end.	313
<b>21</b>	<b>Culture, Learning &amp; Libraries</b> - the main variances in this service are Bruce Castle income shortfall (£80k), library cleaning, security and transport recharges (£71k) and staffing pressures (£62k). These pressures have been offset by a reduction in library stock expenditure (£180k).	33
<b>22</b>	<b>Safeguarding &amp; Strategic Services</b> - contract renegotiations within the Supporting People Programme have resulted in an under spend this year of £531k. This will contribute to the saving required in future years. The balance comprises £86k staffing efficiencies and £30k budget for health and safety expenditure not required.	(647)
	<b>Total - Adults, Culture &amp; Community Services</b>	<b>(1,344)</b>
<b>23</b>	<b>Transfer to reserves</b> - additional NHS grant funding of £1.104m to support on-going investment in the reablement services.	1,104
	<b>Total - Adults, Culture &amp; Community Services (including transfer to reserves)</b>	<b>(240)</b>

## APPENDIX 1

Revenue		Variation £000's + / ( - )
Outturn 2010/11- explanation of variances from budget		
	<b>Corporate Resources</b>	
24	<b>Director's Office</b> - this reflects the 10% top slice of supplies and services budgets agreed in the summer	(407)
25	<b>B&amp;LT Management Costs</b> - the underlying reason for the majority of the over spend is the requirement earlier in the year for additional staffing resources to deal with the benefits backlog and address housing benefit overpayments.	355
26	<b>B&amp;LT Ring fence</b> - the variance is predominately due to an increase in the Housing Benefit debtor over payments raised less an increase in the bad debt provision. These figures will be subject to the audit of the 2010/11 grant claim and an adjustment may be required; to this end, the bulk of this surplus will be transferred to reserves as planned to deal with this possibility.	(1,021)
27	<b>Corporate Finance</b> - the under spend is predominately due to staffing vacancies held pending the implementation of the finance support functions review.	(185)
28	<b>Corporate Procurement</b> - the over spend is largely due to a smaller than forecast rebate from the energy companies.	57
29	<b>Legal Services</b> - this variance is mainly due to the over-achievement of income within the Registrar service as a result of continued high activity levels and the impact of fee changes.	(49)
30	<b>Head of Access &amp; Customer Focus</b> - in expectation of significant staff reductions to achieve planned savings in Customer services & IT, a redundancy provision was created in 2009/10. In the event, and partly as a result of the much wider council -wide savings to be achieved, the full sum was not required and has been written back to revenue creating an under spend.	(364)
31	<b>Customer Services</b> - effective resource management in the Call Centre helped to minimise the need for overtime in the busiest periods which along with the wider spending restrictions and stringent budget monitoring procedures have delivered an under spend of circa £150k. The remaining under spend of £150k is due to the over provision for the impact of single status.	(308)
32	<b>IT Services</b> - the business unit has been forecasting an under spend of circa £250k largely as a result of high under spend on employee budgets associated with implementation of the outcome of the in-year vfm review.	(237)
33	<b>IT Services</b> - this under spend relates to phasing of the infrastructure programme and the resultant funding profile change.	(750)
34	<b>IT Services</b> - the planned decision to capitalise additional IT expenditure to maximise the use of available capital financing and provide on-going flexibility in Council reserves during 2011/2.	(440)
35	<b>Other Minor Variations</b> - over/underspends of less than +/- £50k	56
	<b>Total - Corporate Resources</b>	<b>(3,293)</b>
	<b>Transfers to reserves:</b>	
36	<b>B&amp;LT Ring fence</b> - planned transfer of Housing Benefit surplus against possible audit amendments to prior and current year grant claims	1,000
37	<b>IT Services</b> - planned transfer to the Infrastructure Reserve to provide future financing for the infrastructure renewal programme as agreed.	750
38	<b>IT Services</b> - a decision was made to maximise the use of available capital financing and provide on-going flexibility in Council reserves during 2011/2 via the capitalisation of additional IT expenditure.	440
39	<b>Access and Customer Focus</b> - planned transfer of unused redundancy provision to the Transition Reserve.	360
	<b>Total - Corporate Resources (including transfers to reserves)</b>	<b>(743)</b>

**APPENDIX 1**

<b>Revenue</b>		<b>Variation £000's + / ( - )</b>
<b>Outturn 2010/11- explanation of variances from budget</b>		
	<b>Urban Environment</b>	
<b>40</b>	<b>Director's Office</b> - supplies and services spend saving £135k, NLWA £100k.	(243)
<b>41</b>	<b>Planning, Regeneration &amp; Economy</b> - ABG funded programme savings (£515k) partly offset by cost pressure from Ward's Corner and other budget variations (£70k).	(445)
<b>42</b>	<b>Front Line Services</b> - freezing of vacancies in Enforcement (£632k), net underspends on ABG funded programme and non-household waste costs partly offset by lower than budgeted parking revenue (£59k).	(691)
<b>43</b>	<b>Safer, Stronger Communities</b> - savings on ABG funded programme and freezing of Neighbourhood Management spend	(695)
<b>44</b>	<b>Housing (General Fund)</b> - net additional cost resulting from reduction in Housing Benefit Subsidy and savings from re-negotiated rental cost of temporary accommodation for homeless families	1,998
	<b>Total - Urban Environment</b>	<b>(76)</b>



**APPENDIX 1**

<b>Revenue</b>		<b>Variation</b>
<b>Outturn 2010/11- explanation of variances from budget</b>		<b>£000's</b>
		<b>+ / ( - )</b>
	<b>Policy, Performance, Partnerships &amp; Communications</b>	
<b>45</b>	<b>Policy &amp; Performance</b> - the under spend is due to vacant posts including the Business Intelligence Officer post due to the wider Strategic Finance Review of Policy & Performance; restrictions on non-essential spending implemented during the summer led to planned under spends across the whole business unit.	(379)
<b>46</b>	<b>Communications</b> - the over spend is due to under achievement of income in printing, design and translation and interpretation in part due to the reduction in discretionary spending in the service departments.	290
<b>47</b>	<b>Other Minor Variations</b> - over/underspends of less than +/- £50k	(17)
	<b>Total - Policy, Performance, Partnerships &amp; Communications</b>	<b>(106)</b>

	<b>People, Organisation &amp; Development</b>	
<b>48</b>	<b>Director's Office</b> - this reflects the 10% reduction in supplies and services spend agreed in the summer	(79)
<b>49</b>	<b>Human Resources (excl. the Temporary Resource Centre)</b> - the majority of the under spend is due to the cessation of the New Start Apprentice Scheme and the significant reduction in recruitment activity council-wide.	(195)
<b>50</b>	<b>Organisational Development &amp; Learning</b> - the under spend is against the employee development and change teams where commissioning budgets were held as a result of the embargo on non essential spend.	(82)
<b>51</b>	<b>Local Democracy &amp; Member Services</b> - the underlying under spend has been caused by vacancies, pending the review of the whole service along with secondments which were not backfilled.	(236)
<b>52</b>	<b>Temporary Resource Centre</b> - although use of agency staff has reduced across the year it was still significant and the percentage paid to the managed service provider fell again this year contributing to the over-achievement of the budgeted savings target.	(158)
	<b>Total - People, Organisation &amp; Development</b>	<b>(750)</b>
	<b>Chief Executive</b>	
<b>53</b>	<b>Chief Executive</b> - the under spend is due to the 10% reduction in supplies and services spend agreed in the summer, a £46k under spend on Member expenses budget from restrictions on premises hire, together with other minor underspends.	(160)
<b>54</b>	<b>Electoral Services</b> - the over spend results from providing cover for 2 staff on maternity leave and also expenditure incurred to support and encourage a high level of census completion.	65
	<b>Total - Chief Executive</b>	<b>(95)</b>

**APPENDIX 1**

<b>Revenue</b>		<b>Variation £000's + / ( - )</b>
<b>Outturn 2010/11- explanation of variances from budget</b>		
	<b>Non Service Revenue (NSR)</b>	
<b>55</b>	<b>NSR</b> - the key reasons for the year end under spend are the non-application of the £1.0m general contingency built into the 2010/11 budget, an under-spend of £2.2m against the debt financing costs due to the use of internal cash balances in lieu of borrowing, not allocating out £2.5m of in year Area Based Grant (ABG), a £0.7m reduction in the forecast single status liability and unallocated Performance Reward Grant of £3.6m	(10,033)
	<b>Total - Non Service Revenue</b>	<b>(10,033)</b>
<b>56</b>	<b>Transfer to reserves</b> - the Council's element of Performance Reward Grant and unallocated contingency provisions transferred to Services Reserve (£3.5) and Transition Reserve (£0.7m)	4,237
	<b>Total Non Service Revenue (after transfers to reserves)</b>	<b>(5,796)</b>

## APPENDIX 2

Capital		Variation £000's + / ( - )
Outturn 2010/11 - explanation of variances from budget		
<b>Total Capital Programme outturn 2010/11</b>		<b>(14,796)</b>
<b>Children &amp; Young People Services</b>		
1	<b>BSF Programme: School Construction Projects</b> - the major part of this variation (£5.65m) is due to the BSF programme commencing the year with a substantial balance of unallocated programme contingency held against the outstanding risks on the programme. During the year specific allocations from contingency were made to cover risks and specific issues as they materialised. The profile of expenditure from these allocations will in large part fall into the financial year 11/12, and forms the main reason for the associated carry forward request. The other main reason for the variation is due to £2m of construction payments for Heartlands School not being triggered, although the project has now reached practical completion within budget. These payments will now be made in 11/12.	(7,747)
2	<b>BSF Programme: Managed Service ICT Contract</b> - the underspend is due to schools choosing to delay the expenditure of their "local choice" ICT budgets until later in the term of this 5 year managed service contract. The ICT contract continues until September 2013, and schools have flexibility over when to refresh or procure additional ICT equipment for use by students and staff.	(854)
3	<b>Primary Capital Programme: Rhodes Avenue Primary</b> - expenditure is behind budget due to construction delays resulting from adverse weather conditions and other factors. The school will be able to increase its intake from September 2011 as planned.	(873)
4	<b>Primary Capital Programme: Broadwater Farm Inclusive Learning Campus</b> - expenditure is marginally behind the originally forecast budget profile for this project. Progress on site is good.	(296)
5	<b>Primary Capital Programme Delivery Costs</b> - the underspend for the year is due to the following: a) appropriate programme management costs have been fully allocated to grant funded programmes to maximise grant uptake, therefore reducing the call on this budget; b) the overall costs of the integrated capital delivery team were lower than budgeted; c) a higher proportion of management costs were allocated to the BSF programme than originally anticipated to reflect the continued focus of effort to manage and complete the programme.	(521)
6	<b>Primary Capital Programme: Match Funded Projects</b> - whilst a small part of the variance relates to funding not spent, other reasons include a school deciding not to proceed with their chosen project, and other works being rescheduled to complete during Easter 2011.	(113)
7	<b>Devolved Capital</b> - returns from schools reported a higher than expected use of devolved capital funds. The resources to finance this higher level of expenditure are held within carried forward balances of Standards Fund Grant.	1,498
8	<b>PFI Lifecycle Costs</b> - a number of lifecycle projects supporting the BSF programme were approved during the year. The funding for this variation will be from the BSF programme contingency.	463
9	<b>Other Minor Variations</b> - over/underspends of less than +/- £50k	22
<b>Total Children &amp; Young People Services</b>		<b>(8,421)</b>
<b>Adults, Culture &amp; Community Services</b>		
10	<b>Framework-i Payments</b> - a carry forward request will be made for £25k for an E-Learning package which will provide alternative training for users following the reduction in support associated with savings made in 2011/12.	(55)
11	<b>Transforming Social Care Capital</b> - this Department of Health grant is earmarked to support the implementation of the personalisation agenda following the successful pilots. Due to delays in implementing mobile working the project has underspent and a carry forward request is being made to continue with this development in 2011/12.	(59)
12	<b>Disabled Facilities Grant</b> - £19k is to be paid back to CLG as a result of an ineligible claim for ex-service personnel.	(19)
13	<b>Broadwater Farm Community Centre</b> - this project has been delayed. However, expenditure is now fully committed.	(356)
14	<b>Muswell Hill Library</b> - the planned re-development of the library is dependant on capital receipts from the sale of land to the rear of the building. However, as current property market conditions will preclude the Council from realising the maximum benefit from the sale, the project has been delayed.	(499)
15	<b>Ducketts Common</b> - this externally funded project is fully committed and expenditure will be incurred in 2011/12. Uncertainty around government funding for this project caused significant delays.	(52)
16	<b>Lordship Recreation</b> - Heritage Lottery Funding stage 2 now approved. £400k GLA and £194k Environment Agency funding to be deferred to 2011/12.	(594)
17	<b>Play Provision</b> - this project will be completed during 2011/12. The project was delayed due to uncertainty around government funding and the length of consultation period required.	(156)
18	<b>Down Lane</b> - Growth Area Funding to be spent during 2011/12. Delays linked to the Tottenham Hale Development.	(110)
19	<b>Other Minor Variations</b> - over/underspends of less than +/- £50k	7
<b>Total - Adults, Culture &amp; Community Services</b>		<b>(1,893)</b>
<b>Corporate Resources</b>		

**APPENDIX 2**

<b>Capital</b>		<b>Variation £000's</b>
<b>Outturn 2010/11 - explanation of variances from budget</b>		<b>+ / ( - )</b>
<b>20</b>	<b>Corporate IT</b> - £499k of the in-year under spend is the balance of unallocated budget as the IT prioritisation Board only approve the release of budget for projects that have a fully worked-up business case. The remaining under spend is largely due to timing around when equipment is delivered and installed and the impact of council - wide re-organisations on deployment decisions. The majority of this element of the under spend is fully committed and is therefore requested as a carry forward.	(1,327)
	<b>Property Services:</b>	
<b>21</b>	<b>Refurbishment and Upgrade of Industrial Units (Munroe Works)</b> - programmed works slipped whilst outstanding funding issues were resolved. Works are now planned for 2011/12.	(89)
<b>22</b>	<b>Corporate Management of Property</b> - the key projects creating the under spend are repairs to Bruce Castle roof which was delayed due to English Heritage requirements and the demolition of the rear annexe at Hornsey Town Hall.	(183)
<b>23</b>	<b>Hornsey Town Hall Project</b> - due to the need for an in-year re-assessment of the most appropriate solution to deliver this key regeneration project, there has been programme slippage.	(867)
<b>24</b>	<b>Alexandra Palace Ice Rink</b> - the underspend is a result of a delay in agreeing the final account.	(277)
<b>25</b>	<b>Other Minor Variations</b> - over/underspends of less than +/- £50k	(28)
	<b>Total Corporate Resources</b>	<b>(2,771)</b>

**APPENDIX 2**

<b>Capital</b>		<b>Variation £000's</b>
<b>Outturn 2010/11 - explanation of variances from budget</b>		<b>+ / ( - )</b>
	<b>Urban Environment (General Fund)</b>	
26	<b>Marsh Lane</b> - the project is currently frozen due to the funding gap.	(2,272)
27	<b>Ferry Lane Towpath</b> - projected delayed until Growth Area Financing secured.	(50)
28	<b>Stonebridge Lock Water Sports</b> - project delayed until Growth area Funding secured.	(150)
29	<b>Marsh Lane Green Route</b> - project delayed until Growth Area Funding secured.	(50)
30	<b>Green Link (Down Lane Park)</b> - project delayed until Growth Area Funding secured.	(60)
31	<b>Bruce Grove</b> - delays to building works due to inclement weather conditions.	(40)
32	<b>Myddleton Road (Enabling Project &amp; Partnership Schemes in Conservation Areas (PSICA))</b> - delay in starting the project as grant agreements not signed by property owners until January 2011. Building work is now due to start in 2011-12.	(75)
33	<b>Tottenham High Road (PSICA -English Heritage)</b> - overspend due to additional unforeseen roof works. These roof works were eligible under the English Heritage PSICA funding which will be reclaimed from English Heritage.	65
34	<b>Compulsory Purchase Orders</b> - properties were purchased and sold on back to back basis.	740
35	<b>Re-provision of Recycling Centre</b> - at present the only expenditure is for some preparatory work and initial design and planning work. The remainder of the budget is requested to be carried forward.	(239)
36	<b>Maintenance of Principal Rd</b> - reduced allocation from TFL.	(158)
37	<b>Private Sector Housing Activity</b> - late funding received from Sub region to be spent in the year.	796
38	<b>Section 278 Highways Act 1980</b> - underspend relates to various schemes now due to take place in 2011/12. Funding secured.	(84)
39	<b>Streetscene Section 106 schemes</b> - underspend relates to various schemes now due to take place in 2011/12. Funding secured.	(57)
40	<b>Replacement Wheeled &amp; Green Bins</b> - further investment halted as previous contract was winding down.	(33)
41	<b>Other Minor Variations</b> - over/underspends of less than +/- £50k	23
	<b>Urban Environment (General Fund) Total</b>	<b>(1,644)</b>
	<b>Urban Environment (HRA)</b>	
42	<b>Planned Maintenance</b> - programme accelerated to achieve full spend on the overall HRA budget	733
43	<b>Boiler Replacement</b> - demand led spend	476
44	<b>Lift Improvements</b> - due to delays in starting on site	(306)
45	<b>Major Works Void Conversions</b> - demand led spend	(381)
46	<b>Mechanical &amp; Electrical Works</b> - delays in the Integrated Reception System (IRS) Programme	(981)
47	<b>Professional Fees</b> - additional Asset Management costs to manage an increased the capital programme	179
48	<b>Fire Protection Work</b> - demand led spend	(119)
49	<b>Decent home standards</b> - programme accelerated to achieve full spend on the overall HRA budget	598
50	<b>Other Minor Variations</b> - over/underspends of less than +/- £50k	(266)
	<b>Total - Urban Environment (HRA)</b>	<b>(67)</b>
	<b>Total Capital Variances</b>	<b>(14,796)</b>

**APPENDIX 3**

<b>Capital</b>		<b>Carry forward request £'000</b>
<b>Capital carry forward requests from 2010/11</b>		
<b>Total Capital carry forward requests from 2010/11</b>		<b>12,644</b>
	<b>Children and Young People</b>	
	<b>Budget / Description and Reason for Carry Forward</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>BSF Programme - School Construction Projects</b> - the carry forward request relates to the balance of the BSF programme expenditure now profiled to fall in 2011-12 and 2012-13 financial year.	7,747
<b>2</b>	<b>BSF Programme - Managed Service ICT contract</b> - the carry forward request is to support the ICT contract which will continue until 2013.	854
<b>3</b>	<b>Primary Capital Programme</b> - net reduction to be applied to 2011-12 capital programme (predominantly owed to the greater than budgeted spend within Devolved Formula Capital)	(180)
<b>Total Carry Forward Request – Children and Young People</b>		<b>8,421</b>

**APPENDIX 3**

<b>Capital</b>		<b>Carry forward request £'000</b>
<b>Capital carry forward requests from 2010/11</b>		
<b>Total Capital carry forward requests from 2010/11</b>		<b>12,644</b>
	<b>Adults, Culture and Community Services</b>	
	<b>Budget / Description and Reason for Carry Forward</b>	
<b>4</b>	<b>Frameworki Project Costs</b> - to implement E-Learning as an alternative learning tool following reductions in support through 11/12 savings	25
<b>5</b>	<b>Transforming Social Care Capital Grant</b> - to implement mobile working to support the Personalisation Agenda	59
<b>6</b>	<b>Disabled Facilities Grant</b> - underspend to be carried forward to repay DCLG re 2009/10 ineligible claim re ex-service personnel	19
<b>7</b>	<b>Broadwater Farm Community Centre</b> - project delayed by now fully committed	355
<b>8</b>	<b>Ducketts Common</b> - expenditure to be incurred in 2011/12	52
<b>9</b>	<b>Lordship Recreation</b> - Heritage Lottery Funding stage 2 now approved. £400k GLA and £100k Environmental agency funding to be deferred to 2011/12	594
<b>10</b>	<b>Play Provision</b> - to be completed during 2011/12	156
<b>11</b>	<b>Downlane</b> - Growth Area Fund committed and to be spent during 2011/12	110
<b>Total Carry Forward Request – Adults, Culture and Community Services</b>		<b>1,370</b>

**APPENDIX 3**

<b>Capital</b>		<b>Carry forward request £'000</b>
<b>Capital carry forward requests from 2010/11</b>		
<b>Total Capital carry forward requests from 2010/11</b>		<b>12,644</b>
<b>Corporate Resources</b>		
<b>Budget / Description and Reason for Carry Forward</b>		
<b>12</b>	<b>Monroe Works Refurbishment</b> - programmed works slipped to 2011/12 due to insufficient funding. The property is leased by Haringey and we have a contractual requirement to reinstate the fire damage for which we have received insurance money. However this is insufficient and under spends of £104k within the Commercial Unit and £40k from Corporate Landlord are being requested to be carried forward to enable the project to be fully funded and completed.	144
<b>13</b>	<b>Hornsey Town Hall Rear Annexe Demolition</b> - works completed in May. Funding of £25k from Accommodation Strategy and £33k from Corporate Landlord	58
<b>14</b>	<b>Bruce Castle Roof Repairs</b> - start on site delayed due to English Heritage requirements.	60
<b>15</b>	<b>Bruce Castle Archive Store</b> - refurbishment works to allow relocation of archive files from Hornsey Town Hall. Contractors on site, completing mid May	13
<b>16</b>	<b>Alexandra Palace Ice Rink</b> - awaiting settlement of final account.	277
<b>IT Capital Programme</b>		
<b>17</b>	<b>Parking</b> - project in progress - awaiting software delivery	151
<b>18</b>	<b>Telephony</b> - project in progress	664
<b>19</b>	<b>GCSx</b> - awaiting installation of final circuit	37
<b>20</b>	<b>SAP Optimisation</b> - project in progress - awaiting hardware delivery	10
<b>21</b>	<b>Respond</b> - project in progress	47
<b>Total Carry Forward Request – Corporate Resources</b>		<b>1,461</b>



**APPENDIX 3**

<b>Capital</b>		<b>Carry forward request £'000</b>
<b>Capital carry forward requests from 2010/11</b>		
<b>Total Capital carry forward requests from 2010/11</b>		<b>12,644</b>
<b>Urban Environment</b>		
	<b>Budget / Description and Reason for Carry Forward</b>	
<b>22</b>	<b>Marsh Lane</b> - underspend in 2010-11 is £2.271m - however, only £500k is being requested to be carried forward to meet on-site management obligations such as Relocating an EDF electricity cable; Site security, Finalising land transfers with TfL; Outstanding fees for the commissioned project managers. The rest can be released as the project is not going ahead.	500
<b>23</b>	<b>Ferry Lane Towpath</b> - GAF monies now in place for project to proceed in 2011-12.	50
<b>24</b>	<b>Stonebridge Lock Water Sports</b> - GAF monies now in place for project to proceed in 2011-12.	150
<b>25</b>	<b>Marsh Lane Green Route</b> - GAF monies now in place for project to proceed in 2011-12	50
<b>26</b>	<b>Green Link (Down Lane Park)</b> - GAF monies now in place for project to proceed in 2011-12.	60
<b>27</b>	<b>Bruce Grove</b> - budget is committed for retentions	40
<b>28</b>	<b>Myddleton Road (Enabling Project)</b> - work-in-progress with expected completion being the end of July.	68
<b>29</b>	<b>Myddleton Road (English Heritage)</b> - work-in-progress with expected completion being the end of July.	7
<b>30</b>	<b>Tottenham High Road (English Heritage - PSICA)</b> - outstanding works to be funded from earmarked capital receipts in 2011-12.	87
<b>31</b>	<b>Re-provision of Recycling Centre</b> - only initial design work completed. Still to complete demolition, construction of site and re-construction of access road in 2011/12.	239
<b>32</b>	<b>Section 278 schemes</b> - funding now in place for schemes to commence	84
<b>33</b>	<b>Section 106 schemes</b> - funding now in place for schemes to commence	57
<b>Total Carry Forward Request - Urban Environment</b>		<b>1,392</b>

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Proposed closures of homes, centres, drop-ins and the Alexandra Road Crisis Unit – Consultation Results**

### **Report – May 2011**

#### **Sections**

- 1. Background**
- 2. Results**
- 3. Supporting Documentation**

# Section 1 - Background

## Introduction

This report sets out the main findings of the consultation regarding the proposed closure of homes, centres, drop-ins and the Alexandra Road Crisis Unit. The findings will form part of the reports presented to councillors in June and July 2011.

## Consultation Details

The consultation ran for three months from 31<sup>st</sup> January to 30<sup>th</sup> April 2011. Meetings were however held with users of services, relatives and carers as well as staff either immediately before and after Christmas 2010 or at the start of the New Year 2011 to alert them to the proposed budget cuts and that we would be consulting on the proposal. This was followed up, at various stages in January through April 2011, by letters and emails (over 1200 or more were sent out), notices in the local press, via the independent and voluntary sector, the local online community and NHS colleagues and discussed and advertised via the five Adult Partnership Boards so that the message could be cascaded to as wide as possible an audience. The consultation around the proposed closure of the Alexandra Road Crisis Unit was moreover conducted with NHS Haringey. There was also a comprehensive web page where people could find up to date information, including feedback; this has received over 2100 viewings as follows:

Page	Page views
Budgetconsultation/general	995
budgetconsultation/daycarecentres	428
budgetconsultation/residentialhomes	272
budgetconsultation/alexroad	263
budgetconsultation/dropincentres	177

We also issued a reminder about the consultation (and the time remaining for people to have their say) midway through the consultation and have advised that, though, our three-month consultation, launched in January 2011, has now ended, consultation is an ongoing process and people can make further representation to Councillors when they are making their final decisions.

There were several main channels for the consultation. These included:

- Consultation surveys (printed and online versions were made available), where, participants could separately complete questionnaires for day care centres, drop-ins, residential care homes/bed based respite care or the Alexandra Road Crisis Unit and, in doing so, respond to specific questions and/or add comments of their own.

- email or other written correspondence directly to the council or via a councillor or local member of parliament, which allowed any comments whatsoever to be made on the proposed changes. We have also received responses from advocates acting on behalf of groups or individuals.
- a significant number of events were held with users, relatives and carers where individuals were presented with information about the proposals and the consultation and then given the opportunity to discuss and comment upon the various aspects including the potential impact upon them and to put forward their case or alternative propositions. **See pages 25-34 for details of these meetings.**

There were also opportunities for the five established partnership boards, reference groups, forums and other networks to consider formally the proposal and to respond to the consultation so that carers, older people's representatives, those representing people with learning and other disabilities, mental health issues, the BME community etc could have their say. Several, such as the Older Peoples and Learning Disabilities Partnership Boards, CASCH, a residents association in Crouch End and Haringey User Network taking the opportunity to do so.

16 Feb, 13 Apr 2011	Older People's Partnership Board
19 Jan, 31 Mar 2011	Carers Partnership Board
2 Feb, 23 Mar and 18 May 2011	Learning Disabilities Partnership Board
13 Jan, 14 Apr 2011	Mental Health Partnership Board
24 Jan, 16 May 2011	Autism Disorder Spectrum Group

In addition, in response to requests received, we met with a number of individuals or groups to discuss a number of alternative proposals. Users and other interested parties were also encouraged to begin their own consultation with officers attending or facilitating meetings. Details as follows:

16/02/2011	Muswell Hill Pensioners Action Group
9/03/2011	Cranwood Community Group
09/02/2011	Tom's Club
18/02/2011	Clarendon Centre
21/03/2011	Haringey Local Improvement Network (LINK)

21/03/2011	Older People's Drop-in Centres workshop
15/04/2011	Meet with Cllr Schmitz Options for Willoughby Rd
<b>Planned for June</b>	<b>Young at Heart</b>
<b>Planned for June</b>	<b>Hill Homes 'Extra care' scheme</b>

In respect of the Older People's Drop-ins and the half-day workshop with 40 service users (10 from each centre) facilitated by Age UK, key issues of concern raised by this group were around the loss of social contact, the hot meal in the middle of the day and foot-care and how Dial a Ride and similar were seen as less efficient than the Council service (provided from down-time in the middle of the day from Older People's Services day care-based vehicles).

## Responses to the Consultation

Our consultation sought to reach a wide-ranging audience and we received a significant number and varied set of responses.

There were over **400** direct responses to the consultation including over **200** letters and emails and, at the time this report was produced, **191** completed surveys. On average, over **300** users, relatives and carers a month attended the various meetings that we held.

People said, in some cases, that they planned to fight the cuts and/or advised us that they had or would be submitting petitions to keep the service/venues open – those we have received have been logged as part of the consultation. We received petitions from 'Save the Woodside and Haven Day Centres' (31 signatures), 'The Haringey Day Care and Drop-in Centres' (79 signatures), 'Don't Close the Whitehall Street Centre' (168 signatures), Willoughby Road Drop-in (128 signatures), Woodside House drop-in (108 signatures), the Irish Centre (48 signatures), 'Save Alexandra Road Crisis Unit' (169 signatures), 'Save Broadwater Lodge' (58 signatures), the Liberal Democrat Group in Haringey (586 signatures) and a further 99 signatures from a joint campaign to defend all adult social care services in the Borough.

(as at 19 May 2011)	
Number of meetings: users, relatives, carers	56
Number of other meetings attended or facilitated	10
Number of completed user questionnaires	
68 responses to the proposed closure of day care centres	191

48 responses to the proposed closure of drop-in centres 22 responses to the proposed closure of residential care homes and bed based respite services 53 responses to the proposed closure of the Alexandra Road Crisis Unit	
Number of supporting letters (service users, other organisation, MPs, Members Enquiries etc)  56 responses to the proposed closure of day care centres, of which 6 related directly to the proposed Haynes/Grange merger 23 responses to the proposed closure of drop-in centres 60 responses to the proposed closure of residential care homes and bed based respite services 21 responses to the proposed closure of the Alexandra Road Crisis Unit 62 general and other enquiries, including about the Jackson's Lane Luncheon Club	222
Petitions (total number of signatories: 1474 )	10

There was also local and national press and television coverage and both local members of parliament visited a number of the homes and centres and met with users, relatives, carers and staff as did a number of ward councillors.

There was a deputation to Downing Street and there will be a motion in parliament seemingly.

### **Accessibility Issues**

We produced information about the consultation in a number of accessible forms (other languages, audio, Braille, large print etc) on request and engaged independent advocates for those individuals and groups who needed it. Having listened, separate meetings were held with deaf people and the blind and partially sighted and, after the first meeting, we held separate meetings at Whitehall St for residential and respite users to discuss the proposals.

Advocates were on hand for individuals who may have mental or other capacity issues and who did not have an appropriate family member or friend to advocate on their behalf and/or separate meetings have been arranged with those individuals and/or groups concerned. Several responses received have been dictated to others and/or are resumes of meetings that advocates or others have had with service users in a number of locations.

### **Equalities**

Voluntary sector organisations and users of services alike said it was important that the equalities impact of the proposed savings were fully taken into account and monitored. Equalities Impact Assessments (EQIAs) have been produced and accompany the final report.

Those who attended one or more of the regular monthly meetings and left feedback fell into the following categories:

Total number of respondents 72 (not all commented on all questions)	Gender	Age	Ethnicity	Disability (those who consider themselves to be a disabled person)
	51 women 11 male  Gender differ from birth: 3	17 under 60 43 60 or over	White 42 Mixed 2 Asian/Asian British 9 Black or Black British 6 Chinese or other 3	37 – No 20 - Yes
	Sexual orientation	Religion		
	45 Heterosexual Remainder did not complete this section of the form	None 5 Christian 41 Buddhist 2 Hindu 5 Other 3 Jewish 1 Muslim 5 Other 3		

The following are the key characteristics of the 191 people who responded to the questionnaire surveys.

	Drop-ins	Day centres	Homes	ARCU
Over 60s/under 60s	Roughly 50:50	30:70	Roughly 40:60	High (88%) proportion in their 30, 40s and 50s
Those considering themselves to have a disability	42% (Y) 54% (N)	59%(Y): 37% (N)	14% (Y) 82% (N)	62% (Y) 38% (N)
Ethnicity	95% White just under 1:5 of them White Irish 4% Black or Black British Significantly no Mixed race, Asian, Asian British or Chinese respondents	54% White 11% Mixed 7% Asian or Asian British 28% Black or Black British 3% Chinese or other ethnic group	68% White 9% Mixed 0% Asian or Asian British 14% Black or Black British 0% Chinese or other ethnic group	43% White 8% Mixed 2% Asian or Asian British 21% Black or Black British 4% Chinese or other ethnic group
Gender	2:1 women and less than 5% whose genders different than at birth	60% women 30% men 4% whose genders different than at birth	73% women 23% men 0% whose genders different than at birth	55% women 32% men 2% whose gender differs from birth
Sexual Orientation	75% Heterosexua	84% Heterosexua	73% Heterosexua	70% Heterosexua



	1 2% Gay 2% Bisexual 0% Lesbian	1 2% Gay 2% Bisexual 0% Lesbian	1 5% Gay 5% Bisexual 0% Lesbian	1 4% Gay 0% Bisexual 6% Lesbian
Religion	56% Christian 21% None 6% Muslim 2% other	62% Christian 15% no religion 4% Muslim 2% Buddhist 2% Jewish 2% Other	59% Christian 5% Muslim 23% No religion	38% Christian 28% no religion 8% Muslim 2% Buddhist 2% Jewish 2% Rastafarian 4% Other

Given the relatively small numbers involved compared with the numbers who use the services, from an equalities aspect, the EQIAs are therefore a more reliable source of the impact of the proposed cuts on groups and individuals with specific protected characteristics.

### Comments on the consultation

Direct feedback, including from 72 respondents who attended meetings for users, relatives and carers who took the trouble to complete feedback forms, would indicate that the meetings we held were sensitively run and generally positively received and that the Council had fulfilled its responsibility of keeping those who attended informed. Of these 72, 47 (65%) rated the meeting as good or very good with the remainder who indicated saying they were satisfied, unsatisfied with proceedings or expressing mixed opinions. There were 8 responses without comments.

Others we have heard from said they had struggled to comprehend or hear what was being said, felt the meeting has been dominated by others or that they lacked detailed enough feedback on which to participate effectively.

There were some views that the consultation was “seriously flawed”, should be suspended, reviewed and re-modelled so that it engaged more openly with service users, carers and representative organisations. There were claims that users of services and others have found it difficult to challenge the Council’s figures or offer alternatives because of a lack of a detailed costs or that substitutes/replacements had not been properly costed. It was also stated that there appeared to be no transitional arrangements even though, as was explained, no decision has been taken.

Others suggested that proposals had been hastily arranged or that decisions had already been made, that the questions in the questionnaire were ‘loaded’, queried the levels of advocacy or other support and/or asserted that the consultation was a formality, foregone conclusion or was even a ‘sham’. In the case of ARCU, there was a concern that plans for a new service would appear to have advanced to a fairly advanced stage, questions over the legal justification for the proposed closures of homes or requests for the proposals not to be looked at in isolation.

There was frustration at how long the consultation was lasting, and in the absence of a decision, the 'lack of progress' from one meeting to the next and that no one could tell them what specifically would be happening to them or their loved one or that councillors had not already 'reversed' the proposal. Others said the council should listen to specialists or have taken account of their views as service users, relatives or professionals from the outset.

### **Feedback**

People asked a good many questions at the monthly meetings or in their correspondence. Formal responses to many of the recurring questions that were posed during the consultation have been placed on the consultation web page, displayed in homes and centre and/or made available on request or in responses to individual correspondence received. However, in summary, people asked about the reason for the savings and wanted to discuss other ways of saving money, asked what would happen to the buildings or to other groups using the buildings, asked about the consultation, and for more information to enable them to propose alternative courses of action for consideration as part of the consultation. Understandably some queried what would happen to users of services should the proposed closures go ahead, worried as they were about not having enough time to make alternative arrangements.

## **Section 2 - Results**

### **Interpreting the Consultation Responses**

A great deal of time and effort has been put into the responses by contributors to the consultation. Many individuals, particularly in their letters and at meetings, have described their personal experiences and how they have been using the services for a good many years, even decades in some cases.

Local voluntary organisations and other professionals have also discussed in detail the specific comments they have about the proposals. Plus there are the detailed responses to the various questionnaires. All of these responses have been considered and analysed.

For the purposes of assessing the impact where possible and appropriate within the report the different proposals have been considered separately.

## **Key findings**

Throughout this section of the report, we have sought to include recurring themes emerging from stakeholder responses, rather than detailing specific, individual issues or outlining every point of view.

### **1. Views of users of services**

#### **Meetings with users of services and correspondence (pages 34-60) received:**

Those who attended meetings or who wrote in have understandably expressed a range of emotions and strengths of feeling. Many were angry, upset, appalled, frightened, helpless, stressed or depressed by the proposal. Some said it was affecting their health. There was genuine sadness that this was happening. Others thought the proposal deeply unfair or that it would also have a 'knock on effect' for those they looked after or who looked after them and put extra pressure on them. Some sensed that no one really cared about the impact this would have on them or had their interests at heart. Some said how they did not deserve this.

Across each of the homes and centres and in correspondence received, more users of services understood the reasons for the cuts than did not, even if they did not necessarily agree with the cost-effectiveness of the proposal or why or how the changes were proposed to be implemented.

The general view of those present at meetings and writing-in was that these organisations provided vital, much-needed services and support. They overwhelmingly would prefer it if they remained as they were and 'strongly opposed' or 'opposed' the proposal. People also said how highly they valued and rated these services and for the most part had no complaints with them, making favourable comparisons with the help and support that they had previously received elsewhere and/or referred to their current services as 'beacons of excellence' and 'invaluable in a crisis'.

Many people who participated in the consultation did so with personal stories and explained the impact of the cuts for them and/or their loved ones or the groups and individuals whose interests they represented. We received 27 'impact statements' from users of the Haven about what the closure would mean for them personally. Many said how they would miss the social interaction, friendships they have struck with staff and other users of services or meals, outings and/or other activities on offer including foot care, dancing,

bingo etc. Many said how it was the only time they socialised or had contact with people outside of the home and that they looked forward to coming to centres, drop-ins etc. For those in residential care, this was “their home” and the staff “their family”.

Relatives and carers pointed to the transformation in their loved one demeanour and overall well-being and how the ‘stimulation’ they received from attending centres and drop-ins had helped them a lot since they started coming there. They worried where else they would go or receive a service or the impact that a move (and in some cases another move) would have on users, how their life was “hanging in the balance” or would, some claimed, deteriorate as a result or even result in their dying. Some said they would be become isolated in their homes, lonely, end up in residential care, on the streets or in hospital. Others worried that users of services would become less settled or that relatives and carers would no longer have time to do some of the things they liked or needed to do. Several people cited concerns that family members could have to give up jobs to look after them. The psychological factor and trauma, it was said, should be taken into consideration.

### **Alternatives proposals/sources of funding**

Many said that they understood the Council needed to make savings but that it needed to be more creative or look at other ways of making cuts rather than ‘targeting’, as they saw it, the elderly or most vulnerable and that the council had a responsibility to care for elderly, treat them with dignity and involve them in society. Others felt that, as one of the most deprived boroughs in London, Haringey was ‘bearing the brunt of the cuts’. Others thought that cuts to Adult Services were ‘disproportionate’, something of a soft option and the wrong place to be making cuts. Respondents also said we should support older people, they depend on these services and that they deserved to be treated better after a lifetime of work and paying taxes. Many stated that they were happy with the way things were.

Some people said that the proposed savings were a false economy and/or that it would cost more in the long run to provide them with support at home or in another setting, lead to over-crowding (684), a lack of capacity (dementia services) and/or even longer waiting lists (Alexandra Road/respite services). Others said that it was difficult to put a value on the emotional comfort and support that they received or did not believe that ‘relatively small sums’ could not be found to keep their service or these services generally open.

Included in the responses were suggestions that the Council use its reserves, money from the Icelandic banks, cut management posts, executive pay, communications/IT costs and waste and generally look elsewhere before cutting these ‘vital’, front-line services. Some queried the decision not to cut any of the Borough’s libraries and/or to expand these services. There were worries that for some, including those that were less mobile, ‘use of a library’ was not an effective option. Others suggested the council tender services out, they be run through a charity or trust or trained volunteers supervised by qualified staff, people pay-per-use. Others suggested that alternative sources

of funding be found: charities, lottery, local retailers etc. Some were prepared to pay more council tax. Others suggested that service users might attend different venues on different days or share venues and providers; that operating hours be reduced or saw the logic in amalgamating centres and homes (provided at least one of each type remained in existence) or that neighbouring authorities work together on finding a solution. Others said that what was wanted was more training to get back to work or voluntary work.

Those in favour of the proposals said that the needs of all Haringey residents must be put ahead of the few. Some pointed to what they called the duplication of older people's services or felt that the Alexandra Road Crisis Unit, for example, should close as it did not benefit service users in the long run, with some, as they saw it, simply using the service as a hotel with no lasting improvement in their situation afterwards. Others said the Council should be finding cheaper alternatives in the private sector and felt that the Independent sector was capable of providing care of equal quality. Others accepted that such things as day centres did not have to be run directly by the council provided standards were maintained and regularly monitored. For some, who the provider was, was less important than the quality of the care provided and how centres and homes were closed more important than their closure.

Those in favour also said by all means close centres but provide a safety net for emergencies and ensure that concrete alternatives were in place before changes should be considered. People also said that the Council ought to distinguish between "drug induced and genetic or inherited mental illness" with users being asked to pay rather than receive publicly-funded support for the former.

Others responded that whereas all services were important, that did not mean all of them had to be delivered at all of the centres. It was also suggested that services could be provided in community groups/sheltered housing or 'extra care' type settings and in retirement villages or delivered via personal assistants in the home or that there should be greater access to other statutory and trained professionals outside conventional office hours. One respondent confirmed that supported housing schemes organised events and that they were fairly under-used.

Others were reluctant or declined to comment saying that the savings should be found from elsewhere or that there was simply nowhere out there that matched their service and that it was unique, that we should maintain these existing 'centres of excellence' or that things should stay as they are.

Should the proposed mergers and closures go ahead, the prevailing view was that every effort should be made to find suitable community based groups and organisations to take them over and they be offered practical support in doing so. There was therefore support for discussion with other providers, faith groups and social clubs provided these were open and transparent and encouraged others to come forward and engage in alternative provision. Age UK mentioned it had already been working with church groups and others on

developing neighbourhood befriending schemes and that these could well support new small scales drop-in centres.

Others said they had asked their local church for support or that they could raise the money needed to keep the service open. There were both formal and informal offers by users and others to run the places themselves, for example that a Community Group be allowed to tender to run Cranwood residential care home once the current home had been demolished and replaced by 4 x 12-bed homes. There was a question however as to whether the high degree of dependency at day centres would result in voluntary groups being able to assume responsibility for them or with support to voluntary groups being cut how those groups could be expected to fill the gap.

### **Effects of the cuts – Service-Specific comments:**

#### **Residential and Respite Care**

There were concerns about standards in the private sector and what would replace residential and respite services if the homes closed. Loss of continuity and consistency of service and that alternatives could be too far away for many people to travel to were also uppermost concerns.

There were worries too that moving residents out of the borough would make visiting loved ones more difficult.

Respite facilities save the Council money, it was said, 'by providing the bulk of the care'. They also it was argued gave users of services a regular experience of being away from home and their carer for when the carer was no longer able to care for them.

#### **Drop-ins and Day Care centres:**

It was said that these preventative services provided a 'life line' for those who used them and that many people would be isolated or lose the only significant social contact they had without them. People also considered that without the monitoring of vital signs and regular contact of staff in these centres, the physical and mental health of older service users and those with mental health issues, could worsen as service users could come to harm through neglecting to eat properly or take their medication leading to more demands on social care and health services.

Drops-ins, it was said, were vital for contact, friendship, a hot meal and stimulation and have served as hubs for older people in the local community for many years now. People would have nowhere else to go and nothing to do than sit at home if it facilities were to close, it was said.

Closure of non-statutory services such as the drop-ins was also thought to increase the likelihood of a more serious intervention by the Council or NHS and seen as being a "sound investment in the well being of older people".

Others thought that the journey from one side of the borough to the other would prove too much for some people or that there would be nothing left for them where they lived if their local centre or home were to close or amalgamate.

Several people spoke of the importance of a week-end service in places like the Grange and the Haynes or the profound impact that centres had on the lives and quality of life of people with dementia and their carers.

A number of people said that alternatives such as the Clarendon for day centres users or Recovery Houses or wards for those with mental health issues would have a very different feel about them or fail to adequately meet their needs. The 684 Centre had given people skills to cope and is financially and otherwise successful.

Stability was seen as important for people with dementia. Moreover, people with dementia, it was said, needed a stimulating environment and active and stable relationships and skilled staff that these centres offered. None of which, it was argued, could be sourced in the independent sector or provided in people's homes.

As carers of people with dementia representing themselves and service users who are unable to represent themselves, the Haynes Relatives Support Groups objections to the closure of what they called an 'excellent state of the art facility that had transformed their and their loved ones lives' was that the proposed merger of the Haynes and the Grange and the closure of Woodside Day Centre was contrary to the interest of people with dementia and their carers and would be harmful to them. They argued that the Haynes Centre does not have the capacity to accommodate current clients with dementia and that doubling the numbers (to 30 per day) would result in overcrowding and compromise the quality of care, even if staffing ratios are appropriate and "gross under provision". They cited a 1992 planning and design guide published by the Alzheimer's Society recommending a maximum of 16 clients per day.

As for the proposed closure of the Haven, re-provision proposals (amounting, it was stated, to 3 hrs additional homecare per week) was not seen as a substitute for the care users of services currently received.

Users of some groups and organisations (dance and luncheon clubs for example) could not understand why their centre might close when the activity they attended was, in their view, self-supporting.

#### **Alexandra Road Crisis Unit:**

ARCU was seen as an extremely important part of the mental health service in Haringey providing a positive pathway to avoiding hospital admissions, pressure on GPs etc. Closing ARCU would, it was argued, be short-sighted and high in both financial and human terms. A short stay at ARCU can, it was argued, prevent some people from needing to go onto more serious units for more serious conditions, make a real difference and save lives and was

preferable to locked wards and a hospital setting which were not viewed as viable or preferred alternatives and about which there was genuine anxiety. People it was said, did not want a medical model but a person-centred approach like ARCU.

People were uncertain of the strategy behind the closure arguing that the replacement(s) as they saw it being advocated would be very different to now and based on a medical model that services users did not want. Recovery Houses, it was said, worked along different lines such that ARCU's demise would not pick up on the need for a community based crisis and respite unit with 24hr telephone support leading to gaps in crisis services making it difficult for services users to move quickly from a crisis back into normal life.

People said they appreciated that the NHS rather than council cuts precipitated closure of ARCU but felt the Council should be helping to save the place from closing.

Haringey Users Network as part of its work in supporting service users, having consulted users, said there was a clear conclusion that the service was popular and effective and that service users would be most concerned about the loss of respite care; the skills and empathetic support of staff and the loss of the 24 hr support phone line.

#### **Other comments:**

People with learning disabilities or mental health issues, it was said, needed a secure and stable environment.

Many expressed concerns for the future of staff working in the homes and centres and asked us what we are doing for them.

#### **Comments on the Way Ahead – the Future**

Some respondents worried that these savings would have lasting consequences for the community and those groups and individuals they supported and cared. Some worried that certain users would have fewer opportunities or a reduced voice in the community. Others pointed to the extra demand for statutory and non-statutory services across the Borough and as they saw it the wider social impact of the proposals.

There were worries too about current and future capacity if services closed or amalgamated or that the quality could not or would not be replicated in the independent sector or that prices would rise. Those worried about future capacity, pointed to a rise in both the ageing population in Haringey and the numbers of those with dementia and how current service user numbers was but a fraction of those in Haringey diagnosed with dementia and that this was therefore the wrong time to be making cuts of this kind. One centre for the people with dementia it was said, would not be enough.



They were also concerned that, with the proposed closure of day centres, the Council would not be able to commission the day care needed and that people with personal budgets would not be able to access day care. Care at home, they argued, was an unsatisfactory alternative.

Finally without the specialist care these day centres provide, there will be additional costs in the future due to the loss of these preventative services. Moreover, setting up an independent sector in Haringey (currently lacking) could prove costlier plus it might in due time lead to an increase in placement prices hence comparative costs were meaningless.

Some Mental Health respondents did not have high hopes for future of crisis services in Haringey. They were worried that even if crisis services still existed that the threshold to access them would be much higher such that the only MH services available would be for those who are seriously ill.

### **User Survey Questionnaires:**

(where numbers do not tally this equates to the fact that people for whatever reason did not answer all of the questions) Percentages also rounded up and down. Where returns are identical and obviously written by the same hand and not by an advocate or someone acting on behalf of someone else, the results have not been counted.

A total of **191** responses were received about proposed changes to services. Detailed results are attached as appendices to this report; **pages 20-24** includes some of the analysis that has been drawn out.

## **2. Providers and Voluntary Sector organisations, including advocacy services, and others**

Some comments are raised by others (and so not repeated here) and/or are covered elsewhere in the report.

Commenting on the proposal, several respondents expressed their opposition to any cuts in funding that threatened services for vulnerable people within the community or as in the case of the Unions were opposed to the closure of homes and centres but accepted that funding shortages lay behind the proposal.

Leading charities such as Age UK voiced their opposition to some or all of the proposals but at the same time extended offers of help and/or suggested steps the Council should and could take to mitigate and/or monitor the impact were the cuts to go ahead. Some were pleased to see the personalisation programme moving forward and were keen to work with the Council in developing a diverse market in services. Others like the Unions were concerned that the personalisation agenda was being used to justify some of

the proposed closures and or questioned how we could be advocating more choice and control if we were at the same time proposing to reduce services. They were concerned too that personalisation was being used to generate a market in social care.

Age UK thought that, in the context of the overall savings that had to be found, that Adult Social Care had not fared too badly although this needed to be seen in the context of other Council/NHS reductions, including in its own funding. Having said that, they suggested that cutting back on services that promoted a full and healthy life in older age risked putting short term financial gain ahead of sound long term policy.

Age UK had no objection in principle to outsourcing of home and residential care services to the independent or voluntary sectors and recognised the Council's policy to use only those providers rated 'excellent' or 'good' by the Care Quality Commission. There was concern however about the self-assessment procedures used by providers and that there should be robust monitoring arrangements in place.

Haringey User Network (HUN) acknowledged services needed to be fit for purpose and of value to individuals. From consultation they carried out, HUN was of the view that the 684 Centre and the Alexandra Road Crisis Unit were beneficial to the mental well being of service users. There was however a perception that 684 was under-used, but, should it close, that this should not be at the expense of the needs of current users.

According to HUN, and other responses received, Service Users have expressed the opinion that the Clarendon Centre and 684 are not fully comparable.

The Lewis & Mary Haynes Trust's objections can be summarised as: concerns about the capacity of the Haynes to accommodate the increased usage proposed; highly unsatisfactory transport arrangements if service users had to be bussed from one side of the borough to another recreating, they argued, exactly the problem for users that the Haynes was established to resolve. There were concerns too that re-provision proposals would not meet clients needs or future dementia care needs and that the proposals ran counter to both the National Dementia Strategy and the Haringey Dementia Commissioning Strategy.

In all our conversations with staff, their principal concern has been for the welfare of residents of homes and users of centres. They were particularly concerned where service users would go and the effect the proposals were having on them now. There were worries too that work they had undertaken to build relationships and develop people's confidence and improve their physical and mental well-being would be undermined and could not easily or quickly be replicated.

Supported by the member of parliament for Hornsey and Wood Green, the Haringey Liberal Democrat Group believes the day centres, drop-ins and luncheon clubs for older people in Haringey should not close and is

suggesting that the money to run the centres can be found from savings in other parts of the council budget and that they are “inexpensive and represent excellent value for money”. There were concerns too that there has been no comprehensive assessment of the effects these closures would have on the lives of those who used them nor the financial impact for the council or others of their closure.

## Section 3 - Supporting Documentation

### **Notes on Interpreting the data**

#### **Qualitative research**

There are a number of issues to bear in mind when interpreting the data. First, a consultation such as this is predominantly qualitative in nature and has involved listening to what people have said and the way in which they have said it and interpreting their completed surveys.

This does not devalue their evidence – far from it. Qualitative methods based on ‘themes’ and ‘concerns’ are much-used and well-respected in research.

A number of verbatim comments are included to illustrate and highlight key issues that were raised. These are attributed, where appropriate to specific audiences or sectors.

#### **Quantitative research**

Statistical data is included in order to illustrate the relative importance of particular issues compared with others and to specific groups with protected characteristics as well as to assist commissioners and others shape a future potentially without some or all of the services or levels of funding.

Some figures/response rates in the report are relatively small given the potential sample size or overall numbers consulted; they must therefore be treated with caution.

- **Other Caveats and assumptions**

In reading this report, the following other caveats and assumptions need to be taken into account:

1. It is important to bear in mind that responses may be based on differing levels of knowledge.
2. There were submissions from providers, voluntary organisations etc. This group of stakeholders is likely to be particularly engaged and have much expertise in the subject area, and as a result, many of the submissions comprised detailed, well-researched responses.
3. Many of the users, relatives and carers and providers who have responded would be directly affected by the proposals and thus have a personal interest in the outcome.
4. Not all participants, for whatever reason, chose to answer all questions.
5. While every attempt has been made to classify each participant into the correct category for reporting purposes and capture equalities data, it is not always possible to be certain to which specific category respondents belong. There were for example a number of surveys that could not be attributed to a group or sector or problems interpreting hand-writing.
6. While the consultation was open to everyone, the respondents were self-selecting, and certain types or groups of people have inevitably been more disposed to contribute than others.
7. It is recognised that a number of forms will have been completed on behalf of users of services users by relatives, carers, advocates or, in some cases, service providers. However, there are a number of identical submissions in the same hand-writing; where this is obviously the case, these have been discounted.

## **Analysis of Questionnaire Responses**

### **About the respondents:**

- **Drop-ins** – 45% of those who completed Drop-in questionnaires indicated that they used the centres or were a relative/unpaid carer of someone who did. Of those who did, almost 50% used the Irish Centre, 20% of them used Woodside House, and 4% of respondents apiece attended either Willoughby Road or Abyssinia Court. Almost 38% of respondents said they were members of the public thereby possibly accounting for the ambivalence about the drop-ins retention.
- **Day centres** – 60% stated that they used one of the council-run day care centres. Just under a fifth of respondents were relatives or carers of someone who used the centres and just under 1 in 10 described themselves as members of the public and 6% were health or social care professionals or working in the independent sector. There was a high response rate from users of the Haven (40 people or some 59% of respondents) and not surprisingly given the nature of the centres, much lower percentages for the Haynes and the Grange.

- Over 50% of **Residential and respite care** respondents did not live in or use the homes affected by the proposal or access the respite service with relatives and unpaid/carers understandably accounting for majority of respondents. Of those who did, just under 20% came from Broadwater Lodge with a further 9% of users coming from each of the other 3 homes.
- 45% of **ARCU** respondents were living in accommodation they rented from the Council or a Housing Association, 11% from a private landlord, 9% lived in sheltered housing and 21% owned or part owned their own home. 9% of respondents were currently at ARCU and over half of respondents had previously used the Centre. Relatives and unpaid carers made up 6% and members of the public almost 20% of the respondents. Just under 10% were social care, mental health or other professionals.

### Responses to specific questions:

Asked to what extent they supported the proposal, the overwhelming majority of respondents across the majority of the homes and centres either opposed or strongly opposed the proposals.

	Day centres	Drop-ins	Homes	ARCU
Opposed, strongly opposed	82%	54%	75%	94%
Support, strongly support	10%	30%	20%	6%
Neither	8%	16%	5%	0

Any differences in views between the different day centres and homes are within accepted tolerances or in the case of the Haven can be accounted for by the high number of returns or the emphatic view of those commenting upon the ARCU who, when asked, most wanted or strongly wanted a safe place to go when unwell or in crisis, one which did not remind them of hospital and provided respite. There is a marked difference when it comes to the drop-ins, with respondents still broadly opposed but by only a small margin when those who support or expressed no opinion are added together.

Asked if they understood why Haringey Council was proposing to reduce or cease funding to organisations in some instances, a high percentage (roughly 60-80%) appear to have understood why the Council was proposing to close or merge services. Of those who were unsure or said they did not understand, this had as much to do with the fact that people wanted things to stay the way they were than that they did not understand the proposal or what lay behind it.

Sector	Yes	Not Sure	No
Homes	82%	0%	18%

Centre	78%	9%	13%
Respite for people with LD	73%	5%	18%
Drop-ins	67%	6%	23%
ARCU	57%	11%	30%
<b>Respondents</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>40</b>

Asked what factor(s) councillors should take into account when making their final decision, two-thirds to three quarters thought continuity of care and quality of care the most important factors - significantly higher (80-90%) in case of day centre and homes.

Value for money and using resources to offer more care to more people was rated by roughly a third or more.

Asked what independence meant to them, around 80% of drop-in respondents said it meant maintaining their health and being able to pursue their interests and hobbies. Over 70% cited being able to keep in contact with friends and family or being able to choose and make decisions on how they led their lives and remain in their own home. Fewer than 50% said having their own budget to exercise greater control and choice – not surprising given personalisation's infancy.

Maintaining their health, keeping in contact with friends and family or being able to pursue interests and hobbies or make their own decisions on how they led their lives and remain in their own home were important to over three-quarters of day care and residential home respondents.

Respondents were invited to reflect on a future without Council-run homes, centres and drop-ins and the Alexandra Road Crisis Unit in order, should the decision be taken to close or merge them, to help commissioners of services to work with the voluntary, independent sector and others to look at the most appropriate alternative sources of provision.

Asked to rate in order of importance which services were the most important to them respondents almost universally valued virtually all of the services they received.

Day centre respondents, lunch clubs/other meals and social activities and transport and trips were the services that they rated as 'most important'. Hairdressing was the least important to respondents followed (in ascending order) by foot care/healthcare and art/craft activities. A safe and secure environment, well-trained and friendly staff and home cooked nutritious food was important for 50-60%+ of residential home and bed-based respite respondents.

The surprising result was the low level of support for foot care/health care services given the numbers of people (00s) using the service but then the samples were low.

Over two-thirds of those commenting on ARCU felt a mix of psychiatric user-led self help social groups and adult social care would best help support their futures rather than anyone service on its own.

Asked what has enabled people to remain independent and active or in the case of Alexandra Road, best achieve recovery and return home:

Somewhere to meet others in safety and social activities were viewed by over 80% of drop-in respondents as the things that most enabled them to remain independent and active. Day centre respondents said something similar. Of the services currently provided at Alexandra Road, respondents considered accommodation, the support of other with similar experiences and social activities were the top 3 most important things to people in crisis.

	Day Centres	Drop-ins	Homes	ARCU
	1 (96%) Safe place to go	1 (81%) Safe place to go	1 (78%) Well- trained friendly staff	1 (74%) Accommodation
	2 (84%) Social Activities	2 Social Activities (79%)	2 (59%) Home cooked food	1 (74%) Social support
	3 (78%) Transport	3 Meals (64%)	3 (46%) Social activities	3 (62%) Meals
	4 (75%) Meals	4 Transport (50%)	4 (36%) Outdoor space	4 (55%) Social activities
	5 (60%) Break for relative and carers	5 Refreshments (41%)	5 (32%) Space for own furniture and possessions	5 (53%) Creative activities
	6 (54%) Refreshments	6 Healthcare /foot care (35%)	5 (27%) Good-sized bathroom	6 (38%) Physical activities
	7 (49%) Art/craft activities	7 Break for relative and carers (35%)	6 (23%) Space to entertain in private	7 (36%) Housing benefit and debt advice
	8 (31%) Health/foot care			8 (30%) Education or training
				9 (21%) Help to stay in work
				10 (17%) Help back to work

Looking to the future, friendship (reminiscing), hot and cold lunches and trips out were the services/activities most drop-in respondents wanted in the



future. Keeping fit, health care and refreshments were next. 4 in 10 wanted access to advice and information in the future with hairdressing and light snacks least highly rated.

Friendship (reminiscing) and lunchtime meals were the services 9 out of 10 day care centre respondents wanted in the future closely followed by keeping fit (84%) and trips out (82%).

A safe secure environment, help and support when they needed it and being able to maintain links with family and friends were the services/support that care home respondents wanted most (60-80%) going forward rather than such things as the size of accommodation, being with people from the same culture or staying at home with appropriate care and support although suitable communal facilities and being able to live among people of a similar age were still important.

The respite options people most wanted into the future were short breaks and bed-based respite (around 60% apiece); close to half wanted holidays, support day activities and week-ends away. Just over 30% wanted a sleep-in service.

For ARCU respondents, the key services they think must be provided in the future are a safe place to go (over 80%); helping those in a crisis to manage their own mental health (79%); and information and advice (53%) followed by the support of other users/survivors (42%).

Asked if the service or activity currently provided by the Council were to cease, people thought that the best way to provide services and activities currently provided by the homes and centres in future would be as follows:

<b>Drop-ins</b>	
1 (41.7%)	Run, funded and managed by a charity or trust
2 (37.5%)	Run and funded as a social enterprise
3 (27.1%)	Delivered in sheltered housing
4 (22.9%)	Run and funded by the private sector
5 (14.6%)	Run, funded and managed by users themselves
6 (8.3%)	Delivered to users in their own homes
7 (8.3%)	Other

<b>Day centres</b>	
1 (51.5%)	Other
2 (17.6%)	Run, funded and managed by a charity or trust
3 (11.8%)	Run and funded as a social enterprise
4 (8.8%)	Run, funded and managed by users themselves
5 (4.4%)	Delivered in sheltered housing
5 (4.4%)	Delivered to users in their own homes

<b>Homes</b>	
1 (50%)	Residential care delivered by the Council
2 (27.3%)	Care delivered in a residential care setting

3 (13.6%)	Delivered to users in their own homes
3 (13.6%)	Delivered in sheltered housing
5 (9.1%)	Maintain own independence, stay in community, get access to 24-hr care
6 (4.5%)	Residential care delivered by the private sector
6 (4.5%)	Other

<b>ARCU</b>	
1 (47.2%)	A local mental health charity
2 (39.6%)	Alexandra Road run by someone else
3 (34%)	A national mental health charity
4 (26.4%)	Other
5 (18.9%)	A local survivor/user-led group
6 (15.1%)	Clinic/ward within a local hospital

In the case of ARCU, the most favoured alternative, should the Council-run centre close was a local mental health charity, the least favoured option was a clinic/ward within a local hospital. Half of residential care home respondents felt that the council should continue to provide these services and of the 50-plus per cent of day care respondents who said other, a good many said things should stay as they are.

<b>Location of monthly consultation meetings</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Numbers in Attendance  Groups/individuals who identified themselves:</b>	<b>Those in attendance</b>
The Red House	<b>23 Feb 11</b>	23 Service Users/Relatives/Carers	Lisa Redfern, Assistant Director Adult Services and Commissioning
The Red House	<b>16 Mar 11</b>	15 Service Users/Relatives/Carers	Councillor Dilek Dogus, Lead Member for Adults and Community Services.  Lisa Redfern, Assistant Director Adult Services and Commissioning
The Red House	<b>20 Apr 11</b>	4 Service Users/Relatives/Carers	Lisa Redfern, Assistant Director Adult Services and Commissioning
Whitehall Street	<b>10 Feb 11</b>	16 Service Users/relatives/Carers	Councillor Dilek Dogus, Lead Member for Adults and Community Services.  Beverley Tarka, Head of Service, Learning Disabilities Partnership  Khusboo Puri (Service User Advocate)
Whitehall Street	<b>10 Mar 11</b>	14 Service Users/relatives/Carers	Beverley Tarka, Head of Service, Learning Disabilities Partnership  Mark Heath (Service User Advocate)

<b>Location of monthly consultation meetings</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Numbers in Attendance  Groups/individuals who identified themselves:</b>	<b>Those in attendance</b>
Whitehall Street	<b>7 Apr 11</b>	14 Service Users/relatives/Carers - Respite meeting  10 Service Users/relatives/Carers - Residential meeting	Beverley Tarka, Head of Service, Learning Disabilities Partnership  Mark Heath (Service User Advocate)
Broadwater Lodge	<b>9 Feb 11</b>	15 Service Users/Relatives/Carers  Sue Hessel, Haringey Federation of Residents Association.	Councillor Dilek Dogus, Lead Member for Adults and Community Services.  Beverley Tarka, Head of Service, Learning Disabilities Partnership
Broadwater Lodge	<b>9 Mar 11</b>	6 Service Users/Relatives/Carers	Beverley Tarka, Head of Service, Learning Disabilities Partnership
Broadwater Lodge	<b>6 Apr 11</b>	10 Service Users/Relatives/Carers	Mun Thong Phung, Director, Adult and Housing Services  Beverley Tarka, Head of Service, Learning Disabilities Partnership

<b>Location of monthly consultation meetings</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Numbers in Attendance  Groups/individuals who identified themselves:</b>	<b>Those in attendance</b>
Cranwood	<b>15 Feb 11</b>	15 Service users/relatives and carers Sue Hessel, Haringey Federation of Residents Association.	Mun Thong Phung, Director, Adult and Housing Services  Bernard Lanigan, Head of Assessment and Personalisation
Cranwood	<b>14 Mar 11</b>	23 Service Users/ Relatives/Carers Highgate/Muswell Hill Pensioners' Group 3 Members of the public	Councillor Dilek Dogus, Lead Member for Adults and Community Services.  Bernard Lanigan, Head of Assessment and Personalisation
Cranwood	<b>11 Apr 11</b>	23 Service Users/Relatives/Carers	Beverley Tarka, Head of Service, Learning Disabilities Partnership
Abyssinia Court	<b>10 Feb 11</b>	28 Service Users/ Relatives/Carers  Sue Hessel, Haringey Federation of Residents Association.  Age Concern	Councillor Dilek Dogus, Lead Member for Adults and Community Services.  Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)  Cllr David Winskill Cllr Katherine Reece
Abyssinia Court	<b>23 Mar 11</b>	48 Service Users/ Relatives/Carers	Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)

<b>Location of monthly consultation meetings</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Numbers in Attendance  Groups/individuals who identified themselves:</b>	<b>Those in attendance</b>
Abyssinia Court	<b>13 Apr 11</b>	30 Service Users/ Relatives/Carers	Beverley Tarka, Head of Service, Learning Disabilities Partnership
Woodside House	<b>21 Feb 11</b>	Approx 100  Dance group; Bingo	Cllr Claire Kober, Leader of the Council; Councillor Meehan  Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
Woodside House	<b>21 Mar 11</b>	Approx 77-80 users, relatives and carers	Councillor George Meehan  Mun Thong Phung, Director, Adult and Housing Services  Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
Woodside House	<b>18 Apr 11</b>	85 users, relatives and carers	Lynne Featherstone MP  Councillor David Winskill  Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
Willoughby Road	<b>14 Feb 11</b>	42 users, relatives and carers	Cllr Claire Kober, Leader of the Council Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
Willoughby Road	<b>14 Mar 11</b>	39 users, relatives and carers	Councillor Dilek Dogus, Lead Member for Adults and Community Services.

Location of monthly consultation meetings	Date	Numbers in Attendance  Groups/individuals who identified themselves:	Those in attendance
		Vice Chair for Haringey Forum for Older People	Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
Willoughby Road	<b>11 Apr 11</b>	34 users, relatives and carers	Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
The Irish Centre	<b>15 Feb 11</b>	50 users, relatives and carers Vice Chair for Haringey Forum for Older People	Councillor George Meehan Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
The Irish Centre	<b>15 Mar 11</b>	8 users, relatives and carers	Councillor Dilek Dogus, Lead Member for Adults and Community Services. Councillor George Meehan Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
The Irish Centre	<b>14 Apr 11</b>	10 users, relatives and carers	Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
The Haynes/Grange	<b>9 Feb 11</b>	6 users, relatives and carers  Chair of the Lewis & Mary Haynes Trust	Councillor Dilek Dogus, Lead Member for Adults and Community Services.  Councillor Joe Goldberg, Cabinet Member for Finance and Sustainability  Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older

Location of monthly consultation meetings	Date	Numbers in Attendance  Groups/individuals who identified themselves:	Those in attendance
			People/Mental Health)
The Haynes/Grange	<b>15 Feb 11</b>	No one attended	Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
The Haynes/Grange	<b>15 Mar 11</b>	10 users, relatives and carers	Councillor Dilek Dogus, Lead Member for Adults and Community Services.  Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
The Haynes/Grange	<b>15 Mar 11</b>	5 users, relatives and carers  Sue Hessel, Haringey Federation of Residents Association.	Mun Thong Phung, Director, Adult and Housing Services  Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
The Haynes/Grange	<b>19 Apr 11</b>	10 users, relatives and carers  Patrick Morreau, Lewis & Mary Haynes Trust  Haynes Relatives Support Group	Councillor Jim Jenks  Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
Woodside DC	<b>9 Feb 11</b>	19 users, relatives and carers	Councillor Dilek Dogus, Lead Member for Adults and Community Services. Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older



Location of monthly consultation meetings	Date	Numbers in Attendance  Groups/individuals who identified themselves:	Those in attendance
			People/Mental Health)
Woodside DC	<b>18 Feb 11</b>	23 users, relatives and carers, some of whom mentioned that they had been coming there for 10-15 years.  Maureen Carey, Vice Chair of Haringey Older People's Forum	Beverley Tarka, Head of Service, Learning Disabilities Partnership
Woodside DC	<b>11 Mar 11</b>	23 users, relatives and carers	Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
Woodside DC	<b>6 Apr 11</b>	32 users, relatives and carers	Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
Woodside DC	<b>8 Apr 11</b>	20 users, relatives and carers	Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
The Haven	<b>9 Feb 11</b>	16 users, relatives and carers	Councillor Dilek Dogus, Lead Member for Adults and Community Services. Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
The Haven	<b>14 Feb 11</b>	13 users, relatives and carers, 1 advocate, 1 volunteer  Haringey Carers Forum	Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)

Location of monthly consultation meetings	Date	Numbers in Attendance  Groups/individuals who identified themselves:	Those in attendance
The Haven	<b>7 Mar 11</b>	15 users, relatives and carers	Councillor George Meehan  Mun Thong Phung, Director, Adult and Housing Services  Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
The Haven	<b>10 Mar 11</b>	18 users, relatives and carers	Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
The Haven	<b>11 Apr 11</b>	10 users, relatives and carers	Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
The Haven	<b>15 Apr 11</b>	13 users, relatives and carers	Councillor Gideon Bull, Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Councillor Anne Stennett Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
Woodside/Haven	<b>16 Feb 11</b>	10 - users, relatives and carers  Vice Chair for Haringey Forum for Older People	Councillor Claire Kober, Leader of the Council Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
Woodside/Haven	<b>23 Mar 11</b>	5 users, relatives and carers	Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)
Woodside/Haven	<b>13 Apr 11</b>	8 users, relatives and carers	Councillor Gideon Bull, Chair of overview & Scrutiny Councillor Anne Stennett Len Weir Head of Provider Service (Older People/Mental Health)

<b>Location of monthly consultation meetings</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Numbers in Attendance  Groups/individuals who identified themselves:</b>	<b>Those in attendance</b>
684	<b>9 Feb 11</b>	22 users, relatives and carers	Councillor Claire Kober, Leader of the Council Barbara Nicholls, Head of Commissioning, Adult Services
684	<b>10 Feb 11</b>	5 users, relatives and carers	Barbara Nicholls, Head of Commissioning, Adult Services
684	<b>8 Mar 11</b>	22 users, relatives and carers	Mun Thong Phung, Director, Adult and Housing Services Barbara Nicholls, Head of Commissioning, Adult Services
684	<b>6 Apr 11</b>	7 service users, relatives and carers	Barbara Nicholls, Head of Commissioning, Adult Services
684	<b>6 Apr 11</b>	23 service users, relatives and carers	Barbara Nicholls, Head of Commissioning, Adult Services
Alexandra Road Crisis Unit (ARCU)	<b>11 Feb 11</b>	5 service users, relatives and carers	Councillor Dilek Dogus, Lead Member for Adults and Community Services. Barbara Nicholls, Head of Commissioning, Adult Services Duncan Stroud, Assistant Director of Communications for Haringey NHS
Alexandra Road Crisis Unit (ARCU)	<b>14 Feb 11</b>	7 service users, relatives and carers  Sue Hessel, Haringey Federation of Residents Association.	Barbara Nicholls, Head of Commissioning, Adult Services Duncan Stroud, Assistant Director of Communications for Haringey NHS

<b>Location of monthly consultation meetings</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Numbers in Attendance  Groups/individuals who identified themselves:</b>	<b>Those in attendance</b>
		Dr Nuala Kiely representing Save Alexandra Road Crisis Unit (SARCU)	
Alexandra Road Crisis Unit (ARCU)	<b>2 Mar 11</b>	10 users, relatives and carers	Barbara Nicholls, Head of Commissioning, Adult Services Stephen Deitch, Assistant Director Commissioning, Haringey Primary Care Trust
Alexandra Road Crisis Unit (ARCU)	<b>3 Mar 11</b>	5 users, relatives and carers	Barbara Nicholls, Head of Commissioning, Adult Services Stephen Deitch, Assistant Director Commissioning, Haringey Primary Care Trust
Alexandra Road Crisis Unit (ARCU)	<b>14 Apr 11</b>	8 users, relatives and carers	Barbara Nicholls, Head of Commissioning, Adult Services Stephen Deitch, Assistant Director Commissioning, Haringey Primary Care Trust
Winkfield	<b>29 Mar 11</b>	9 Blind/partially sighted service users (Phoenix Group)	Bernard Lanigan, Head of Assessment and Personalisation
Winkfield	<b>29 Mar 11</b>	6 deaf service users	Bernard Lanigan, Head of Assessment and Personalisation Signers in attendance

Location	Date	Correspondent	Substance of Correspondence received
<b>Cuts general</b>			
	<b>7 Jan 11</b>	Member of public	Asking why other centres are not being closed down
	<b>17 Jan 11</b>	User of Services	Copy of letter from a concerned user of services highlighting the cuts.
	<b>11 Feb 11</b>	User of Services	Jackson Lane luncheon club – important part of community that has been in existence for many years. Only such venue for older people in the immediate area and (it is said) provides users with their main meal of the day. Co-ordinator role essential, (it is argued) as number of members frail or otherwise in need of support. Given relatively small saving, ask that the facility continue.
	<b>14 Feb 11</b>	Member of the public	Opposition to unfair cuts and how “the elite”/“richer councils” and not “the hated poorer councils” or “poor, disabled, old and young in our society” should “pay the price for failed past policies”.
	<b>28 Feb 11</b>	Employee	Jackson Lane – “unique”, longstanding service to the community. Cuts unavoidable but other ways to make these levels of savings and unfair older people are targeted.
	<b>1 Mar 11</b>	User of services (N22)	Cuts unfair and raising Equalities concerns, including petition
	<b>22 Mar 11</b>	Member of the public	Plea not to cut services for older people and what life would be like for them (isolation etc) if that care or support were not there or in its present form
		User of services	Dissatisfaction with proposal to cuts services which are, (as they see it), unfair, immoral, unlawful and unnecessary and “deliberately targeted” at most

			vulnerable and disadvantaged.
	<b>9 Mar 11</b>	Relative*	Alarm as proposed cuts to those with learning disabilities
	<b>19 Apr 11</b>	Users of services	How number of users of Jackson lane Luncheon club are very elderly and frail and how presence of co-ordinator is essential to their welfare and that this is a relatively small amount of funding.
	<b>28 Apr 11</b>	Liberal Democrat Group	<p>Formal response to consultation asking that the process be immediately halted for two reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the relatively small amounts of money, (as they see it), needed to run these centres can be found from savings in other parts of the Council budget.</li> <li>no comprehensive impact assessment has been made about the effects of these closures on either the lives of those who use them nor the financial impact on Haringey and partner agencies of re-provisioning these services or the consequences of closure.</li> </ul> <p>Also attached a petition - a paper one as well as an online version containing 586 signatures.</p>
	<b>28 Apr 11</b>	Age UK Haringey	Formal response to consultation – see main report
	<b>28 Apr 11</b>	Haringey User Network	Formal response to consultation – see main report
	<b>13 May 11</b>	Member of public (N17)	worried by the cutbacks in services proposed for their ward
	<b>9 May 11</b>	UNISON	Formal response to consultation – see main report
<b>The Red House</b>	<b>31 Jan 11</b>	Relative (out of Borough)	Concerned about impact on their loved one.

	16 Jan 11	Frequent visitor (N10 – age 14)	Don't have growing close to residents and request getting to see feedback people has helped them to grow.
<b>Cranwood</b>			Dreads to think what will happen. Knows there have to be cuts but doesn't want this to be kept "targeted".
	7 Jan 11	Relative	Apprehensive about future of the service and its impact on the community. Concerned about the loss of this service and the impact on the community.
	9 Jan 11	Relative	Apprehensive about future of the service and its impact on the community. Concerned about the loss of this service and the impact on the community.
	11 Jan 11	Friends of the residents *	Private care homes. That loss of this service would be a great loss to the community.
	17 Jan 11	Member of the public (N10)	With a growing population of older people, it is very important to have a service of this kind in the community.
	16 Jan 11	2x Member of the public	Concerned about the loss of this service and the impact on the community.
	17 Jan 11	Member of St James Church involved with a number of local homes and facilities for	Understand the financial difficulties but hope a solution will be found before such a tax is used for the closure of the service.
	16 Jan 11	Member of the public (N10)	Apprehension and concern locally. "Sad and
	17 Jan 11	Member of public (N22)	Apprehension and concern locally. "Sad and
	18 Jan 11	Local family (N6) (N10 – age 9)	Don't know what is proposed here and if it will be a good thing. Residents are happy. Worried about impact of these cuts on the community. How an "excellent" care home would help be spared from the cuts.
	16 Jan 11	Frequent visitor (N10 – age 11)	Don't know what is proposed here and if it will be a good thing. Residents are happy. Worried about impact of these cuts on the community. How an "excellent" care home would help be spared from the cuts.
	10 Jan 11	Member of the public (N6) (age 12)	Don't know what is proposed here and if it will be a good thing. Residents are happy. Worried about impact of these cuts on the community. How an "excellent" care home would help be spared from the cuts.
	16 Jan 11	Frequent visitor (N10 – age 11)	Don't know what is proposed here and if it will be a good thing. Residents are happy. Worried about impact of these cuts on the community. How an "excellent" care home would help be spared from the cuts.
	19 Jan 11	Member of the public (N6)	Don't know what is proposed here and if it will be a good thing. Residents are happy. Worried about impact of these cuts on the community. How an "excellent" care home would help be spared from the cuts.
	16 Jan 11	Frequent visitor (N10 – age 11)	Don't know what is proposed here and if it will be a good thing. Residents are happy. Worried about impact of these cuts on the community. How an "excellent" care home would help be spared from the cuts.
	19 Jan 11	Frequent visitor (N6)	Don't know what is proposed here and if it will be a good thing. Residents are happy. Worried about impact of these cuts on the community. How an "excellent" care home would help be spared from the cuts.

	10 Feb 11	Member of church group	Expressed concern
	19 Feb 11	Member of public (N12) Group	Requested for elderly residents alternative housing
	20 Jan 11	Member(s)* public (N10)	Condemning and hostile. Notably extreme negativity,
	21 Mar 11 & 19 May 11	Solicitor (Acting on behalf of relative)	Added right to be proposed a closing of the home and essential grounds for justification for deprivation of services of the id homes and talking about judicial review. Urges council "to preserve or find other
	30 Mar 11	Relative, carers, friend*	Wrote off providing the relevant services about the
	20 Jan 11	Member of the public (N10)	Asked for a principal of people. Requested that it could be reviewed on the proposal and to avoid the alternative that is being put forward by the Cranwood
	23 Jan 11	Member of the public (N10)	Church community group concerned about impact for both
	2 Apr 11	Cranwood Community	Residents and local group of Christian young people
	18 Jan	Group of members of the public (N10)*	Revised funding to support the residents and at cuts to a group for the welfare of the residents of the by many friends and the group and the well-being of the residents of the facility and the residents are.
	26 Jan 11	Cranwood Community Group member(s)*	Requested for a community group to take over and the running of the home.
	20 May 11	Member of the public (N6) Group*	Submission of the Group's options approach to see what can be done to make the home safe and caring environment.
Whitehall St	25 Jan 11	Member(s) of the public (N10)	Endorsement of the decision to be made. Not
	4 Feb 11	St James Church Muswell Hill	Support about proposal. Respite facility serves as a council office of help providing the bulk of care. Gives people an alternative option of being away from carer and home for when carer no longer able to care for them
	7 Feb 11	Member of the public (N6)	and carer, the only opportunity to visit family, asks council to consider carefully the consequences for residents.
	9 Feb 11	Relative (N17)	Relative in condition such that unable to care for self,



			live independent life and totally dependent on the care of others. "Prospect of move will probably have an enormous adverse effect on behaviour and quality of life". Leave Whitehall St and other care homes 'out of the equation'.
	<b>16 Feb 11</b>	Member of the public	Concerned about closure after spending money on its refurbishment
	<b>28 Feb 11</b>	Carer (N10)	Proposal causing stress and lead, (as they see it) to crisis at home with families/carers unable to cope. Respite not easy to find once it closes down; already people waiting. Take months/years to resolve. Please save Whitehall St.
	<b>23 Mar 11</b>	Relative	Ever-lasting appreciation for the service provided and how it has played such an important part in their and their loved one's lives for a good many years. Would be a great loss and implore councillors to think again.
	<b>5 May 11</b>	User of services (N8)	Saying what excellent help they receive from the centre and asking for this to be taken into consideration
<b>Broadwater Lodge</b>	<b>10 Jan 11</b>	Relative	So called "cutbacks" hitting the defenceless – "easy pickings". Users of services have 'paid into the system' over many years and are being badly let down. Concerned at what will happen to people in the home. Wanting more information on our plans.
<b>Day Centres</b>			
	<b>24 Jan 11</b>	Member of the public *	Treatment of people with dementia and asking if council had explored innovative ways of keeping

			them open,
<b>The Haven</b>			
	<b>30 Dec 10</b>	Member of the public (N6) *	Disturbed at prospect of closure and urging council find a more acceptable solution.
	<b>16 Jan 11</b>	User of Services (N17)	Very upset at news of possible closure and worried about the impact. Outlines how going to the centre has improved well-being. Suggests leaving at least one centre/lunch club in the borough. <b>[same letter received by several councillors]</b>
	<b>2 Feb 11</b>	User of Services (N22)	Do not support proposal. A 'very good service' (as they see it) which enables them to leave the house and interact with other people.
	<b>3 Feb 11</b>	User of Services (N17)	Does not want centre to close. Lots of things to do and would be "depressed", isolated, bored and "devastated" if it were to close. <b>[same letter written to several councillors]</b>
	<b>3 Feb 11</b>	User of Services (N15)	Personal story of how trips and other activities the centre lays on have made a difference to them. "Know all centres cannot be saved but the Haven means so much to me"
	<b>10 Feb 11</b>	User of Services (N10)	Personal story of how activities the centre lays means everything to them: health, getting out. Suggest put charges up as an alternative.
	<b>22 Feb 10</b>	User of Services (N10)	Upset at proposal. Believe people will suffer if centre closed. Plea to keep it open
	<b>3 Mar 11</b>	Carer	Grave concerns at closure. Outlining their experiences and appreciation for the support and what it would be like for their close relative if centre were to close in terms of their health and well-being

			(depression, loneliness, happiness, mental stimulation etc). Cuts ill-advised and short-sighted (as they see it) with impact for NHS etc. Debt owed to wartime generation. "All be old one day".
	<b>3 Mar 11</b>	Relative (N22)	How haven has transformed loved ones life, worried on impact on both of them if no respite.
	<b>25 Apr 11</b>	Relative (email)	Relative concerned that without the day centre, and the lunch club their immediate relative attends, s/he will become housebound, and therefore their physical and mental well-being will suffer, leading to extra costs to NHS and Council "who would find itself picking up the pieces in other ways". Worries too about the choice of cuts and their use as "political footballs".
	<b>15 Apr 11</b>	Relative *	Vital to maintaining health and quality of life of older and disabled residents of the borough. Debt owed to older people by present generation.
	<b>Undated</b>	User of Services	Concern at closure and loss of opportunity to socialise and interact with people like themselves
	<b>Undated</b>	Relative	Personal life story and how life has been changed for the better by attending the centre: "the transformation has been miraculous" and the impact on users of services of taking the facility away (as they see it): deprived, neglected and forgotten with nothing to look forward to. Dispute claim that provision could be replicated by a personal budget.
	<b>Undated</b>	Relative (out of Borough)	"Different kind of care that family cannot give" "Staff go the extra mile". Personal story of how trips and other activities the centre lays on have made a

	13 May 11	Haynes Relatives Support Group	Difficulties for those involved in the care system. How relative would have struggled to cope with the proposed support of staff at the centre.
	19 May 11	Relative	Need for their relative to be given alternatives to keep their independence, interact and shop.
	Undated	Young Adult Volunteer	Need for their relative to be given alternatives to keep their independence, interact and shop.
The Haynes/Grange	3 Feb 11	Relatives Support Group and Users of Services (N17)	Need for their relative to be given alternatives to keep their independence, interact and shop.
	Undated	Users of Services (N17)	Need for their relative to be given alternatives to keep their independence, interact and shop.
	Undated	User of Services (N17)	Need for their relative to be given alternatives to keep their independence, interact and shop.
	Undated	User of Services (N22)	Need for their relative to be given alternatives to keep their independence, interact and shop.
	7 Feb 11	Carer*	Need for their relative to be given alternatives to keep their independence, interact and shop.
	Undated	User of Services (N17)	Need for their relative to be given alternatives to keep their independence, interact and shop.
	4 Mar 11	The Lewis & Mary Haynes	Need for their relative to be given alternatives to keep their independence, interact and shop.
	12 May 11	Resident's Association	Need for their relative to be given alternatives to keep their independence, interact and shop.

Woodside DC	31 Jan 11	Relative (out of Borough)	How the timing of the part of this and fully financial transformed their lives and life. Appraisal for
	30 Mar 11	Relative, Carer*	Relative staff the ending what the impact of closure
	1 Feb 11	2 x users of services (N10)	Essential if the staff would move (as they would), for people with dementia the situation of sitting in the rooms on the way to limited places, confusion [identical to other
	20 Mar 11	Relative (N17)	How the response to the received and being with other
	4 Mar 11	The Lewis & Mary Haynes Trust	Deputations to help to put the idea of the Grange and Haynes and the old school at Woodside DC. Relative could accept to help to provide the service offered
	22 Mar 11	Carer (N15)	How to be with an, and see level of quality of care": with the different people that they would accommodate in the same place proposed for a separate unit of care. It is a good idea of a difference to this, the "decreasing and actually the problem for" because the hospital has been established to provide a range of provision with potential for the mental health and the physical (as they see it), depression, isolation and general deterioration in care needs. Proposals to provide a national dementia strategy and Haringey dementia commissioning strategy.
Alexandra Road			
Crisis Unit (ARCU)		Interested party	Proposal is a short term one and a 'soft option' that would be difficult to reverse as and when the financial situation improves.
	28 Apr 11	Haynes Relatives Support Group *	Formal response – see details main report
	22 May 11	Secretary, Lewis & Mary Haynes Trust *	Notification of deputation to Cabinet meeting in Jul 2011

	<b>30 Jan 11</b>	User of Services	Extremely concerned and anxious at the prospect of closure. No viable alternative, (as they see it), being offered. Many delighted to come there because of its ethos and first class service. "Disastrous and fundamentally wrong thing to do". The option to stay at ARCU and talk to someone helping user to keep it together. Need more support not less in Haringey. This proposal, (it is argued), goes against the ethos of equal opportunities the council claims to support.
	<b>7 Feb 11</b>	User of Services (former)	Makes comparisons with other types of provision. ARCU "treats you like a human being". A person-centred, non-overly medical approach to a crisis situation. Asks us to think about improving the experience for people who have to be admitted to hospital in a crisis if ARCU closes.
	<b>10 Feb 11</b>	SARCU*	ARCU an extremely important part of the mental health service in Haringey. High user satisfaction. More acceptable than hospital. Recovery Unit would not, (it is argued), pick up on need for a community based crisis and respite unit with 24hr telephone support preventing out of hours contact with GPs and other health professionals. Preferable to locked
	<b>23 Dec 10</b>	Provider	Quality of the provision hospital assessment unit and recovery house(s)) won't, (it is argued), be
	<b>26 Jan 11</b>	Member of the public	Disappointed at proposed closure of ARCU and survey replacement by hospital based "People do not want that Medical Model have person-centred approach like ARCU" in 2011/12, of which ARCU formed part.
	<b>12 Feb 11</b>	SARCU*	Health and social care for the PCT to address about

			Oak House and recovery houses, respite care and the telephone support service.
	<b>1 Mar 11</b>		99-signature Petition. Deprived borough; provision already stretched (Office of National Statistics). Disadvantaged people need as much choice and independence as others. Cuts reckless, unfair and disproportionate. With equalities at the heart of its policies, contradictory for council to be targeting, (as they see it), the most deprived. Not convinced that reliance on private and independent sector can fill gap. Urges councillors to not implement the cuts and 'defend the borough's vital public services' and pleads with council to reconsider its position.
	<b>20 Mar 11</b>	Save Alexandra Road Crisis Unit*	Request for council help with setting up ARCU as a social enterprise and information on costs and demand levels.
	<b>20 Apr 11</b>	Service User ( N17)*	ARCU a valuable role to play in preventative provision, providing a short period of support away from home. Proposal should not be looked at in isolation and that strategy (mental health) and facts not set out at the beginning making it difficult to consider the proposal properly. Fundamental that there is sufficient supply/quality/alternative provision and overlap between existing and any new provision. Greater certainty needed about Recovery House(s) and other alternatives before firm decisions on ARCU. Worries for self-referrals , those ' below the threshold' of recovery Houses and about respite for carers. Increased risk of spending

			elsewhere.
	<b>29 Apr 11</b>	SARCU	Formal response to consultation – see details main report
	<b>2 May 11</b>	Social Care Professional	Worried at this loss of positive pathway to avoiding hospital admissions.
<b>684 Centre</b>	<b>11 Feb 11</b>	Mind in Haringey (at request and with permission of service users at the Centre)	Of those users spoken to, nearly all (two wished it to close and one did not say), wished the centre kept open. Personal experiences and explanations of how the centre enabled people to overcome boredom, avoid hospital, lead normal lives and help with daily tasks: trips out, computing classes, use internet, washing, eating etc, go onto get work with the experience and qualifications gained there). Queries over whether it could be re-sited at St Ann's and what would happen to the building. Concerns from users about where they would go. How services it offers save users money: on lunches, on transport.
	<b>15 Feb 11</b>	Service User (anon)	ARCU should close as brings only short term benefits and people use it 'as a hotel'. There is St Ann's Hospital for those who are unwell. Should be looking at closing the Clarendon Centre instead – benefits few, is expensive to run and does not empower service users. Retain 684, on whatever basis. 684 has given people skills to cope and is financially and otherwise successful.



	<b>20 Apr 11</b>	User of Other MH Services (N17)*	Acknowledges does not have detailed knowledge of provision there. Concerned threshold to access social care will be changing and personal budgets will be inadequate to meet future needs. Worries that remaining/alternative provision won't be adequate and people will fall through the 'gap'. Any closure needs to be accompanied by a proper, non-stigmatized assessment of needs.
<b>Drop-ins</b>			
<b>Unnamed Drop-in</b>	<b>Undated</b>	User of Services (N22)	Without drop-in would not get out, socialise or provide respite for close relative/carer.
	<b>15 Jan11</b>	User of services (N22)	Concerned and disappointed and urging councillors to reconsider
	<b>28 Apr 11</b>		
<b>Abyssinia Court</b>		Relative*	Questioning whether decision had already been made and how the cuts were to be implemented. Enquiring how they might participate in the process. Concerned about its potential impact ad a regular user of the service on their loved-one's health and well-being.
	<b>7 Jan 11</b>	Relative (N21)	Explaining what impact would be for their loved-one and hoping the Council would keep drop-in open
<b>Abyssinia Court</b>	<b>27 Apr 11</b>	50 Something Service	Relaxed comfortable atmosphere, accessible venue and with the necessary space and place where 50 something service users made to feel at home. Adds to their general well-being and fulfilment. Venues like this hard to come by.
	<b>Undated</b>	User of Services	Dramatic blow. Centre is close to home and met

	<b>Undated</b>	User of services (N22)	Wish to speak to councillors to reconsider and including
<b>Woodside House</b>	<b>6 Jan 11</b>	User of Services	Suppliers of petrol of the same price as their
	<b>13 Jan 11</b>	Dance Club members	Case stated service was ongoing self supporting and
	<b>20 Jan 11</b>	General Practitioner (N4)	been thinking for provides an at valued trust for many of the residents and asking council to consider them.
	<b>28 Apr 11</b>	Relative of public	Pointed out closure and why the 'essential' is saving users of service and asking the council to
	<b>13 May 11</b>	Users of services	Group of users wanting to work with Council on
	<b>1 Feb 11</b>	User of Services	Keeping the Denwood Club worried at loss of venue
<b>Consultation</b>	<b>19 Feb 11</b>	SAROU Services (on behalf of 28 or more other	Notification of the for old people and in the old added to it for last years now. Opportunity to
	<b>23 Feb and 1 Mar 11</b>	Signatories Federation of Residents Associations	Nature of the findings and fear part of the intended publicity. People's assertion publicly about the of their lives being sacrificed and new shop the most proposed closure will be required and any
	<b>14 Mar 11</b>	User of Services	Changes which had failed to meet needs of the local general p
	<b>26 Mar 11</b>	Member of the public (N22)	Seeking confirmation whether Woodside closed.
	<b>1 Mar 11</b>	Relative (out of Borough)	Relatively have state any questioning the the local authority has consulted publicity of feelings etc organisation to, a sheltered housing scheme and outlining (as they saw it) the impact of closing 684y for loneliness, loss of place of refuge etc.
<b>Willoughby Road</b>			Anxiety at a reliance on St Ann's or for people with
	<b>6 Jan 11</b>	Relative	Seeking health issues of what was seen (self-harm, suicidal tendencies). Disagreement for how the cuts
	<b>12 Jan 11</b>	User of Services	Proposed to be implemented.
	<b>16 Mar 11</b>	User of Services (attending a meeting at Cranwood)	Difficult to hear and understand what is going on - "a waste of time" people feel only interested in what the

			plans are for Cranwood.”
	10 Feb 11	SARCU*	Notification of letter from SARCU to GP’s on the commissioning executive committee.
	16 Feb 11	SARCU*	Request for information and statistics concerning ARCU
	11 Mar 11	SARCU*	Request for notes from meetings at ARCU
	5 Jan 11 11 Jan 11 25 Jan 11 5 & 12 Jan 27 Jan 11  3 Feb 11 7 Feb 11 22 Feb 11 1 Mar 11  2 Mar 11 22 Mar 11 31 Mar 11  4 Apr 11 6 Apr 11 6 Apr 11 6 Apr 11 6 Apr 11 7 Apr 11	<b>General Enquiries:</b> Member of the public* Voluntary group SARCU* Member of the public*  Cranwood Community Group member* Relative Local GP Haringey Older Peoples Forum Hayen Relatives Support Group *  Relative, carer  User of services Faith leader Freelance photographer Relative* Relative, user, carer	Request for budgetary information Querying what will happen to Jackson’s Lane building Details of NHS involvement in consultation Request for information and follow-up  Querying rumour building had already been sold.  Further details meetings etc Woodside DC Request for further information Request for feedback from meetings Request for information (occupancy figures, design standards etc) – Day Centres <b>[preceded by representation to full Council in Feb 11]</b> Request for financial information – the Haven  Request for further information Request for further information Request to take photos of buildings proposed for closure Details of what council spends its money on Details of Broadwater Lodge ward councillors

	<b>13 Apr 11</b>  <b>18 Apr 11</b> <b>27 Apr 11</b> <b>28 Apr 11</b> <b>2 May 11</b>  <b>5 May 11</b>  <b>5 May 11</b>  <b>8/11/12</b> <b>May 11</b> <b>13 May 11</b>  <b>16 May 11</b>  <b>18 May 11</b>	Relative, user, carer Member of the public Member of the public (N22) Charity Member of the public (N10) Member of the public Relative (out of borough) Member of public Cranwood Community Group * Relative (out of borough)  SARCU*  Haynes Relatives Support Group* Voluntary Sector organisation member of public (out of borough) Voluntary Sector organisation	Request for consultation questionnaire(s) Take off mailing list – not a user of services Double check closing dated for the consultation Request for consultation questionnaire  Request for financial information - ARCU Request for future information via email How to submit proposals Asking where to send the feasibility study  Details of how soon after any 'closure' decision changes would be implemented Querying where to drop off petition and more completed questionnaires Further details about the Haynes/Grange and about EQIAs and final decision Copy of previous updates/feedback  Asking for information about policies and procedures request for details of submitting a deputation
	<b>11 Jan 11</b>  <b>12 Jan 11</b>	<b>Members Enquiries:</b>  Lynne Featherstone MP	Request for rundown on the proposed closures  Correspondence from constituent concerned about

	<b>25 Jan 11</b>		dementia services and how their needs will be taken into consideration
	<b>11 Feb 11</b>		Feedback and follow-up questions following visit to Cranwood.  Constituent concerned at proposed closure of Whitehall St and Edwards Drive and the impact on people with learning disabilities having no respite or residential care. Hugely concerning, cannot be easily replaced or left to the personal budget system leading to concerns over potential costs and ability to meet future needs quickly and flexibly enough if at all. Need a mix of provision and not total reliance on the private sector. <b>[also submitted as a representation to councillors to Feb's full Council]</b>
	<b>18 Feb 11</b>		Constituent (N10)* not satisfied by earlier response to request for information on the budget
	<b>3 Mar 11</b>		Constituent (N22) concerned about the impact of closure of the Haven day centre on her immediate relative, how it has made a difference to both their lives.
	<b>25 Mar 11</b>		Constituent (social care professional in Central London) worried about the quality of services that would be provided by a social enterprise and the impact of any change of Mental Health provision on

	<b>28 Apr 11</b>		service users: (as they see it) homelessness, hospital admissions, health issues.  Formal submission from the MP supporting Haringey Liberal democrat's response
	<b>20 Jan 11</b>       <b>25 Mar 11</b>       <b>13 Apr 11</b>	David Lammy MP	Letters from a number of constituents concerned at proposed closure of Willoughby Road lunch club saying how they value facility and how it would be impossible to conduct current way of life without: safe environment (outside the home), social interaction, health care, food. Financially ineffective, (as they see it), as they'd turn to other services for assistance.  Request for details of the source of the funding (Formula grant, Department of Health etc) that has been cut.  Carer (N17) concerned about impact of cuts on their loved one and stating what the impact would be for her and pointing to rising levels of dementia.
	<b>7 Apr 11</b>	Cllr Bull	Request from carer * for Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider the proposed closures in advance of Cabinet/full Council concerned about the loss of 'much valued' day care and respite services and its impact, particularly on other services such as the Haynes. [encouraged to make representations

			on 9 May 11]
	<b>24 May 11</b>	Cllr Bull	Asking to meet with Cabinet member to discuss proposals and raising concerns on behalf of a deputation to Overview & Scrutiny.
	<b>22 Mar 11</b>	Cllr Allison	What will happen to the building (Cranwood)
	<b>16 Mar 11</b>	Cllr Davies	Parent of disabled adult * querying proposed amendments to Fairer Contributions Policy and questioning the savings generated
	<b>8 Jan 11</b>	Cllr Egan	Query from relative re-the Haven and the facilities that would be provided if the closure went ahead
	<b>25 Jan 11</b>	Cllr Egan	Request for financial information and about review/assessment process
	<b>16 Jan 11</b>	Cllr Gibson	Correspondence from constituent how everyone at meeting confused and stressed by proposed changes and wanted to know where to turn for support
	<b>12 May 11</b>	Cllr Goldberg	Request for financial information – Abyssinia Court
	<b>16/17 Mar</b>	Cllrs Kober, Khan and Mallet	Multiple letter to councillors from carer (N15)* about the proposed closure of the Haven and how its closure would impact on both user (fall, end up in hospital) and relative (who works part-time).
	<b>10 Feb 11</b>	Cllr Mallett	Admissions policy and how care homes will be run down.
	<b>28 Feb 11</b>	Cllr Mallett	Sustainability of the proposal and equalities implications for day centres being run by community groups.
	<b>21 Mar 11</b>	Cllr McNamara	Volunteer at one of the homes concerned that

			homes are under threat of closure and what can be done to prevent them.
	<b>1 Mar 11</b>	Cllr Newton	intended audiences at meetings in homes and centres, assurances that views of the most vulnerable will be taken into account and any changes would be tailored to an individual's needs.
	<b>5 Jan 11</b>	Cllr Schmitz	Breakdown of costs – Willoughby Road
	<b>3 Feb 11</b>	Cllr Schmitz	Additional material and details in Harringay ward, particularly Willoughby Road
	<b>17 Feb 11</b>	Cllr Schmitz	Request for information regarding the lease on Willoughby Road
	<b>15 Apr 11</b>	Cllr Schmitz	Interest from users of services, (it is said), in running Willoughby Road themselves. Request for meeting to consider.
	<b>3 Feb 11</b>	Cllr Vanier	User of the Haven * begging councillors not to close the centre.
	<b>26 Mar 11</b>	Cllr Watson	Older Person/user of services (N15) worried about the impact of the proposed closure of the Haven and asking councillors to reconsider.
	<b>22 Mar 11</b>	Cllr Wilson	Written Question (4 Apr 11) – how many responses have been received to the consultation
	<b>10 Feb 11</b>	Cllr Winskill	Request for some sort of forum of drop-in users
	<b>18 Feb 11</b>	Cllr Winskill	Enquiry from constituent regarding accessibility of information about the proposed cuts for blind and partially sighted people
	<b>21 Mar 11</b>	Cllr Winskill	Concerns from a local voluntary organisation at 'late notice' (as they saw it) of remaining consultation dates and why ward councillors not aware <b>[the notification referred to was a reminder notice at</b>



			<b>the mid-point of the consultation of dates issued in Jan 11]</b>
	<b>4 Apr 11</b>	Cllr Winskill	Relative living in Muswell Hill outlining what the impact of closure of day care centres would mean, (as they saw it), for people with dementia: isolation, further pressures on already limited places, confusion, together with requests for answers to specific questions about capacity, staffing levels etc at the Haynes/Grange. [identical to other correspondence received]
	<b>8 Apr 11</b>	Cllr Winskill	Feedback on workshop with Drop-in Centre users on 21 Mar 11
	<b>28 Apr 11</b>	Cllr Winskill	Details of other changes in adult provision
	<b>22 May 11</b>	Cllr Winskill	Request for opportunity to discuss proposed changes to provisions for residents with mental issues

\* Multiple

This page is intentionally left blank