



Appendix 1

Annex A:	Responses from community groups and partner organisations
Annex B:	Consultation response document
Annex C:	Learning Disability Experience Independent Advocacy Support and Facilitation
Annex D:	Summary from Investing in Our Tomorrow pre-budget consultation

1. Consultation response to 2015-2018 Budget and Corporate Plan

- 1.1. This report sets out responses to the 2015-2018 MTFS and Corporate Plan.
- 1.2. The consultation was divided into two parts:
 - Pre-budget consultation which took place between September 29th and November 10th seeking feedback on emerging priorities
 - MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation between December 17th and January 18th, seeking feedback on the three-year vision and budget
- 1.3. The purpose of the MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation was to involve residents and businesses in the budget-making process, inviting feedback before detailed plans and proposals are developed.
- 1.4. Both the pre-budget and MTFS/Corporate Plan consultation was organised around five key themes:
 - Young people and families
 - Adults and healthy living
 - The environment and community safety
 - Economic growth and employment
 - Housing

2. Consultation activity

- 2.1. The tables below sets out consultation activity covering both the pre-budget period and the MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation period.

Pre-budget consultation with HAVCO, September 29th to November 10th			
Activity		Areas	Participation levels
Council online survey with questions under every theme		All	766



Roadshows		Priory Park, Middle Lane, Hornsey N8	190
		Marcus Garvey Library, Tottenham Green N15	
		Albert Road Recreation Group, Bowes Park, N22	
		Chestnuts Park, St Ann's N15	
		Lordship Recreation Ground, N17	
		Alexandra Palace Market, N10	
		Wood Green Library, N22	
		Finsbury Park, N4	
		Sainsbury's Green Lanes Retail Park, N4	
		Bruce Castle Museum, Bruce Grove, N17	
Focus Groups		11 focus groups and 1 workshop	130
Health Watch Workshop			32
TOTAL			1,118

MTFS and Corporate Plan Consultation, December 17th – January 18th			
Publicity			
Item	Dates	Actions	Quantity
Consultation packs with survey	December 18 th	Consultation packs summarising proposals and signposting information sent to community groups and partner organisations	1120



		Leaflet drops to libraries and Citizens Advice Bureau	
Media	December 18th	Press release issued to local media	N/A
Haringey People	December 18th	Stories on Corporate Plan and budget consultation	
Letters to service users and their families	December 17 th	Letters in an accessible format promoting the consultation and engagement events sent to: adults with a learning disability that: 1) Receive residential or residential nursing care directly from the Council, 2) Reside within the shared lives scheme (internal to Haringey Council) 3) Reside with supported living schemes internal to Haringey Council	700
Engagement activity			
Event	Date	Audience	Participants
Ermine Road Day Opportunities drop-in (two sessions)	January 6th	Service users, families/carers	44 and 10



Haven Day centre drop-in	January 9th	Service users and their families/carers	62
Osborne Grove drop-in	January 9th	Service users, families and carers	28
The Roundway	January 9 th	Engagement between service users of The Roundway Day Centre and independent advocates	30
The Haven	January 9 th	Engagement between service users of The Haven and independent advocates	12
Ermine Road Day Centre	January 12th	Engagement between service users of Ermine Road Day Centre and independent advocates	29
Linden House	January 12th	Engagement between service users of Linden House residential home and independent advocates	13
Voluntary Sector	January 12th	Voluntary sector organisations	10
West Green & Bruce Grove Area Forum (January 12 th)	January 12th	Residents	25
The Triangle Centre – drop-in	January 13th	Young People	30
Osborne Grove	January 13th	Service users and carers	15
Osborne Grove	January 14th	Engagement between service users of Osborne Grove Nursing	12



		Home and independent advocates	
Birbeck Centre	January 14th	Engagement between service users of the Birkbeck Centre and Allways Centre with independent advocates	42
Haringey Youth Council	January 14th	Young people	20*
Children's Centres Cluster Chairs	January 14th	Cluster governors	10
Children's Centres, Noel Park	January 14th	Staff	24
Children's Centres (Civic Centre)	January 15th	Staff	24
Children's Centres, Professional Development Centre	January 15th	Nursery school governors	12
Bruce Grove Youth Centre	January 15th	10 Bruce Grove N17 6RA	45*
Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches, Civic Centre	January 15th	Neighbourhood Watch members	35*
Children's Centres, Professional Development Centre	January 15 th	Staff	35
Children's Centres, Professional Development Centre	January 16 th	Headteachers	6
Children's Centres, Professional	January 16th	Private, independent and voluntary childcare	19



Development Centre		providers	
Events in parks	January 17th	Albert Recreation Ground, Finsbury Park, Queens Wood, Markfield Park	43
			*Approx

3. Pre-budget consultation feedback

3.1. The information below is a summary of responses made. A full summary version of the report is available in Appendix A

Theme	Issues raised
Supporting Children and Families to Thrive	
Improve the early help offer	Children’s centres should be strengthened and expanded with a greater focus on early help. Improvements should be made in the way people can access the services.
Improve education	Improve the early learning offer for young people and ensure a consistent standard of education across Haringey’s schools. Improve the quality of library facilities and learning resources for children and young people of all ages.
Young people	Provide more recreational support for young people, particularly during holidays. Support the development of more apprentices and better career advice.
Support parents	Provide more parenting classes for new parents and expand healthy eating programmes. Improve training and advice for parents returning to work. Provide ESOL classes for parents with language barriers. Improve access to affordable and subsidised childcare.
Reduce the fear of crime	Increase the visibility of community policing in parks. Deal with anti-social behaviour and provide anti-gang and anti-bullying support. .
Enabling adults to live longer and healthier lives	
Promote available support for healthy ageing	Ensure that people of all ages and abilities have information on help available to them,
Joined up	NHS, Public Health and social care should work closer



services	together.
Improve access to GPs	The Council should work with the NHS to try and resolve problems with access.
Improve prevention	Roll out health checks at places where people go (i.e. supermarkets).
Reduce social isolation	Improve the availability of befriending opportunities for older people.
Improve mental health	Improve mental health advocacy and support.
Reduce obesity	Use children's centres as a hub for every programme, provide more affordable sports facilities and provide a greater range of healthy school meals. Ensure that there is support tailored for people with learning disabilities.
Ensure that Haringey is cleaner, greener with safer public spaces and streets	
Create a cleaner environment	Revise refuse collections and improve enforcement.
Improve community safety	More visibility of community policing in parks and open spaces. Promote Neighbourhood Watch to increase community involvement. Improve lighting in streets and parks, deal with drug and alcohol use in parks.
Provide more family-friendly places	Increase the availability of safe spaces for children of all ages to play.
Support community gardening	Provide more communal gardening spaces to bring people together.
Improve reuse and recycling	Provide adequate bins and promote recycling to residents.
Support and promote active travel	Promote the benefits of walking and cycling. Improve dangerous junctions and accident hot spots. Improve road safety and awareness among residents.
Improve public transport	Work with Transport for London on better bus routes connecting east with west.
Building better housing and stronger communities and streets	
Ensure housing is affordable	Provide more affordable social housing.
Improve the quality of private rented sector accommodation	Introduce a landlord registration scheme to ensure that appropriate standards are met. Work to bring empty properties back into use.
Increase community cohesion	Promote community support, activities, events and groups more strongly. Provide more community spaces. Improve the way we keep people informed.
Promoting Economic Growth	
Improve business support	Increase the amount of support and advice available to start-up businesses and improve communication with



	businesses.
Employment advice and opportunities	Improve career advice and secure more apprenticeship opportunities for younger people. Provide affordable childcare.
Utilising vacant premises	Work with landlords to utilise empty space and create more pop-up shops.

4. MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation - overview

4.1. Open responses were invited to Corporate Plan and MTFS proposals across the following areas:

- Young people and families
- Adults and healthy living
- The environment and community safety
- Economic growth and employment
- Housing and communities
- Other proposals
- Equality Impact Assessment

4.2. In addition respondents to the online and postal survey were asked the following question: To what extent do you support our proposal to freeze council tax?

4.3. Responses were received through the following means:

- Online and postal survey
- Letters and emails
- Engagement events

4.3.1. The table below sets out the number of responses made to the consultation:

Format	Number
Survey – website	322
Survey – postal	50
Emails/Letters	90
Petition signatures (from The Haven)	113
Petition signatures (from Pembury House Nursery School and Children’s Centres)	103
Total	678

4.3.2. The table below sets out the number of responses made per individual against each category in the online and postal survey:



Category	%
Children and families	60
Adults and healthy living	79
Environment and community safety	43
Economic Growth and Employment	38
Housing and communities	42
Other	36
EQIA	15

4.3.3. About the people who responded to the online and postal survey:

Do you have any children in your household?	Number	%
No	178	48
Yes	138	37
Did not answer	55	15
Total	372	100
What is your age?	Number	%
Under 16	13	3
16-24	8	2
25-44	99	27
45-64	126	34
65+	60	16
Did not answer	66	18
	372	100
What is your sex?	Number	%
Male	114	30
Female	177	48
Did not answer	81	22
	372	100
Do you have any physical or mental health conditions or illness?	Number	%
Yes	62	17
No	208	56
Did not answer	102	27
	372	100




What is your ethnic group?	Number	%
White	237	61
Mixed	8	2
Black	22	6
Asian	9	2
Other	11	3
Did not answer	100	26
Total	372	100

If you live in Haringey are you	Number	%
A Haringey leaseholder	7	2
A Haringey tenant	22	6
A housing association tenant	19	5
A private rented tenant	31	8
An owner occupier	217	58
Did not answer	76	21
Total	372	100

4.4. The information below sets out where people responded from

Stronger Haringey Survey Respondents 2014

In total 387 responses were received but only 247 had a full postcode and live in Haringey.



Produced by Business Intelligence, Haringey Council
 © Crown copyright. All rights reserved 100019199 (2015)



5. MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation – overview

- 5.1. The information provides a brief summary of significant themes that were raised during the consultation period through the survey, emails and letters. A much more detailed summary looking at individual issues raised across each of the areas is included later in the report, along with detailed responses from partners and direct engagement with service users at events.

Council tax: survey responses

To what extent do you support our proposal to freeze council tax?

To what extent do you support our proposal?	Number	%
Total responses	305	82%
Strongly support	81	22%
Support	53	14%
Neither support nor do not support	63	17%
Do not support	50	13%
Strongly do not support	58	16%
Did not answer	67	18%
Total	372	100%

The consultation

A number of people criticised the consultation process, saying that the period for consultation was too short, there were insufficient details in many of the proposals and there were too few options. Some people felt that the title of the Corporate Plan, “Building a Stronger Haringey Together”, was misleading and at odds with the reduction in budgets and there were “too many mission statements” and “not enough tangible proposals.”

Budget making

It was felt that the Council should be doing more to challenge the Government and fight for more resources rather than implementing cuts. Questions were also asked about why the Council is setting a three-year budget rather than one-year-budget, especially given the belief that the funding envelope may change should there be a change of government at the general election. Some expressed the view that the Council should consider increasing council tax.



Many people also expressed the belief that reductions in Children's and Adult budgets were being unfairly apportioned which meant that vulnerable people were being hit the hardest by the savings that are proposed.

Some felt that alternative savings could be found if expenditure on council consultants was reduced.

5.2. Priority 1: Young People and Families

Youth services

Respondents questioned the statement that only a small number of people use council youth services and that Bruce Grove is a valuable hub for young people in Tottenham and a safe haven where people come together and learn from each other. Some people expressed the point that youth centres play a valuable role around skills and employment and more should be done to find alternative sources of funding. It was clearly felt that the future of Bruce Grove youth centre was under threat from the savings that have been proposed.

Childcare

Affordable childcare is seen as a must across the borough and it was felt that children's centres play a strong role in providing high quality affordable childcare.

Children's Centres

Children's Centres play a major role in prevention and reducing the number would impact on the most vulnerable the hardest It was felt that there was a misunderstanding about the services that are provided, all of which play a major role in helping families and signposting services. Some people said that children's centres are crucial to integration and are non-stigmatising, where as it was felt that visiting people in their homes can be stigmatising with people more reluctant to engage.

A petition of 103 signatures was received in support of Pembury House Nursery School and Children's Centre).

Young people with complex needs

It was felt that the budget reductions would undermine the quality of life of vulnerable young people. A number of people expressed the same point that people with autism need to have routines and people around them. Withdrawing services would reduce independence and impact on their physical and mental health. It was strongly felt that services for disabled



people should not be withdrawn.

Pendarren Outdoor Education Centre

A number of people, including past and present headteachers, highlighted the importance of the centre in developing team work, positive thinking, confidence and social skills. Overall it was felt that Pendarren is a great educational resource, providing young people across the borough with an equal opportunity for an educational vocation which would potentially be lost if the centre moved towards a more commercial operating mode.

Schools

It was stated that the quality of education across the borough should be of a consistent standard.

5.3. Priority 2: Adults and healthy living

5.3.1. The vast majority of comments centred on the impact the budget reductions would have on vulnerable people. These have been categorised across different themes as shown below.

Complex needs – general comments

It was suggested strongly that it was wrong to consider reducing services that would impact on the most vulnerable. Reducing services would impact on their quality of life and may cause deteriorating health. It was suggested that people with complex needs, such as autism, require structure and a loss of service would potentially leave people isolated and anxious. Many were concerned that a loss of service would also increase the burden on carers and families with people worried that they will not be able to cope.

Reablement

Some respondents said that a reablement approach is ill-suited for people with very complex needs. It was also suggested that reablement services are poorly co-ordinated across the local NHS and particularly with acute hospital providers. It was stated that changes should not occur until reablement measures have been proved to have been effective.

Day centres and residential care

It was felt that the closure of day centres were at odds with the stated aims in the Corporate Plan. Many respondents expressed the view that day centres provide valuable support to elderly and vulnerable people, particularly around providing a structure and providing social engagement. . Closure would also place an extra burden on carers and may lead to increased social isolation



and deteriorating health, which potentially could place an extra cost burden on other parts of social care and the NHS. Many people said that day centres connected people and provided structure.

The Haven

Multiple letters were received from 14 service users of The Haven and their carers/family. Service users, through advocates, spoke of the fear that they will have nowhere to go and become isolated should it close. They felt that their health, quality of life and independence had improved since going to The Haven. Family members and carers spoke of visible improvements in health and wellbeing, with increased social interaction. They also said that The Haven provides valuable respite.

In addition a petition containing 102 signatures was received which said: "This day centre is an important part of community life for older people with disabilities and mental health issues and should remain so."

Linden House

A letter was received sign by seven people on behalf of the Friends of Linden House residents saying that closure would be detrimental for the health, quality of life and mental well-being of the residents.

Care packages

It was expressed that a reduction in care packages would increase the burden on carers and family members in a way that would mean that many would struggle to cope to look after their loved ones.

Voluntary sector

Some respondents said that the Council was increasing expectations on voluntary sector services while reducing its effectiveness through a proposed £1.6 million reduction in core funding.

Social Care

Concerns were expressed that a reduction in social care staff would impact on safeguarding and potentially put more people at risk of abuse.

5.4. Priority 3: Environment and community safety

Streetscene and street cleaning

Some respondents felt that street cleaning should be a major priority and were concerned that reductions in budget may lead to a reduction in service.



While some people said that the service had improved it was felt that further improvements were needed. It was expressed that the service was still too reactive to problems such as fly-tipping, incurring greater cost.

Recycling and refuse

Concern was expressed that the closure of the Park View Road Reuse and Recycling Centre would increase fly-tipping. While there was general support for the proposal to remove street-side recycling points, a point was made that it would make it harder for people to recycle who did not have cars.

Roads and parking

Mixed views were expressed about the introduction of a 20mph zone, with some respondents saying that it would be hard to enforce.

Community safety

Some people stated that they would like to see more CCTV, more work is needed generally to improve community safety, particularly around reducing gang activity.

Parks

A number of people expressed concerns around proposals to increase income from events in parks which could bring unreasonable levels of disruption for local people, particularly around Finsbury Park.

5.5. Priority 4: Economic Growth and employment

Regeneration

Some concerns were raised that regeneration in Tottenham may result in some residents and businesses being priced out of the area. Some felt there should be a stronger investment focus on other parts of the borough, particularly Wood Green.

Employment and skills

The living wage was highlighted as being important, while concerns were raised about the impact of job reductions at the Council and partner organisations.

Business support and growth

Views were expressed that the Council should focus on supporting business forums and improving shopping areas. A point was made that the Council



should identify priority sectors and help more companies relocate to Haringey.

5.6. Priority 5: Housing and communities

5.6.1. A number of people raised issues around the need for more affordable housing in the borough, with the need to bring more empty homes back into use. Many people expressed support for a Landlord Registration Scheme. Some concerns were expressed about the impact of regeneration schemes on existing affordable housing.

5.7. Other budget proposals

Muswell Hill Library

Views on the library’s future were mixed, with some opposing any relocation while others believe a more accessible building is needed. Some people expressed the desire to see more detail before commenting.

Marcus Garvey Library

All respondents who commented on the proposal felt that the current library space should be preserved and it was an important asset for people of Tottenham, particularly for younger people who may struggle to find sufficient to complete homework within their home.

5.8. EQIAs

5.8.1. A number of people commented that they felt that the current EQIA lacked sufficient detail. General points were expressed that the budget proposals would reduce inequality, resulting in the poorest and most vulnerable being worst hit.

6. Consultation – specific points raised

6.1.1. The table below summarise key points made through the survey and via emails and letters.

General issues cutting across all priorities	
Consultation	The restricted survey and questionnaire is a farce as is the ridiculously short period here allowed for 'consultation'. The consultation period for review of the plans is far too short - an insult.



	<p>A consultation must involve full transparency and clear facts as well as fully worked out details of options and alternatives. This council has again not complied with these requirements. The consultation period should be at least 3 months</p> <p>How you can use the language you do: "A Stronger Haringey"? You are proposing to slice millions from the services for the most vulnerable people in the borough. How will this make it stronger? For whom?</p> <p>The consultation period is too short and there are too few options available to choose from</p>
<p>The Budget</p>	<p>There are no alternatives set out on cuts, one being to first construct a budget for one year instead of three. A change of government the financial situation may change significantly</p> <p>If you can do so much with less, why have you not done it before? There is a lack of analysis and review in the documents</p> <p>The Council is decimating services against the wishes of residents</p> <p>Council tax should be increased by 1 or 2% so that more services can be retained - children and young adults will be less likely to benefit from the timely interventions and appropriate facilities needed to help them develop into responsible and happy adults</p> <p>It is unnecessary to push through a 3 year budget plan. Given the possible change in central government from May 2015 it would be better to formulate budget plans for further years after the May election</p> <p>Too much money is spent on consultants – one fee could keep a school based Children's Centre open for a year</p> <p>The Council should stand up against the Government.</p> <p>The Council should consider how it can increase its reach and influence on national Government to increase financial resources.</p>



<p>Corporate Plan</p>	<p>The title “Building a Stronger Haringey Together” is misleading when there are significant reductions in budget. There is no ‘investment’ in younger people. The statements are vague, unambiguous and subjective with few tangible proposals. It give the impression that there will be additional services rather than cuts</p> <p>There is insufficient detail in the Corporate Plan and MFTS about plans and proposals</p> <p>The document suggests that the borough will be more effective and efficient following the cuts and this does not sit well</p> <p>The Corporate Plan had too many mission statements, is vague and does not enough substance or proper analysis of the issues</p>
<p>Young people and families</p>	
<p>General</p>	<p>The cuts have a big impact on vulnerable people and people with autism without any review of need</p> <p>The objectives are at odds with what is being delivered by way of reductions in services</p> <p>The Council should be fighting for more resources rather than implementing cuts</p> <p>Support for the voluntary sector is at odds with the reduction in budgets</p> <p>Early investment for children and families is essential to get better outcomes and reduce pressure on more expensive services longer term</p> <p>The vision laid out is unrealistic – even if there was unlimited resources it would not be possible to give ‘all’ children the best start in life and to safeguard ‘all’ children from abuse</p> <p>Support for principles around early intervention and prevention</p> <p>The proposals seem well thought through given reductions in Government expenditure</p>



	<p>We need to ensure all children are given the best opportunities, including those with special educational needs</p> <p>Improving early help is commendable but actions rely too much on voluntary and private organisations. Private organisations make a profit or go under. Voluntary groups are experiencing the same problems as LAs</p> <p>I understand that cuts will have to be made but I expect Labour Council to protest to Government more</p> <p>To have preventive services investment needs to be made in education, youth services and child protection</p> <p>The proposals will not be possible with the level of cuts proposed. The proposals are not detailed enough to give a proper response and there is no evidence for what you are suggesting</p> <p>Has thought be given to the impact of the cuts in the longer term? There is only need to agree a one year budget as there is a General Election in May. Could reserves not be used in order to prevent such cuts? Once gone staff, facilities and expertise cannot be brought back</p> <p>These objectives will set young people up for a better future in life. Child care should be more affordable and moulded by council and the voluntary sector. Children's centres should be located centrally to reach more parents, more emphasis should be placed on improving school results standards and preparing young people for the world of work in the 21st century</p>
<p>Pendarren Outdoor Education Centre</p>	<p>As a past Headteacher for 8 years, I know the benefit of Pendarren Outdoor Education Centre in developing team work, positive thinking, confidence and social skills</p> <p>The proposals for Pendarren put at risk a facility which is instrumental in Haringey's current success, and continuing ambition, to improve standards in all schools</p> <p>Pendarren House and its facilities are an amazing privilege for the children of Haringey - do not reduce access to the best asset the schools have. Every child in Haringey has the opportunity to experience an unforgettable educational vacation</p>



	<p>Pendarren is a fantastic educational resource, giving pupils in our community opportunities that they wouldn't get from some of the other more commercial school journey centres</p>
<p>Youth Centres</p>	<p>Claims that a small number of people use youth centres is subjective and not based on evidence. A FOI in November and December revealed that no monitoring data is collected. The Council is either withholding information on its future plans, only making people aware once the budget has been agreed or it is stating that there are no proposals at the moment, in which case we cannot be expected to respond</p> <p>Bruce Grove is a valuable hub for young people in Tottenham</p> <p>If youth centres are not working the Council should be trying to change the model, not getting rid of them altogether.</p> <p>Youth clubs are vital and should offer a full provision, including physical fitness activity, nutritional advice, discussion groups around relationships, friendships, self esteem, sexual health etc</p> <p>To stop funding Bruce Grove Centre would create more problems than it would save solve money</p> <p>Youth centres should be kept open as they are places where young people can come together and learn from each other</p> <p>Youth services really help young people with skills and reduce gang activities</p> <p>Youth centres provide great support</p> <p>Do not agree with the cutting of young people's services. You should be fighting for more resources and refusing to implement cuts. Otherwise your promises are just a lot of hot air and empty rhetoric.</p> <p>The Council should not be cutting funding to Youth Services even further</p>



	<p>Youth clubs provide a safe haven for young people</p> <p>Every effort should be made to look at alternative funding sources and models of provision keep youth services open</p> <p>It is a lame excuse to say that youth clubs don't provide the support young people need. All age groups need somewhere to go to go and continued reduction of places to go to will be counter-productive to your stated aims</p> <p>There is little to do for young people in Tottenham already and in the light of the riots a few years ago, is it wise to deprive young people of a tiny corner of Tottenham that they can call their own?</p>
Childcare	<p>Affordable childcare is a must for families</p> <p>There should be a cap on the cost of childcare in Haringey provided by private entities such as nurseries childminders, to a maximum of £40 per day</p> <p>The council should continue to provide childcare. Some of the children's centres provide affordable childcare that is second to none. The new Asquith nursery in Crouch Hill charges £83 a day, and some private nurseries don't offer 3 year old their free 15 hours a week. This is not affordable and will price ordinary parents out of the workplace</p> <p>The market does not work in providing childcare and Haringey should intervene, making sure that there is excellent childcare provided in the east of the borough with a range of specialist child-minders</p> <p>Council should be supporting existing childcare providers, rather than replacing it</p>
Children's Centres	<p>Reducing children's centres and childcare will hit the most vulnerable parents the hardest</p> <p>Saving money by closing children's centres is wrong because families rely on the support that is provided</p> <p>Children's centres are a support hub, if you take them away the level of support will be reduced</p> <p>There is insufficient detail in the proposals as to how more support will be given to people in their own homes</p>



	<p>Children's centres provide a good service and it is wrong to consider closing them</p> <p>Reducing the number of Children's Centres will surely mean that it is more difficult for families to access them. I know that I only really used my local Children's Centres as it was the easiest to get to with the buggy. Restricting access doesn't make sense</p> <p>Opposition to fewer sites - full day sessions should happen at local pre schools, i.e. for 3 year olds at school nurseries. The uptake would be better and help working families</p> <p>Having designated communal places with organised activities for children and carers is important – many people with children living in cramped private rented accommodation need to get out</p> <p>Children's centres are a vital link to the community and a major prevention strategy enabler, reducing poverty and improving access to services and wider community links</p> <p>How can cutting children's centres achieve more 'early help' and give more children the best start in life?</p> <p>The centres are crucial for the integration of a very diverse community. Many activities are oversubscribed. For bilingual or trilingual families, home visits can never replace the vital encounters that take place at the centres and the confidence this brings</p> <p>For some families, home visits can be quite judgemental, intrusive and even threatening. Our centres deal with children on the child protection register, children in need and in poverty, families facing issues of domestic violence and housing crises, children with special needs, health issues, bereavement, and other things. They also offer a chance to access health services, ante and postnatal, and baby feeding support</p> <p>Please ensure continued or improved support for established and thriving children centres such as the Broadwater Farm children's centre. Ensuring better reach is important, but please not not take resources away from children's centres</p>
--	--



	<p>To say that children’s centres could offer employment support and ESOL shows that whoever produced this plan is not aware of the services currently on offer. Children’s Centres already work with the whole family by default. Parents, mainly but not exclusively mothers, who do not have a good command of English lack the confidence to attend ESOL classes at venues other than the Children’s Centres where they have told their story and feel at home in</p> <p>All sorts of agencies work from children's centres including Job Centre Plus, the Citizens' Advice Bureau, ESOL teachers, adult and family learning. Ante natal and post natal care is provided. Services are universal and non-stigmatising</p> <p>It’s counter-productive to close children’s centres They are at the heart of the early help strategy</p> <p>You are doing the absolute opposite of what you should be doing to support families. The Children's Centres focus on outreach as well as providing a safe and supportive environment close to home to come to for support</p> <p>It’s counter-productive to close children’s centres They are at the heart of the early help strategy. It is better to pay for high quality early intervention than spend more money later on.</p> <p>Plans make the objectives impossible to meet. Children's Centres provide outreach as well as a safe and supportive environment. Instead of building partnerships between all support agencies you will be destroying them. The most vulnerable will be at much greater risk than now, as Children's Centres do the preventative child protection work.</p>
Complex needs	<p>The cuts will bear very severely on young people with autism and complex needs and have been announced without any review of need and going against national research around identifying the complexity of needs, putting adequate provision in place and supporting the transition between youth and adult life</p> <p>Services for young people with disabilities and especially high functioning teens with autism are already threadbare.</p>



	<p>The Council should be challenging Government.</p> <p>Services for disabled children should be maintained. We should be giving children the best start in life, therefore improving their quality of life and reducing the need for resources in adulthood</p> <p>The Council should do more to raise awareness of Special Educational Needs, increase access to information and respite for carers. Children with Special Educational Needs need inclusion and activities yet there is very little provision</p> <p>These proposed cuts will undermine the quality of life of our most vulnerable. If the cuts go ahead, the independence and safety of already vulnerable people will be endangered</p>
Day care	<p>Services for young people with disabilities and especially high functioning teens with autism are already threadbare</p>
Parental support	<p>More emphasis should be put on good parenting to alleviate the responsibility of the local authority to spend so much on younger people</p> <p>Parents do not have sufficient support. The council should encourage the voluntary sectors in the borough to support children at all levels</p>
Looked after children	<p>Budget cuts appear to be driven by assumptions which are unproven. Is there evidence, for example, that you will be able to effectively and safely reduce the number of children who come into care? Or that you will be able to recruit at least 30 foster carers per annum?</p>
Schools	<p>It is important to ensure not only a consistent standard of education across the borough's schools, but also to ensure that education is provided at a high quality in terms of teaching and inspiring the young. Financial constraints cannot be an excuse for poor educational provisions</p> <p>The Council should focus on raising achievement, public and personal behaviours and reduce social inequality by raising high school standards, including citizenship, and improving emotional intelligence and resilience</p> <p>The ambition should be to provide kindergarten places for all 3 year olds; class sizes under 30; and proper education for all 16 - 18 year olds, vocational & otherwise.</p>



	<p>Budgetary cuts will not allow for this</p> <p>Schools will be left no option but to focus on educating children and families on emotional health and wellbeing, obesity and healthy relationships, emotional health and wellbeing and obesity as well as gang crime etc. How are we to do that effectively when our core purpose is raising standards educationally to reach national standards in Reading, Writing and Maths? What do you propose we 'drop'?</p>
Voluntary Sector	<p>Do not like the idea of over-reliance on the voluntary sector. Knowledge of volunteer-led activity suggests this is not a good solution</p> <p>Putting more emphasis on the voluntary sector to supply services whilst cutting financial support will lead to a reduction of service providers</p>
Adults and healthy living	
General	<p>Budget cuts 'are immoral' and fall disproportionately on services for children and vulnerable adults</p> <p>Regardless of financial pressures it is wrong to consider withdrawing services that protect our most vulnerable</p> <p>Budget reduction should come from other areas of the Council</p> <p>The proposals would increase social isolation and alienation</p> <p>Reductions in number of social workers would remove protection for people who are vulnerable to abuse and exploitation</p> <p>The vision to "Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives" is at odds with the plan to cut £30m and 283 staff</p> <p>Community support is very important given the financial challenges</p> <p>The plan puts considerable emphasis on reactive options (health care for the elderly and people with complex needs) It would be good to include other options around investing in healthy lifestyle for younger people- for example improving cycling and making it cheaper to use</p>



	<p>sports facilities.</p> <p>The Council is not in a strong position to facilitate community support and does not have the systems and solutions in place to help people live healthier lives in which they exercise autonomy.</p> <p>The Council is making these cuts is a false economy as more and more people will go into crisis and require expensive statutory services.</p> <p>The Council has produced a very clear vision with a particular focus on early intervention and working with the voluntary sector.</p> <p>More support will be needed from GPs to identify people most at need.</p> <p>The consultation came out just before Christmas and the Council is giving people insufficient time to respond. Many adults with complex needs will not understand the implication of cuts and will not be able to respond.</p> <p>The cuts will also contribute to increasing isolation; poorer quality of life; and greater possibility of abuse as monitoring of family's and individuals' situation decreases.</p> <p>Volunteering schemes to reduce isolation and loneliness for the elderly need to be advertised.</p> <p>Other London councils are seeking to lessen the impact of social care cuts by raising council tax and see notes re other options in question above. To focus on learning disabilities, the closure of three day centres and one residential home, the reduction of care packages by £10m, of social workers by 25%, and funding for daytime activities for people living in residential homes and supported housing can only undermine the little quality of life they enjoy and place more pressure on already over-worked parents and carers, leading to increasing numbers of adults with learning disabilities becoming the council's responsibility at considerable additional expense.</p> <p>Cutting social work staff is short-sighted and will create more problems and put more vulnerable adults and</p>
--	---



	<p>children at risk.</p> <p>The cuts in social care will increase the burden on our NHS services in the borough.</p> <p>Objectives are at odds with your proposals. Communities will live healthily for less time and will not feel supported to live independently. Proposals will exacerbate mental health issues and increase the burden on our NHS services in the borough. There is an assumed reliance on the voluntary sector yet you are slashing the voluntary sector funding by 50%. Utterly incompatible.</p>
<p>Reablement</p>	<p>The council has produced no evidence that a reablement approach is appropriate to any of the groups currently using these services (including people with autism, learning disabilities, dementia).</p> <p>Agreement with the objectives, but concern that the services are not there to support reablement.</p> <p>Current services to enable people to stay or return to their home are weak and poorly co-ordinated with hospitals such as North Middlesex and The Whittington. Closing day centres and reducing residential care homes should only happen after alternatives have been put into place and preventative measures have been shown to work.</p> <p>Cuts in established services are to be supplanted by new untested approaches, with no independent evidence that they will improve the outcomes of these people. The rationale is that it is better for people to be in their own homes or to “reable” them. That is impossible for people with Alzheimer’s, with Severe Autism, or with severe learning difficulties.</p> <p>Promoting independent living for elderly is admirable but there has been a reluctance within the NHS to support home care and many elderly people, with health problems, are forced into care homes at considerable financial cost to themselves because they are viewed as unsuitable for home care. Haringey should recognise this problem and actively support home care initiatives.</p> <p>Reablement/neighbourhood connects might work for some relatively fit 60-somethings. Even if they do not have any serious health problems, most 80-somethings</p>



	<p>are not physically and mentally agile,. They need regular, structured support. Day centres stop them becoming house-bound.</p>
<p>Day centres and residential care</p>	<p>Closure of day centres and other services to the health and wellbeing of service users and their families is at odd with the Council’s vision to ensure that ‘all residents will be as healthy as possible for as long as possible’.</p> <p>Adults denied access to day centres will place an extra burden on family resources. There is a risk of increased anxiety and challenging behaviour, greater social isolation and deteriorating mental health (for both individuals and family carers. It will also increase pressures on the NHS.</p> <p>Stated aims around independent living are valid but for some people it isn't suitable, achievable or preferable.</p> <p>More provision for sufferers of dementia, not less.</p> <p>Closing the Haven could impact on mental health and increase admissions to psychiatric hospitals.</p> <p>The Haven Day Centre, Hayes and Grange provide an opportunity for people to meet with each other and provide respite for carers.</p> <p>Day centres support the most vulnerable in society and it is wrong to consider closing them.</p> <p>Closing day centres is a false economy because care packages will need to be renegotiated. More people will require care homes.</p> <p>There may be increased pressure on public spending because families may have to leave jobs and claim benefits to look after loved ones.</p> <p>Without support from day care people with complex needs will not be able to live independently.</p> <p>People with autism need the sort of consistent and structured service currently provided in a secure and familiar place with staff who have relevant training and experience. There is limited scope for community-based activities.</p> <p>On Osborne Grove information is inadequate to understand the implications and logic of the proposals.</p>



	<p>What does running down OG mean? What alternative facilities will be available to those not suitable for "reablement" How will dementia sufferers be cared for in the proposed "running down/reablement" environment?</p> <p>The severity of the residents' conditions renders them ineligible for participation in any 'Shared Lives Plus' service. The Shared Lives Plus' service is a thoroughly inadequate alternative care model for the residents.</p> <p>Care Homes and Day Centres provide obvious savings against the cost of home care services provision. These can be extended to include Health checks, library services of Benefit Advice and Guidance, Food Banks and IT services to counteract isolation and also allow more independence choices. Voluntary and Community groups already offer many of these services and should be commissioned to run services within the Centres.</p> <p>I am a client of The Haven and believe to close it would be a very wrong decision. I live above the centre and it gives me support and people to talk to. I am very lucky to attend now and hope that you will not close the Haven. There is not much left in life for older people who cannot get out and about. I have worked all my life and should be entitled to care and support which I am lucky to have now. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>These day centres provide such people with a good quality of life in a safe environment providing activities and exercises that are proven to slow the deterioration of dementia patients at fraction of cost of full-time care.</p> <p>"Close Linden residential home which supports people with complex needs" The explanation does not acknowledge that there are some people who unfortunately are unable to live independently. There is a risk of exacerbating pressures on the health service if these Council facilities are always being withdrawn.</p> <p>There should be more centres for adults and not close centres. My centre is like a second home I have paid my taxes when I was younger so when I became ill I thought I would get the help I needed. My sons feel at ease knowing that I am comfortable and happy at the centre</p>
--	--



	<p>and that I am being well cared for.. If my centre did close down I would deteriorate and go back to being a cabbage.</p> <p>The Haven centre has changed my life.</p> <p>The recommendations from Investing in our Tomorrow consultation clearly says that "improve the availability of day centres" but you are proposing to close them - what is the logic? Justification? Explanation?</p> <p>The recommendation to close Lindon House and make £400k savings is totally uncaring and unfeeling and with little consideration for a very vulnerable client group that are unable to function and live in their community on their own.</p>
<p>The Haven – specific correspondence</p>	<p>Representations from service users, dictated by an advocate:</p> <p>We do not want The Haven to close – where are people going to go, what are we going to do, where are staff going to go?</p> <p>If it closes I will be lonely and isolated – the staff at The Haven look after me.</p> <p>I am on my own and dreading the future without The Haven. I had cancer last year and the staff attended my appointments – without them I don't think I would be here now.</p> <p>The Haven is our refuge, our second home and family. Savings should be found in other areas – could the council's income from parking fines and CPZs not go towards services for older people? Without The Haven we will be in a much worse position at a crucial time of our lives.</p> <p>I am 78-years-old and live alone – the only time I manage to leave my house is when the staff at The Haven collect me three days a week. I am unable to cook and rely on takeaways – at the centre I have cooked meals and get to meet friends.</p> <p>Since coming to The Haven my health has improved immensely – if it closes I will go back to square one. I am</p>



	<p>very anxious and worried. If the Haven closes I cannot see an alternative where I could attend.</p> <p>The announcement of the proposal just before Christmas was heartless, people have been driven to a state of anxiety and panic. Staff are excellent and help reduce social isolation. Cannot see how the proposal will “empower adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives.” People who have lived and worked all their lives in Tottenham are not being treated fairly.</p> <p>Representations from carers and family members:</p> <p>Since my dad has been at The Haven he has become a changed man – he laughs and is able to have conversations at home. Before, after losing his wife, he was withdrawn. If the centre closes it will shut my dad down.</p> <p>The community and health services benefit in the long term when the community are cared for in the way that they are at The Haven.</p> <p>Our father suffers from a bipolar disorder – he used to spend most of his days indoor and in bed, The Haven provides him with stimulation and allows him to socialise. The Haven has helped my father socialise and, the time he spends there gives me the opportunity to rest and carry out other duties.</p> <p>The Haven has been a lifeline for my aunt – she is now interested in what is happening around her and has more self esteem. The centre provides respite for carers. The service users access physiotherapists and occupational therapists to achieve progress against their needs assessment - would you leave a child on their own to fend for themselves?</p>
<p>Complex needs</p>	<p>There is insufficient detail in budget papers about what resources will be devoted to ‘prevention’ and what ‘prevention’ means in relation to autism, learning disability, and dementia.</p> <p>People with learning disabilities and autism have been assessed as having very high care needs and are some</p>



	<p>of our most vulnerable people. Reducing care packages and closing day centres will undermine their quality of life.</p> <p>The proposed cut of 25% to people with learning disabilities is unjust as many people who suffer from these disabilities will also be affected by major cuts to care packages.</p> <p>People with autism need to have routines and people around them. Withdrawing services will reduce independence.</p> <p>The reductions would hurt our most vulnerable adults and out pressure on ageing parents and carers and is likely to result in increased costs around emergency care and within social care and mental health.</p> <p>It is irresponsible to cut services for people with autism or any mental health.</p> <p>The lives of people with complex needs will be impoverished and their mental and physical health will suffer. People will lose control of their lives and their lives will be less fulfilling. This is turning back the clock because people will be treated with less respect.</p> <p>It is essential for people with autism to have routines and consistent structures and people around them. If this is taken away, there is a huge risk that these clients will become isolated, anxious and that their mental health will suffer.</p> <p>Haringey, as a member of North London Waste Authority recently spent £5-6m as its portion of the costs on an aborted waste procurement plan. Majority of spending went on highly paid consultants. Financial blunders must be recouped by cutting vital services.</p> <p>If the council is serious about equality and meeting the individual need of children then it is vital that they take into account children with disabilities.</p> <p>Families who currently have support/respite caring for disabled adults would have to consider residential care because of the lack of support.</p> <p>Closing older people's day centres will increase mortality</p>
--	---



	<p>rates for the people who use these centres.</p> <p>Elderly people and those with disabilities should not be at the mercy of private providers whose interests are making profits rather than looking after people and treating them with the respect and care they deserve.</p> <p>Haringey council is supposedly about supporting a fair society, the rights of the disadvantaged, and social justice. However you are targeting the most vulnerable with huge cuts to their services and care packages.</p> <p>To close down and take away facilities that are lifelines for elderly people and others who need desperately stability and care in their lives is shameful.</p>
Voluntary sector	Reducing the voluntary sector grant from £3m to £1.6m will not enable it to fill the void.
Care packages	<p>A reduction in spend on care packages will result in pressure to transfer individuals to supported living projects run by the lowest cost providers – who rely on poorly paid staff, often lacking in relevant skills and experience, with limited training opportunities. This will lead to a high turnover of staff and a loss of continuity and quality of care.</p> <p>Care packages are already as low as they can safely be. Assessing with an eye to save money is illegal and all carers should sharply oppose this</p>
Health and social care integration	It is important to ensure there are appropriate mechanisms at every stage of delivery of services to ensure objectives with in intended quality.
Environment and community safety	
General	<p>Concern over proposals to implement a 20mpg zone given evidence suggests that it will be widely flouted.</p> <p>Proposals seem reasonable</p> <p>More should be asked of late-night businesses to financially support the activities.</p> <p>General agreement on the proposals</p>



	<p>Proposals sound like soundbites and are vague – lack of trust on delivery.</p> <p>Acknowledgement that the rubbish collection is very good, impressed with the new recycling centre but concerned about implications for residents in the East of the borough if a recycling centre closed.</p> <p>Proposals to increase parking fees remove street recycling points seem reasonable, but concern about reduction in budget for park maintenance and litter collection.</p> <p>Cut in youth services could increase crime.</p> <p>Concern about impact on heritage sites like Alexandra Palace and Bruce Castle but welcome 20mph speed limit.</p> <p>Reinstall twice annual free-pick up for large bulky items.</p> <p>Get people to clean in front of their house rather than cut services for the disabled.</p> <p>Proposal will be compromised by outsourcing which will mean that the lowest bidding provider is appointed.</p> <p>Improvements are needed around dog fouling, including raising awareness.</p> <p>It is not realistic to base proposals around use of volunteers.</p> <p>Applaud the aim of reducing violence against women and plans to make Haringey more cycling-friendly, but more work needs to happen on 40:20 policy.</p> <p>How will we know if the aims have been successful and what are the measures of success?</p> <p>This should be a priority. There is no other public body that is able to protect and improve quality of life for residents.</p> <p>Increase Council tax rather than parking charges. Increase on street recycling bins for litter as other Boroughs have.</p>
--	---



<p>Streetscene and street cleaning</p>	<p>Street cleaning should be the number one priority</p> <p>Street cleaners should be merged with traffic wardens.</p> <p>Strong support for aims to improve cleanliness and the overall environment.</p> <p>Concern about impact of reducing street cleaning in favour of litter picking.</p> <p>More work is needed to improve cleanliness – with litter being a real problem. Closure of Park View Road recycling will reduce recycling.</p> <p>Remains to be seen whether goals can be met given current problems around fly-tipping, litter and dog fouling – not convinced.</p> <p>Council already does the minimum, community clean-ups are not realistic.</p> <p>We need to reduce littering and educate residents. Do not reduce budgets for litter collection.</p> <p>Proud to live in Tottenham. The council has worked to support effective and dedicated community groups and have begun to make great strides in improving the environment, but more need to be done</p> <p>The borough isn't clean now so how do you expect £70M funding cut to make it clean?</p> <p>Street cleaning has shown improvement over the last 10 years, the silent majority would consider that the level of street cleaning is a major part of the council's responsibility towards residents</p> <p>This not badly done at present and there is no need to promise more.. If street cleanliness uses resources better deployed elsewhere, it can be reduced somewhat without harm done.</p> <p>More money should be spent on cleaning services, not less. The street litter is a huge problem..</p> <p>Very sceptical of these proposals - fly tipping is endemic in the area and outsourcing this to Veolia has made this</p>
--	---



	<p>worse, but hopefully some changes may help this.</p> <p>To prevent fly tipping there should be more information and education and help to people for discussing bulk items. The community needs to work together to stop fly-tipping.</p>
<p>Recycling and refuse</p>	<p>Concern that closure of Park View Road recycling will increase dumping, particularly in the East.</p> <p>Western Road site is too far away- flytipping will increase at a time when we have only just started to get decent street cleaning.</p> <p>The blanket 2-week cycle rubbish collection was a mistake with no adequate waste storage in large parts of the borough – question over whether it has substantially eaten into contract savings.</p> <p>Small electrical recycling bins at streetside should be retained as items are not allowed for household collection.</p> <p>Carry on with fortnightly rubbish collection, neighbourhood watch schemes and surgeries with local police to keep people safe.</p> <p>The only reason Haringey's spending on waste management is out of line with neighbouring boroughs is the 'reactive' approach that is taken. Businesses and some homes do not have adequate waste facilities (commercial or appropriate bins), hence unofficial 'collection points' are set up.</p> <p>Back plans to remove all in street recycling points to reduce fly tipping – they are a real eyesore. You should also remove some bins.</p> <p>There should be a charge for collection of larger items, which cannot be collected by Veolia. This would offset some of the costs</p> <p>Appreciate the logic around removing street recycling points but would point out that there is no easy provision for people without cars. On-street collection may not be ideal but urge Council to look at making recycling of the sorts of items that go to the recycling centres easily available to those without their own cars.</p>



	<p>Closing Park View Road recycling centre seems short-sighted. Older People, those without transport, will find it difficult to recycle items such as small electrical goods. There will be more fly tipping, not less..</p>
Roads and parking	<p>Implementing 20mph zones will be expensive and hard to enforce.</p> <p>Plans sound fair – people should pay more for parking.</p> <p>Disappointment with proposed increase in car permits.</p> <p>It is vitally important that the clearing of broken glass and debris from cycle lanes (and cycle routes generally) is not reduced</p> <p>Less reactive maintenance to street lighting should be achieved by using more reliable lighting (eg LED), not by removing illumination from signs, which is essential for road safety.</p> <p>Cost of parking permit should not be linked to the size of car and or emission.</p> <p>20mph speed limit is an excellent idea for the borough</p> <p>As if parking was not a rip off already! We pay our council tax so why pay to park on roads we already paid for!</p>
Community safety	<p>Reductions in support for vulnerable people may lead to higher costs for emergency services.</p> <p>Doubts Haringey can deliver with poor current response to community safety.</p> <p>More CCTV should be added.</p> <p>More work is needed to reduce gang activities.</p> <p>People in Haringey do not feel safe and people are treated like second class citizens.</p> <p>More visible police patrols are needed to enforce fly tipping and speeding.</p>
Parks	<p>Oppose the plan for large events in Finsbury Park and other parks. These parks are for local people.</p>



	<p>Expecting £600k income from parks event is either over-optimistic or will commercialise them too much and destroy them as quiet, accessible places.</p> <p>Very concerned about the proposal to increase income from events held in parks. Big concerts at Finsbury Park are unreasonable and bring unacceptable levels of disruption.</p> <p>Council Tax should cover looking after parks. Treating parks as money making venues for commercial events means that you are not protecting them.</p> <p>Please don't permit another concert on the scale of Wireless to take place. Ensure that if a concert takes place during the day as well as the evening, it only last for one day. Please ensure that evening concerts only run for 2 consecutive evenings. Reduce the permitted noise levels.</p>
Economic Growth and employment	
<p>General</p>	<p>Proposals are vague on how you will attract investment</p> <p>This should be best left to the private sector</p> <p>Given the Council's financial challenges, these aspirational objectives should not be a priority</p> <p>Reads well but can Haringey deliver?</p> <p>Agreement with the proposals</p> <p>These are the most important objectives given the value of employment.</p> <p>Proposals are sensible and very important.</p> <p>Plans are not well defined enough to comment.</p> <p>The focus should be on stable growth so that people are not pushed out of their homes, as has happened in Hackney.</p> <p>I applaud the encouragement of growth.</p> <p>Council should persuade Mayor to extend Zone 2 to</p>



	<p>Wood Green and Tottenham Hale</p> <p>Haringey should lobby for more transport investment, much of the borough is isolated from central London and East/West links are not good.</p> <p>For 'everyone' to benefit from growth, there is a need for genuinely affordable housing, which your proposals do not offer,</p> <p>Objectives and plans in this section are the best so far. We need experienced speakers into schools who can promote different industries, in a positive way.</p>
<p>Regeneration</p>	<p>The proposals make no mention of demolition of thousands of council homes</p> <p>Concerns that regeneration will drive local people out of Tottenham</p> <p>Does Tottenham need all the money and could it not be shared with Wood Green?</p> <p>Fine proposals but how much redevelopment is appropriate?</p> <p>There is too little attention to West Green Road and Broad Lane shopping areas. Haringey should do for South Tottenham what Hackney has done for Dalston.</p> <p>Stop suggesting investment in Tottenham Hotspur will create jobs when it will allow a private company to make money.</p> <p>Tottenham regeneration plan is low on measures to ensure that current Tottenham residents aren't priced out</p> <p>Scant concern - if any - appears to be paid to businesses in N22 faced with closure and the loss of substantial skilled jobs in what has been a thriving area for business development – urge council to identify priority sectors and help firms in those sectors to locate, grow and create jobs in Haringey, recognising in particular the importance of small and medium-sized businesses to the borough's economy.</p> <p>Regeneration' plans for North Tottenham are destroying</p>



	<p>small businesses</p> <p>Tottenham does not need to grow anymore, it is already grossly over- crowded. Money could be saved using the buildings that we have rather than rushing to turn Tottenham into a pale imitation of Crouch End.</p>
Green economy and carbon emissions	<p>Support for the council’s proposals – council should encourage businesses to switch off lights when shut.</p>
Employment and skills	<p>Closing day care centres will result in job losses.</p> <p>Haringey Council is abolishing longstanding employment in Wood Green with no plan to replace employment or relocate local businesses. No evidence that Haringey understand its local economy.</p> <p>There is too much focus on creating demand for employment rather than addressing supply and transforming the local economy.</p> <p>Removing youth services will not help people find employment. Youth workers know how to support people.</p> <p>People should be provided with the living wage.</p> <p>It is important to help families and individuals who wish to start up their own business.</p> <p>Support plans to promote economic growth. More support is needed for the private sector, historical attempts to stimulate this directly (techno park) have been unsuccessful.</p> <p>All contracts for new build and maintenance of buildings in Haringey should include a commitment to employ Haringey residents.</p> <p>We want to know that there is something to motivate young people of our days. The Council could open some more day centres for the elderly to give some jobs for the younger people.</p>
Business support and growth	<p>Scant concern - if any - appears to be paid to businesses in N22 faced with closure and the loss of substantial skilled jobs in what has been a thriving area for business development – urge council to identify priority sectors and</p>



	<p>help firms in those sectors to locate, grow and create jobs in Haringey, recognising in particular the importance of small and medium-sized businesses to the borough's economy.</p> <p>Giving support to community business forums and improving shopping areas would help. Making the area more attractive to visit, more car free areas or car free days would help traders - there is ample evidence of how business benefits from better environments.</p> <p>The most effective way to boost growth and help local businesses would be to freeze or reduce the rates charged by the council.</p> <p>Would like to see more imaginative ways of leveraging the economic resources of the west to support the east. For example, could successful shops in the west of the borough be offered a rate reduction if they open a new branch in the east? What about better transport links across the borough? This section calls for tangible new ideas.</p> <p>Haringey needs to look attractive like other points of London to attract new businesses to the borough and create jobs.</p> <p>The Council should review all charity shop business rates discounts</p> <p>The current network of town centre trader groups should be strengthened by the Council providing more administrative and logistical support to promote the business sector, thereby increasing business rates.</p> <p>The Planning directorate should bring forward policies to actively promote the business sector.</p>
Housing and communities	
General	<p>There are too many buy-to-let houses being built</p> <p>More housing, schools, hospitals and GP surgeries are needed to meet the needs of the population</p> <p>Amenities need to be provided for new homes, such as doctors and dentists</p>



	<p>Housing for adults with additional needs should be a top priority</p> <p>More emphasis needs to be placed on support existing vulnerable adults before bringing new people into the borough.</p> <p>Little confidence in proposals given the Council's record on social housing over the last 20 years.</p> <p>General support for the proposals</p> <p>The objectives are sound.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given into the needs of children with disabilities.</p> <p>Housing should not be a priority except for the most acutely vulnerable.</p> <p>Mixed housing and strong communities will help raise the aspiration for a wider section of Haringey residents.</p> <p>Buy-to-let speculators should be more heavily taxed.</p> <p>Accommodation for students should be included in new developments, along with housing for people who have difficulty with mobility.</p> <p>'Housing is about people and communities' yet regeneration plans propose to demolish homes and tear apart communities.</p> <p>Need to crack down much harder on illegal and often unsafe rented accommodation in the borough - at present enforcement is not strong enough</p>
Housing	<p>Best use of the Council's money is to build considerably more Council Housing. If there was any way to introduce rent caps on the private sector that would be an improvement too.</p> <p>More social housing is very important but the rents must be affordable for people living on very low incomes.</p>



	<p>When increasing the number of council homes, follow the example of Enfield Council in retaining control of the land and therefore not allowing the right to buy</p> <p>Concern that plans to redevelop estates mean that affordable housing will be replaced by much more expensive housing</p> <p>Reducing poor management within the private rented sector is particularly important in this borough</p> <p>Repairing and maintaining existing council housing instead of moving people out through regeneration proposals.</p> <p>More affordable homes should be built</p> <p>There should be more investment into affordable housing.</p> <p>More work needs to happen to encourage development on areas where planning permission has already been granted, while empty council buildings and other empty properties should be considered for sites.</p> <p>The Council should guarantee loans to Housing Associations to develop new homes with homes coming back to the Council if they default.</p> <p>Action is needed on exploitative landlords.</p> <p>More decent homes are needed in Haringey</p> <p>Rents should be capped.</p> <p>Empty homes should be brought back into use.</p> <p>Landlord Register is a good idea.</p> <p>Aims to improve the quality of private rented sector homes are laudable.</p> <p>Landlord Registration Scheme have not been thought through and can only result in supply of available accomodation drying up/shrinking as landlords pull out</p> <p>There is no mention of plans to demolish council homes.</p>
--	---



	<p>There should be more housing available to people on low income as well as young people .</p> <p>Is this only for the council homes? What about the generation of people who want to be first time home owners? Will they be able to afford</p> <p>Haringey needs more affordable housing and shared ownership homes and reduce homelessness in the borough. The homes must be good quality and spacious to reduce overcrowding.</p> <p>Before more ghastly multi-colored monstrosities are imposed on the borough, more effort should be made to bring empty properties back into use.</p> <p>The council make things too easy for young people when it comes to housing, they should tell them to stay at home with their parents and go to college.</p>
Other budget proposals	
<p>Muswell Hill Library</p>	<p>Closing Muswell Hill library would be a crime – if you had proposed a new site before suggesting closure you would have more credibility</p> <p>Selling the building is a great idea – it has never functioned well as a library</p> <p>Not to selling the library – it serves the community</p> <p>Moving Muswell Hill library would be a waste of money</p> <p>Relocating Muswell Hill Library is a good idea but we cannot comment until there are plans</p> <p>Relocating the library is not needed – if you want to make libraries more accessible use the money on building council homes and building new libraries</p> <p>Muswell Hill Library is a local treasure and should be kept. As long as it is done the way you write Muswell Hill community will benefit. Not sure that selling Muswell Hill Library is a good idea and would benefit the community in the long term. It would bring in funds which would soon disappear in the overall plans.</p>



	<p>Come on! We can stand on the moon but can't make our library more accessible?</p> <p>Plans for Muswell Hill Library sound good as it is out of the way.</p> <p>If Muswell Hill Library is sold it must be to a responsible buyer and remain a community asset.</p>
<p>Customer services</p>	<p>Marcus Garvey library should be preserved as an important resource</p> <p>Preserve Marcus Garvey – many residents in Tottenham do not have space in their own homes and benefit from space to do their homework. People feel that in the west libraries are being refurbished while in the east where they are really needed they are being downsized.</p> <p>Plans to substantially reduce the size of Marcus Garvey library have been hidden and not explicitly referred to in this consultation. The children's library is a very important source of support for young people and their families and fosters a love of learning and imagination in our young people.</p> <p>Self-service can become a barrier to accessing services, we still need humans to speak to on the phone or meet</p> <p>The 'single point of contact' would replace face-to-face contact. The enquiries that I have made at Apex House and previously at 639 High Road have either involved the production of original documents, or have involved personal details that I would have not felt comfortable discussing with someone that I could not see.</p> <p>Not sure whether the new call centre is part of this but it is truly awful. Please make sure that you actually do make it easier and quicker to deal with the Council, not just take cost out with a reduction in service. We like to speak to people not computers. Automated services are insufficient. Happy with 'My Haringey Account' initiative.</p> <p>By all means provide online resources but do not forget that many people do not have a computer</p>



Equality Impact Assessment	
General	<p>Proposals the harshest impact on the most vulnerable</p> <p>Difficult to see how the outcomes will be achieved when it is implementing rather than challenging the Government's austerity agenda.</p> <p>Cuts will impact on women in low pay. EQIAs are weak.</p> <p>Proposals do not promote equality.</p> <p>There is insufficient detail and data to comment</p> <p>Cuts are discriminatory, they will directly impact upon</p> <p>BME groups in Haringey, the elderly & vulnerable.</p> <p>Disability is a protected characteristic under the Equality Act. Disabled adult people's needs must not be ignored Vulnerable service users and workers will be most affected.</p> <p>Families in the east of the borough come from a different mix of ethnic groups than in Haringey generally and cuts in services for children and young people would therefore have a detrimental bias against those groups.</p> <p>People most at risk are the most poor and the most vulnerable - the worst hit will be those from ethnic minority backgrounds who are usually the poorest with greatest level of unemployment, disabled people and those with the least education.</p> <p>Proposals will increase inequality in the borough by removing services from the poorest and most vulnerable people.</p>

7. Engagement events: Children and Families

7.1.1. Events were held to engage on issues relating to Children's Centres, Childcare and Youth provisions. Details are set out below.

7.1.2. Children's Centres



7.1.3. Events were held for staff, governors and headteachers.

7.1.4. Children's Centres/Staff

7.1.5. Three events were held, attracting 83 participants.

It was set out the consultation was in relation to £70m of savings that needed to be made over the next three years, £18m of which needs to be found in CYPS.

In response to questions it was stated:

- No firm decision had been made on reducing children's centres to 8.
- Planning on the early help landscape has been underway for some time before the level of reductions were known. Now there is an opportunity to work in partnership.

A point was raised that capacity is already at a limit, to which a response was made that we need to think about doing things differently to increase capacity.

A question was asked about how childcare will be provided differently to which a response was made that for some children access to childcare is not good enough and a step change is needed.

It was explained that Full Council will make a decision on whether to take £70 million out of the system over the next three years, plans and proposals will then come forward. We need to start thinking about how we work differently from now. Bringing services together does not mean everything under a roof, but improving the connectivity of various places and agencies that are delivering services

A point was raised with regards to cuts to youth and adult services that we need to be mindful of early years not picking up services that have been already cut and filling gaps.

It was asked what does this mean for staff if centres are merged? centres? How many staff would this affect? The response was that we have not really looked at the fine details. We need to acknowledge that people are worried and you have gone through this before.

A timescale was set out that if the budget is agreed on February 23rd consultation on a future model is likely to start in the summer, alongside a detailed Equality Impact Assessment report. A decision will be made in Autumn 2015



7.1.6. Children's Centres meetings with cluster and nursery governors

7.1.7. Two events were held with 22 people. Key points raised:

- Some of the most challenged families in the borough access services from our children's centres. You cannot achieve Priority 1 outcomes with fewer centres.
- There is no need for a one-year budget
- How will you improve access to stay and plays by cutting services?
- You mention 'improved access to stay and plays', yet stay and plays are oversubscribed and you are going to cut services, so how is this improving access?
- Where is the evidence that a small number of people currently access services from Children's Centres? Park Lane reach over 100% of the families in their area.
- Children's centres play a key role, and make a vital contribution to those starting school. Have you looked at the cost of all the things they do in relation to the budget, and what services will have to be cut if the money is taken out the system?
- Haringey Council spends too much on consultancy costs
- What modelling has been done around fee structures to inform your proposal to remove/alter the childcare subsidy?
- Detailed modelling should have been done prior to the decision to close centres.
- Children's centre are already at full capacity – they could not take families up to 25 years as well.
- Find it difficult to believe that the council cannot social workers to a children's centres
- The £4m that is currently spent across Early Years is incredibly cost effective. We continue to provide high quality services and reach the people that we are supposed to reach
- Currently children's centres are operating at over capacity. There are issues around the amount of space yet you do not want to increase the range of services. How can you possibly extend and deliver a wider range of services when you are using fewer sites?

7.1.8. Children's Centres meeting with headteachers

7.1.9. One meeting was held with headteachers with the follow issues raised:

- Three years ago you said that you would learn from the fact that we were not consulted in an appropriate way. You haven't learnt. This time round it is worse.
- Children's centres are not static sites. Staff constantly go out in to the community and engage. They do not sit there and wait for the community to come to them.



- Parents are not going to trek miles to a centre.
- The starting point needs to be what the families need. I don't get a sense that this document has any understanding about what the need is in Tottenham.
- It is outrageous to say that children's centres are not working. There has been talk about outsourcing – but look at the quality ratings we've given private childcare providers in the borough.

7.2. Children's Centres meeting with Childcare providers

7.2.1. A meeting was held with 19 private, voluntary and independent childcare providers. Key issues raised are below:

- Public buildings are under utilised and could be used to hold integrated services to save money.
- There should be evidence that all childcare proposals are well thought out
- Providers need more information about the services available and their benefits so they can direct families.
- What do you want to cut from the voluntary sector? We have been delivering and piloting. Private nurseries make money, voluntary do not. I would like to pay my staff more but I do not receive enough funding through the grant”.

7.3. Young people and youth services

7.3.1. Meetings were held at Bruce Grove Youth Centre and Haringey Youth Council, while a drop-in was held at The Triangle. Approximately 95 young people attended the events. The main issues that were raised are listed below.

7.3.2. Bruce Grove Youth Centre

- Concerns were raised about the centre closing and the youth club ceasing.
- Some young people did not want Tottenham Hotspur running the centres because of the belief that services would be too geared towards sports activities.
- Young people said there was a strong feeling of a family within the centre
- More effort should be made to publicise the youth centre/club more.
- Need to involve young people more in future decisions, if using external providers



- Concerns were raised about losing existing staff

7.3.3. The Triangle Youth Drop-In

7.3.4. The Triangle currently has around 150 children on its database. Erol Grant, Triangle Director, explained that they are a voluntary sector organisation with some of projects funded by the council. Most staff work for free and they would like to see the youth centre become a hub for specialist services. Project Manager Tony Walker said that there needs to be more communication between the council and youth provision in Haringey. Concerns were also raised that young people believe that services are about to stop and require reassuring.

7.3.5. Young people who attended the drop-in said that they typically play football, basketball and table tennis. They said that the centre provides a good environment with adults that they can trust.

7.3.6. Meeting of the Youth Council

7.3.7. Around 20 young people attended the meeting, with the following issues raised:

- There is not enough detail or transparency
- Council must ensure young people are involved in developing services
- Disagree with any closure of youth clubs, in particular Bruce Grove Youth Centre
- Concerned that third sector groups may not be able to provide services and would prefer to continue with services provided by the council
- Disagree with changing facilities at Bruce Grove – happy with it as they are
- Libraries funding may be better spent on youth services
- Doesn't make sense to talk about "creating jobs" (priority 4) when you're cutting jobs
- Facilities at post-16 are not seen to be as good in Haringey.
- The council should be making a full list/directory available of what exists for young people in Haringey and make it available to young people and online.
- Most activities and events for young people seem to be in the east – it should be more balanced
- Youth Council has been involved in recruiting DCS in the past – this should happen again
- Stronger youth democracy is needed – need to ensure that young people's voices are heard



Other budget points raised:

- Agree there needs to be greater efficiency in adults services and a strong voluntary sector
- How can people feel engaged in the community if they don't feel safe?
- Agree with Haringey being a cycling and pedestrian friendly borough
- Should combine traffic warden and street cleaner roles
- Cutting jobs can't benefit employment
- Supporting the green economy is not as beneficial as directly funding jobs

7.4. Engagement events: Adult and healthy living

7.4.1. A series of events were held with service users with a Learning Disability, Physical disability and Older people to help explain the consultation process and proposals more fully. These sessions were for service users that:

- **Receive residential or residential nursing care directly from the Council,**
- Reside within the shared lives scheme (internal to Haringey Council)
- Reside with supported living schemes internal to Haringey Council

7.4.2. Advocacy service Learning Disability Experience (LDX) was commissioned to provide independent advocacy and facilitation. LDX met with 85 people with a range of abilities, either individually or part of a group. In addition the organisation engaged with 78 people who were identified as 'Circles of Support' including family, carers, support workers and staff. The full report is summarised below and set out in full in Appendix C.

7.4.3. Osborne Grove Nursing Home: 9/1/2015 and 13/1/2015

7.4.4. Concerns were raised around the length of the consultation. There was praise for the work at Osborne Grove and the quality of care there; with distinctions made with nearby residential care providers who had recently failed their CQC inspections. Questions were raised about the actual saving to be realised from the winding down of Osborne Grove and the ability to rehouse the residents. Suggestions were made regarding Health Services supporting the work there further and opportunities to increase revenue at Osborne Grove. Questions were raised about the practicality of how a wind down of services would work for the residents of Osborne. It was stated: "Dementia is becoming bigger and bigger and you are closing this? We pay our rates. This is the one thing we have in Haringey."

7.4.5. Ermine Road: 06/01/2014 (2 sessions)



- 7.4.6. Concerns were largely raised around the viability of the proposals for service users with Learning Disabilities and the potential for isolation. There was also concern from family/carers regarding (1) what the changes would mean for them (2) the validity of the consultation, (3) the viability of the suggestions/proposals around reablement and (4) the quality assurance that would be given if the proposals progressed.

It was stated: “Our concern is that you are putting out all these proposals that are not fit for purpose. Nothing about research back up, what the proposals mean and I cannot find anything. New empty words – transformation and reablement. You have not demonstrated proper research on cost and proper evidence which is very irresponsible. There is nothing there to show you have done any research of the adequacy of these new policies.”

7.4.7. The Haven: 09/01/2015

- 7.4.8. Points were made regarding the usefulness of the Haven in preventing isolation. Praise was given to the staff that currently work there and concern expressed for what would happen to them if the centre closed. Concern was raised as to what the changes would mean to service users and how the proposals would work in practice.

It was stated: “You are using old people, disabled people as an excuse. I know you are only doing your job but I am fed up of hearing the same thing. Don’t close places like this or the children’s place. People work all their lives, pay their taxes and then you have the cheek to say you need to save £30m. Look at where you can save money. Properties are empty. Scaffolding left for 6 months costing the council 10-15k and its not being used. What are you going to do with these people? You basically want to get rid of old people, kids, education, form for care and then you expect them to put up with it. Reason you can put them in a house and forget about them. That’s what it all boils down to, money and privatisation.”

7.5. The Haven Day Centre with advocates

- 7.5.1. The information below includes a range of views from services users expressed to advocates:

- It’s very nice to come here. If we don’t come we’ll go back to square one. If the centre closes I’ll be on my own most of the time and I’m scared because I have mental health problems.
- What about the people who can’t get out and walk. This is what places like The Haven is for.
- The day centre is family.
- It has made such a difference to my life being here. My wife and I used to come here. She died last year. She was my beautiful



flower. I would be at home on my own if I didn't come here. I have my friends I like getting together and socialising.

- You don't want people coming to your home? We come here to get out on our own.
- This day centre means the world to me- more than anything.

7.5.2. The information below includes a range of views expressed by carers:

- Can we not share this building? How many people out of hospital do you think you will be getting? Let's leave this people a little bit happy.
- Cuts have previously been made and frontline adult social services should be protected.
- Mum suffers from Alzheimer's and before coming here she hardly spoke a word. Mum attends three days a week and she's made friends. Mum loves this place, without it she will regress again.

7.5.3. Linden House with advocates

7.5.4. Linden House residents were unable to speak up for themselves. Staff and family cares spoke up on behalf of residents, as set out below:

- We explained to residents that there may be some changes happening but it meant absolutely nothing to them. The group has no understanding of what's going on.
- Because of their autism and challenging behaviour, some residents will only accept support and personal care from specific staff. They go to staff who they recognise.
- There are not enough details and a lot of speculation. The information is vague. Staff feel unsettled for the residents and closer to time we will have to draw on our skills to help people understand.
- The people who live here need 24-hour supervision. They can't understand and will become very aggressive. People have bespoke complex service needs.

7.6. Osborne Grove Nursing Home with advocates

7.6.1. The information below sets out the views of service users:

- My wife has been here since it opened in 2008. She was a bed blocker in hospital. Her needs cannot be met in the community. She requires nursing care, a nursing home.
- I do not know where people like me with high support needs will go? The private sector does not want high support needs like me. I had lots of care in the community but I still had to come here in the end.



- Osborne Grove is an example of best practice. It would be tragic if Haringey Council let Osborne Grove close.
- People are living longer. Carers in the community don't have enough time to support people like us. They have appointments back-to-back.

7.6.2. The information below sets out the views of carers:

- People at Osborne Grove have high dependency needs. If they are not going to stay here where are you going to house them?
- There are only 2 other residential care homes in the borough and both have failed their CQC. People will need to be shipped out of the borough.
- You haven't done an evaluation of all the residents involved.
- Publicity about this consultation is lacking. The whole thing is rushed.

7.7. Ermine Road Day Opportunities with advocates

7.7.1. Most of the Ermine Road Day Opportunities users were unable to speak up for themselves. Advocates identified 10 people to have a discussion with. The following points were made:

- I like it here because it makes me happy. I enjoy myself. I like the people.
- Daily routine. I will lose it.
- Big change. Have routines.
- I like it here.
- Trust the people at Ermine Road.
- Not happy to have change.
- I would not be happy if I was at home all of the time. I get upset if I can't come.

7.7.2. When asked how people would feel if changes were made to the service, the following was stated:

- Sad.
- [Gestured] I feel sick.
- I would feel angry
- [Gestured] tears – sad
- Lonely

7.7.3. The following points were made by carers:

- Parent carers need as much support as the service users do? Some of them are really elderly. They physically can no longer do



things anymore. Parent carers have confidence in staff and there are longstanding relationships that would be hard to recoup.

- Care in the community – it doesn't feel a lot of financial planning has gone into this?
- Health will deteriorate – unhealthy impact on health and wellbeing.
- My son loves to come out during the day. I am 69-years-old. I will kill me if he can't come here anymore.

7.7.4. Day centre provision/services for people with complex needs

7.7.5. Advocacy service Learning Disability Experience (LDX) was commissioned to provide independent advocacy and facilitation. LDX met with 85 people with a range of abilities, either individually or part of a group. In addition the organisation engaged with 78 people who were identified a 'Circles of Support' including family, carers, support workers and staff. The full report is summarised below and set out in full in Appendix C.

7.8. The Roundway Service with advocates

7.8.1. Advocates spoke to six users of services at The Roundway. The remaining users of the service were unable to speak up for themselves.

- I feel sorry
- I love my activities. I don't want to stop doing them. I loves cooking.
- I'm afraid it's going to happen.
- I would feel stressed.

7.8.2. The following points were made by carers:

- My daughter lives in a residential care home. Will she lose her day service? Structure meaning routine to her day.
- We won't be able to go anywhere. I will restrict our movements. My son becomes destructive when he is affected by change.
- Some people will become socially isolated. At least here they meet different people.
- Timescale is very rushed.

7.9. Birkbeck Road Services with advocates

7.9.1. Users of the service made the following points supported by staff:

- The centre is important.
- We love coming here.
- Please don't take it away.
- We would struggle to get through the day.
- Where would I go? Where would we go...nowhere to go?



7.9.2. The following points were made by carers:

- I do not want them to close this place as my daughter is happy here despite the barriers. She is so happy.
- My sister is aging and her mobility needs and care have increased. She's not only disabled, she is also elderly. I have to consider, on a daily basis, what activities we do. I need the centre to lighten the load.
- Staff support us.

7.10. General points across all services

7.10.1. The following general points were expressed by users of the service, carers and circles of support

- Saving money should be the furthest thought away
- Accessible, appropriate, safe access life opportunities not often cut by society. Essential in people accessing society.
- The Council is building a stronger Haringey off the backs of the weakest and most vulnerable.

8. Other engagements event

8.1. The information below is a summary of other engagement events

8.2. The Voluntary Sector Forum

8.2.1. It was stated that some kind of action plan was needed for working with the voluntary sector. Support needs to go into the voluntary sector if we are to play a greater role. It was also asked: who is going to pay for other organisations to take up the slack? There needs to be more volunteers. It was felt the voluntary sector was not getting the required support that was needed from the council.

8.3. West Green and Bruce Grove Area Forum

8.3.1. Cllr Jason Arthur gave a presentation on the three-year budget and the financial issues facing the Council. He explained the process around the current consultation and summarised proposals across each priority area. A number of attendees asked specific questions about youth services and, particularly, the future of Bruce Grove Youth Centre. Cllr Arthur explained that there is no proposal to close Bruce Grove Youth Centre and said that the centre will remain open.

8.4. Quarterly Neighbourhood Watch Meeting



Haringey Council

8.4.1. Points raised:

- Are we going to encourage betting shops to increase our licensing income?
- There is a need to publicise recycling more.
- Littering is an issue in the borough what is being proposed here?
- Nuisance garages are a problem where people dump refuse.
- The Council should carry out more preventative work in schools
- Older people will suffer from neglect, and there will be safe guarding issues
- Fly tipping will be an issue if we remove roadside recycling
- Residents should keep cameras to record anyone dumping refuse.
- Apps should be used further to report fly tipping.

8.5. Events at Finsbury Park and Albert Recreational Cafe (check)

8.5.1. Points raised:

- Why is the Council not using the £70m reserves it currently holds to support reducing the severity of the cuts?
- Slashing the children's Youth and disabilities budgets are disgraceful
- Why are the Council changing the Parking Zone in Wood Green when it already works, we signed up for all day permits not just for two hours, there was no option to keep as is, why ?
- Why is the Council seeking to pursue more events in parks to achieve a £600k increase in income, when Finsbury park already has significant disruption to its users?

9. Consultation response from community groups and partners

9.1. The following responses were received:

Muswell Hill Traders Group
The Friends of Finsbury Park
Haringey Healthwatch
Markfield
Unison
Mental Health Support Association
Haringey People First Advocacy Group
Open Door (Young People's Consultancy Service)
Haringey Forum for Older People (Health and Social Care Sub Group)
Cypriot Community Centre
Haringey Learning Disabilities Partnership Board
Older Peoples Reference Group
Marcus and Marcus (provider of specialist services for Adults affected by a Learning Disability / Autism and Complex Behaviours)
Lewis & Mary Haynes
Hornsey Housing Trust



Haringey Council

Haringey Education Business Partnership
Haringay Traders Association
The Spitz Charitable Trust
Haringey Autism
Ambitious about Autism
Autism Working Group
Haringey Children's Centre Alliance
The chairman of the Whittington Hospital NHS Trust

APPENDIX A: Submissions from partners

THE MUSWELL HILL TRADERS GROUP

Building a Stronger
Haringey *Together*

DRAFT CORPORATE PLAN

2015 – 18

THE MHTG RESPONSE

FORWARD FROM THE MUSWELL HILL TRADERS GROUP



Haringey Council

Our vision:

to make Haringey an even better place in which to work
and how the business community can help

Our approach:

to encourage a business friendly environment for the greater good of all Haringey traders,
entrepreneurs, customers, shoppers, residents and visitors

FORWARD FROM THE MHTG OFFICERS

The MHTG recognises the Herculean challenges now facing our elected councillors and the staff of Haringey Council. The council is required to make a further £70 million cut in expenditure during the next four years in addition to the £117.60 million cuts already made over the past four years.

Many businesses in our borough have had to make similar and even greater proportional cuts since the beginning of the latest recession. Sadly some of the businesses long established in Haringey have been forced out of existence. Others are surviving but only just.

Yet despite the recent gloomy economic environment there are relatively vibrant retail, commercial, trading, manufacturing and service sectors offering a vast range of goods and services to Haringey residents and visitors as well as the immediate local, regional, national and even international markets.

As the recession draws to a close the Haringey business community looks forward to working closely with the council to find new and innovative ways to ensure the best possible value for money from the council in return for the near 50% we as business enterprises contribute to the total council coffers through payment of our Business Rates.

MHTG Chair
Marcelo Monaco

MHTG Vice Chair



INDEX

- Forward from the MHTG
- Forward from the MHTG Officers
- Index
- Executive Summary
- MHTG
- Some General MHTG Concerns
- Some Constraints on the MHTG Response
- Facing Up To The Cuts – And Surviving
- Commissioning, Privatising and Merging Council Services
- Merging of Borough Services in North London
- Economic Use of Council Properties
- CORPORATE PLAN PRIORITY 4:
 - Town Centre Traders Groups
 - Business Rate Subsidies for Charity Shops
 - Business Rate Subsidies for Trade Unions
 - Planning Directorate Powers
- THE WAY AHEAD

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – 10 POINT ACTION PLAN

The MHTG proposes *the appointment of a Business Czar to work with leading council officers and the appropriate elected officials to lead new initiatives aimed at expanding the business sector in Haringey.*

The MHTG proposes *that the implementation of existing council policies and the adoption of any and all new policies by the council's officers and elected members be subject to a simple test as to how that policy will impact either positively, neutrally or negatively on the business sector.*

The MHTG proposes *a clear and simple breakdown on a department by department basis of the current and projected annual expenditure proposals for each of the spending Directorates linked to the Draft Plan Priorities for each of next four years.*

The MHTG proposes *a commitment be made in the Corporate Plan to identify each and every spending head for all in-house services and public services with a view to securing private sector bids to provide matching services at competitive prices with a similar or higher value for money ratio than being currently achieved.*



The MHTG proposes *immediate steps to be taken to identify council services suitable for merger with neighbouring boroughs.*

The MHTG proposes *the Corporate Plan should include a commitment to an immediate and public review of each and every council property, its purpose and perceived benefit to the community, its marginal cost benefit to the ratepayer and its value for money ratio.*

The MHTG proposes *the Corporate Plan should commit the council to reviewing and strengthening the current network of Town Centre Traders Groups with a view to providing them with administrative and logistical support in their promotion of the business sector thereby increasing the borough's business rates income.*

The MHTG proposes *the council commits to a full review of all charity shop business rate discounts.*

The MHTG proposes *the council serves notice to its recognised unions to terminate all council funded trade union activities including payment of wages to full and part time union officers. We call upon the council to inform the business rate payers of the precise and accurately costed sums of money paid by Haringey through their subsidies to those unions.*

The MHTG proposes *the Planning Directorate brings forward a set of policies to actively promote the borough's business sector.*

INTRODUCTION

The MHTG thanks the Leader of the Council and the Haringey Chief Executive for inviting participation in the consultative process prior to the recent publication of its Draft Corporate Plan for 2015 to 2018. MHTG members took part in a number of the public debates around the local Area Forum presentations of the council's "Investing in Tomorrow" documents.



Haringey Council

MHTG officers contributed to the Alexandra Palace “key partners” consultative conference in November last year. Our specific involvement was in the conference Working Party Four which eventually emerged as “Priority 4: Drive Growth and Employment from which Everyone can Benefit” in the Draft Plan.

Officers and members from the four other recognised Traders’ Groups in the borough made their business oriented contributions to the remaining listed Priorities in the Draft Plan. We are content that the council leadership and senior officers have made every effort to listen to the Haringey business community in preparing the council’s draft budget and strategic policy positions for submission to the council Cabinet on February 10th.

The MHTG submits this response to the Leader’s Office, Chief Executive Officer and appropriate drafting committee members in the hope our stated policy positions and principal observations on the Draft Corporate Plan are taken fully into consideration in amending the current Draft as it transmogrifies into the final proposals for agreement by the Full Council meeting on February 23rd.

THE MUSWELL HILL TRADERS GROUP

The MHTG can reasonably claim to reflect the borough wide mix of business types and styles. The Muswell Hill principal and secondary shopping streets and linked business hubs contain most of the recognised nationwide supermarket stores such as Waitrose, Sainsbury’s and Marks and Spencer’s as well as the national bank chains, building societies and pubs. There are the nationally branded coffee shops, restaurants, women’s retail shops, opticians and pharmacists, solicitors and accountants as well as a wide range of health and beauty outlets. We also have a superabundance of nationwide and local estate agent offices!

However, it is the significant number of independent shops that makes the Muswell Hill retail experience that extra bit special. Nearly every type of goods sold by the national chain stores is matched in our wonderful array of independent shops offering equivalent services with a local identity.

MHTG members work hard to promote Muswell Hill as a destination shopping centre. We strive to increase footfall with the hoped for resultant uplift in shop takings and the guarantee that traders gain the financial security to pay their, suppliers, rents, wages and business rates.

SOME GENERAL MHTG CONCERNS

We have two major concerns with the Draft Plan. They relate to the lack of emphasis placed on the role of assisting Haringey’s businesses in our generation of nearly 50% of your council’s budget as well as a worry that the council may still be underestimating the



Haringey Council

extent of further cuts which may yet be announced by the government and the consequent need to build sufficient contingency funds.

SOME CONSTRAINTS ON THE MHTG RESPONSE

The MHTG recognises that you have invested much detailed work in preparing the Draft Plan. The five stated Priorities alongside their Vision statements are clearly worthy and appropriate aspirations. Indeed the wording of the Plan is a masterpiece of local authority corporate objectives neatly explained and set out with fine clarity. If only all such official documents were so well crafted!

However the MHTG has some difficulty in making meaningful representations on the specifics of the five Priorities as we are not fully aware of the related background costings involved. Our efforts to make simple sense of the council's accounts drew a blank when we attempted to cost out the implementation of the Priorities.

The MHTG proposes *a clear and simple breakdown on a department by department basis of the current and projected annual expenditure proposals for each of the spending Directorates linked to the Draft Plan Priorities for each of next four years.*

The MHTG feels that without the appropriate financial information it is constrained in making properly informed observations on Priority numbers One, Two, Three and Five. Luckily we noted that there were numerous key partners attending the Alexandra Palace consultative conference with specific expertise in the fields of Education, Health, Environment and Housing. We look forward to their observations on the Draft Plan safe in the knowledge they will offer constructive contributions towards the final set of policies for approval, or otherwise, by the Full Council meeting in February.

FACING UP TO THE CUTS – AND SURVIVING

The MHTG looked at how other public bodies, of all sizes, modelled their budgets in western democracies in the face of major cuts in their income streams. Pitifully few successful examples are to be found! Those who had achieved the key objectives of making cuts in staff and services, balancing the books and then progressing to a surplus whilst at the same time protecting core services required by legislative constraints are few and far between. The best exemplar was that of the Canadian government when it was faced by the last major financial crisis that in turn precipitated the worldwide economic recession. So, it is to the core of the Canadian approach that the MHTG commends to the drafters of Haringey's Corporate Plan.

COMMISSIONING, PRIVATISING AND MERGING COUNCIL SERVICES



Haringey Council

Fundamentally the Canadian approach to policy and fiscal planning in the face of major cuts in income was a simple and open one which was transparent to all parties involved in the process.

On a Directorate by Directorate and Department by Department basis each in-house service and every service provided to the public was posed the question “can this service be delivered to a similar or better standard with a similar or higher value for money ratio by the private sector than the public sector?” In virtually every case it was discovered that by commissioning the private sector to provide equivalent services not only were substantial savings made to annual running costs as well as fixed overheads but far higher value for money ratios were achieved. The architect of this approach was the then Governor of the Bank of Canada. He has since taken up the post as the current Governor of the Bank of England.

The MHTG calls on Haringey council to adopt a similar approach to each and every one of its expenditure heads.

In doing so the leading council officers would in effect become sub-contracting and commissioning agents. Their main role would be to monitor service standard and scrutinise all such council commissioned service contracts.

Service Standard Quality Reports could then be issued regularly and be subject to public scrutiny through the existing structure of council committees. In freeing up potentially substantial sums to be made available to public contract competition the council could then redouble its efforts to encourage current council employees to use their own expertise to bid for such contracts. Since such a form of privatisation of council services has already started we see little problem in extending such a policy with a bolder approach and substantially broader agenda.

The MHTG proposes a *commitment be made in the Corporate Plan to identify each and every spending head for all in-house services and public services with a view to securing private sector bids to provide matching services at competitive prices with a similar or higher value for money ratio than being currently achieved.*

MERGING OF BOROUGH SERVICES IN NORTH LONDON

The MHTG suspects that in the not too near future the suspiciously large number of elected borough councils covering north London’s populous will be subject to rationalisation. Given the current nature of almost exactly similar services being offered by neighbouring councils it is an excellent opportunity to once again look at merging a range of council services where reasonable matches can be found. Such an approach should not be limited simply to external council provisions for the public but should include in-house services such as Human Resources, Rates Collection, Accounts, Finance, Legal



Haringey Council

Departments and so on and so on. This will lead to major cost reductions in expensive overheads and costly managerial staff layers.

The MHTG proposes *immediate steps to be taken to identify council services suitable for merger with neighbouring boroughs.*

ECONOMIC USE OF COUNCIL PROPERTIES

The MHTG is pleased to note at least some progress on the rationalisation of underutilised council occupied properties. We would like to see further commitments to sell off council property and a consolidation of existing council offices with a view to generating substantial income which could then be used for those essential services that are subject to increasing demand from the public especially in the fields of Health and Education.

The MHTG fully recognises the council's determination to try and ring fence certain politically sensitive services and their related premises, but we would caution against such an emotional response. In the case of library buildings for example there is clear evidence that at least some of the borough library buildings are woefully empty of customers and cannot under any circumstances be justified on any sensible economic criteria. In an age of internet downloading it will not be long before libraries are seen as a quaint anachronism – as they are already viewed in most modern high tech' cities on the west coast of the USA and across Asia.

The MHTG proposes *the Corporate Plan should include a commitment to an immediate and public review of each and every council property, its purpose and perceived benefit to the community, its marginal cost benefit to the ratepayer and its value for money ratio.*

PRIORITY 4: DRIVE GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT FROM WHICH EVERYONE CAN BENEFIT

The MHTG congratulates the authors of the Draft for the contents of PRIORITY 4 (pages 36 to 45). We have a number of specific administrative and policy issues in response to the Draft which we feel would be best included within the broad purview of PRIORITY 4.

Quite how the authors of the final documents for the Full Council wish to handle them we leave to their excellent penmanship.

These issues relate to the current structure and nature of the representative bodies of the business sector in Haringey (Town Centre Traders Groups),



Haringey Council

Council Business Rate Subsidies for Charity Shops, Council Business Rate Subsidies for Trade Unions and the use of Planning Department Powers to protect properties currently classified for business use from being converted to residential use.

It may be the view of the authors of the Corporate Plan that one or more of this list of topics is inappropriate for inclusion in the Plan on the grounds that they are more of tactical interest rather than the strategic views being adopted by the final version.

- **TOWN CENTRE TRADERS GROUPS: BUSINESS REPRESENTATION WITHIN THE BOROUGH OF HARINGEY**

There are a variety of formal and informal clubs and organisations functioning in Haringey in which companies large and small participate with the express purpose of business networking. In practice these are generally sector specific and localised to any one of the council designated Town Centre areas. In the main they tend to be social forums where business people can meet and discuss common issues.

Unlike some London boroughs there are no effective borough wide subsections of any of the nationally recognised business representative bodies such as the Confederation of British Industries, the Federation of Small Businesses or even the Chambers of Commerce.

The reason, to the great credit of our council, is that some years ago they initiated their own network of organisations to provide a route by which businesses could communicate directly with the council. These bodies are known as Traders Groups. There are five in Haringey each covering the geographical areas determined by the council as Town Centres. Town Centre Traders Groups offer the opportunity for any business within a designated

Town Centre to meet up and explore ways in which common problems can be tackled with, or without, the assistance of the council. Over time each such group has developed their own method of working. Some of them charge a subscription others are free to enter. Some are more active than others and all depend upon voluntary work usually from their respective group officers.

Each of the traders groups operate under a Joint Agreement originally drawn up by council officers setting out the terms and conditions by which communication between the traders and the relevant council officials are determined.

There are five principal Town Centres and each one has a functioning traders' group covering Green Lanes, Tottenham, Crouch End, Wood Green and Muswell Hill.

The MHTG has a long list of proposals by which the borough could strengthen the current system of Traders Group representation.

These include the extension of membership to cover Sole Traders who typically may be working from home offices or kitchens and currently pay no Business Rates. But with positive support and encouragement they may soon grow their businesses and seek out a proper business premises within Haringey. There are already many examples of businesses that began from such humble origins in Muswell Hill and elsewhere in Haringey. Such entrepreneurs can range from accountants, lawyers, tax advisors, bakers,



Haringey Council

cooks, hair stylists and beauticians to personal trainers and life coaches. The list is almost endless. It is likely to extend given the continuing and quickening long term trend towards the growth of start-up businesses and self-employment.

The MHTG proposes *the Corporate Plan should commit the council to reviewing and strengthening the current network of Town Centre Traders Groups with a view to providing them with administrative and logistical support in their promotion of the business sector thereby increasing the borough's business rates income.*

- BUSINESS RATE SUBSIDIES FOR REGISTERED CHARITY SHOPS

Significant savings for the council coffers can be quickly made by immediately ceasing the perverse council policy of granting 100% business rates relief to registered charity shops and offices.

Councils are obliged by legislation to automatically grant an 80% discount but that still leaves 20% business rates income.

For reasons unknown the council invariably offers a further full 20% discount to these so called charities. This has resulted in an explosion of shops registering as charities and opening in our high streets selling goods and services in direct competition with retail outlets that have loyally paid their business rates in full.

Haringey residents are used to seeing at least one of the popular and established nationwide charity outlets such as Oxfam or perhaps a North London Hospice shop perfectly reasonably adding to the local mix of retail outlets. Sadly that traditional picture is long gone.

Most of the well known nationally branded charity chain stores are now multi million pound commercial enterprises, a far cry from the corner charity shop we used to know. They have discovered Haringey's generous but hopelessly out of touch free business rates policy and are snapping up vacant business sites in our Town Centres as soon as they come on the market. These major high-street bring and buy shops look upon Haringey Council as one huge charity. Something is wrong here.

Muswell Hill Town Centre alone now has ten charity shops packed into all the prime retail sites. Ten!

Charity shop chain stores deprive the borough of much needed business rates income. They operate at a competitive advantage over other retail outlets as a result of their much reduced overheads. To add insult to injury they rarely employ any staff by using volunteers thus depriving the borough of the opportunity to reduce Haringey's unemployment totals. This is an ongoing madness which depletes our hard pressed borough of hundreds of thousands pounds. The business sector demands the council addresses this problem with urgency.



Haringey Council

The MHTG proposes *the council commits to a full review of all charity shop business rate discounts.*

- BUSINESS RATE SUBSIDIES FOR TRADE UNIONS

The business community cannot reconcile the publicly expressed angst of the council over the effects of central government funding cuts whilst at the same time that very council is spending thousands of pounds a year in subsidies to their own trade unions.

We see little reason why our business rates, 50% of the council's income, should be used to pay for time off work for full time and part time trade union convenors.

We see even less reason why businesses who are often struggling to make enough income to pay their own staff should then see their business rates being used to pay for a full time teachers' union representative involved in organising industrial action in one of our own leading schools. Such council funded activity generates yet more damaging headlines to the already poor public image for our borough.

The local government and teaching unions recognised by our council are multi million pound businesses. If they so wish to fund their own full time officers in Haringey then that is their democratic right. We wish them well providing they pay their way just like the rest of us.

The business sector does not wish to see its business rates used for this and other union subsidies.

If the council cannot face up to that challenge then we formally request that whatever sums of public monies are donated by the council to its unions should be matched by the council donating equivalent sums to buying National Lottery tickets.

With so much money at stake we are far more likely to bring some gain to the borough's residents through a massive lottery win than by squandering it on the wealthy union barons.

Should the council feel this too extreme a view from the MHTG we then commend the matter be put to a public referendum.

The MHTG proposes *the council serves notice to its recognised unions to terminate all council funded trade union activities including payment of wages to full and part time union officers. We call upon the council to inform the business rate payers of the precise and accurately costed sums of money paid by Haringey through their subsidies to those unions.*



- **PLANNING DEPARTMENT POWERS TO BOOST THE BUSINESS SECTOR**

We urge the council to use the powers available within the planning laws to provide support and growth for the borough's business sector.

There are a number of ways in which this could be achieved. For example the Planning Directorate could take a proactive stance in supporting the Traders Groups in their opposition to the steady decline in business sites and workshops through change of use applications being submitted by property developers with a view to building yet more luxury housing units.

The MHTG proposes *the Planning Directorate brings forward a set of policies to actively promote the borough's business sector.*

THE WAY AHEAD: BUSINESS IN PARTNERSHIP WITH HARINGEY COUNCIL

The future of Haringey's income stream increasingly depends on the need to nurture a thriving local business sector. Failure to support and develop the latent talent within the borough's business community will inevitably contribute to a continuation of the current steady decline in our council coffers.

The Corporate Plan provides the council with a perfect opportunity to boost its income by growing the number of businesses in Haringey and thus increasing its Business Rates monthly income and reducing the borough's unemployment levels.

In simple terms the business community stands for growth leading to prosperity, profits and a better Haringey. Businesses need to invest in a business friendly environment in order to earn income to pay suppliers, to pay rent, to pay wages and of course to pay Business Rates as our contribution towards your expenditure on the Corporate Plan Priorities.

To help in achieving this objective requires a positive working relationship between the borough's business people based on mutual trust and understanding.

MHTG members fear there may be some misconceptions on both sides. Any such mutual misunderstandings are a block to our joint prosperity and it seems obvious they should be resolved.

It is sometimes the case that businesses see the council as an obstacle to growth and development. Perhaps some of us have indeed been taken in by a seemingly endless press barrage claiming to expose huge cash payoffs for council staff, massive sums on



Haringey Council

unnecessary consultancy fees, waste of public monies on abandoned IT schemes and a lack of any apparent accountability.

There is a perception amongst some in our business community that the council simply fail to recognise that Business Rates now form nearly half the council's income and that the council take the business sector for granted.

The Corporate Plan is our opportunity to jointly work towards the creation of a healthy local economy in which the business sector is actively engaged in the preparation and implementation of the crucial policies with a direct impact upon economic growth.

The MHTG proposes *the appointment of a Business Czar to work with leading council officers and the appropriate elected officials to lead new initiatives aimed at expanding the business sector in Haringey.*

The MHTG proposes *that the implementation of existing council policies and the adoption of any and all new policies adopted by the council's officers and elected members be subject to a simple test as to how that policy will impact either positively, neutrally or negatively on the business sector.*

We thank you for taking time to study our submission. We wish you well in the process of finalising the Corporate Plan confident that the council's leadership fully appreciates the business sector's concerns, and hopes, for 2015 - 2018.

NOTE: Whilst we are confident the views expressed in this document are a fair and honest reflection of the MHTG membership the author accepts sole responsibility for its contents.
RW. 16/1/15



THE FRIENDS OF FINSBURY PARK RESPONSE TO THE HARINGEY COUNCIL'S CONSULTATION: 'BUILDING A STRONGER HARINGEY TOGETHER'

RESPONSE

The Friends of Finsbury Park are opposed to any proposal which would require an increase in the number or duration of large scale events in Finsbury Park. We consider that the present level of events is excessive and that, for the duration of the concerts, including the lengthy periods of set up and take down, they impose a blight on the park and on surrounding communities.

The major events held in in Finsbury Park in 2014 led to a very large area of the most used parts of the park being fenced off for months during the summer when access to the park is most needed. The consequent loss of amenity, including access to children's playgrounds and to the tennis courts, is seen as unacceptable and unreasonable.

The considerable degradation of the Park, particularly the turf and paths, is still very evident many months after the last event. The restorative works have had very limited impact.

The noise pollution resulting from last years' concerts was widely considered by impacted communities to be the worst experienced since these major events commenced in Finsbury Park.

We would welcome any proposal for a new approach to the nature and management of events in Finsbury Park which would lead to lower noise levels and to less disruption and degradation of the park.

We are opposed to any further sub-letting or commercialisation within Finsbury Park. We believe that the Park should be maintained as a people's park and not transformed into a commercial park.

We are opposed to the privatisation of services or parks management within Finsbury Park.

PLEASE SEE BELOW A MORE DETAILED RESPONSE TO THE SPECIFIC PROPOSALS RELATED TO PARKS



Haringey Council

INCREASED INCOME FROM PARKS EVENTS

We note the intention to generate £600,000 increased revenue from events over three years.

We note that no figure is stated for projected total event income from Finsbury Park, or indeed Haringey Parks overall, during the three years of the budget proposals. We believe that these figures are central to any setting of budget targets.

We note the acknowledgement under 'Impact on Residents' that "Growth of event may have negative impact on local residents, specifically around Finsbury Park". We would, of course, want to avoid any such negative impact on park users and local residents and believe that generation of the projected additional income of £600,000 over the three year budget would be very difficult to achieve without unacceptable additional disruption, noise and loss of public amenity.

We would regret any pro-active marketing of the park for commercial purposes which led to an increase in the number of days when parts of the park were not freely accessible to all park users.

We would welcome any initiatives to 'encourage and develop community led events by local groups and residents' provided that the necessary balance is maintained to ensure that no one park is over used. We would also want to be assured that the nature of such events would not cause unreasonable additional noise disturbance within the park and surrounding areas.

Until such time as we are able to convince Haringey Council to reduce the number of these major events, we would welcome any imaginative initiative on the management of events which could maintain income whilst managing to lessen the duration and negative impacts of these events. This could possibly be achieved, at least in part, by negotiating better deals with promoters or franchise holders.

EFFICIENCY SAVINGS AND DELIVERY REVIEW OF THE PARKS

We note the intention to achieve the projected savings of £400,000 over three years.

Under 'Impact on Residents' you list no negatives. However, we would want to be assured that the loss of two staff and the proposed review of the makeup of the landscape features in parks to reduce the cost of maintenance could be achieved without some negative impact on park users.

We would welcome discussing volunteering as a means of achieving improvements and believe that there is considerable scope for Friends of Parks groups working together with the Haringey Parks Department to achieve community solutions which will impact positively on the overall Parks environment.

NEW WAY OF DELIVERING THE PARKS SERVICE

We note that the objective is to secure a further £100,000 savings in year 2 of the budget. In 'exploring and comparing different operating models' we would be very concerned that this should not encompass any element of privatisation. We would want our Parks to remain publicly owned and publicly run.

We would welcome new models which further empowered local residents. We would be interested to hear more about what is envisaged by 'promoting independence'

We welcome the undertaking to enter into consultation and dialogue with Friends of Parks Groups and look forward to fully participating in this process.

We would welcome exploring other options with Council representatives. Finsbury Park is an asset to Hackney and Islington as much as to Haringey. We have some ideas about



Haringey Council

more Tri-Borough engagement over the maintenance of this valuable amenity to all three boroughs and would welcome the opportunity to engage with you in exploring more imaginative solutions.

I would be grateful if you could confirm to me in writing that this submission has been accepted for inclusion in the contributions to the Council's budget consultation.

Many thanks,
Yours sincerely,

Kevin Duffy
Chair
The Friends of Finsbury Park



Dear Cllr Kober,

HARINGEY COUNCIL'S MEDIUM TERM BUDGET PROPOSALS 2015/18

I am writing on behalf of the Healthwatch Haringey board which has considered the proposals set out in the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy as they affect users of health and social care service users in the borough.

The statutory role of Healthwatch is to represent the concerns of users of health and social care services, both current and potential, as well as those who care for them. This very often means that we must speak for those whose voices are seldom heard, to ensure that those who make decisions do so with full knowledge of the effects of their decisions on those who cannot speak for themselves. Since our establishment in 2013, we have begun to establish a wide range of contacts and networks in order to build a sound evidence base upon which to do this.

We acknowledge of course that the Council is required to make substantial revenue savings over the next three years and accept that some savings are needed which will impact on current services in public health, for children and young people, and social care budgets. We also accept that some savings can reasonably be made by redesigning



Haringey Council

services to increase efficiency, and that improved outcomes may well, in time, result in some cases.

We have primarily considered the proposals in Corporate Priority 2 relating to Adult Social Care and Public Health but our comments below are also relevant for the proposals in Corporate Priority 1. We have of course noted many of the detailed responses from service user groups and individual representations which have been shared with us, and do not rehearse them here. However we would wish to make the following general observations:

1. The consultation period is very short with a deadline of 18th January and reduced even further by the Christmas and New Year break; leaving only three weeks at the most for people to understand the proposals and respond. We understand that there will be further consultation on each of the service proposals after the Council has agreed a budget on 23rd February but at this point the financial envelope will be fixed, leaving little room for meaningful consultation with alternative options available. This is an unsatisfactory situation as the proposed budget cuts are not clearly translated into specific service cuts, and it is therefore difficult for service users and carers to understand the full implications of the proposals at this stage. In order to understand the impact of the proposals it is necessary to see the revised financial profile for the specific service areas but this is not available. To be meaningful too, it would be helpful for the public to be able to see the current proposals against a profile of what services and expenditure will remain and have not be selected for inclusion in these Corporate Priority Pro Forma's. We think that it is wrong to assume this knowledge.

2. Our strong view is therefore that, after the Council has set the budget, there should be meaningful consultation on each of the service proposals with a well-publicised consultation programme over a reasonable period commensurate with changes of such significance. At this stage detailed, revised service budgets should be available in order to properly evaluate the impact of these changes (Healthwatch could usefully be involved in this process to provide an assurance that the consultation is appropriate and inclusive.)

3. We cannot help but observe that the various service changes included in Priority 1 and 2 are highly likely to result in outcomes which contradict important priorities and cross-cutting themes clearly identified in the Council's Corporate Plan.

- i) The implications of these proposed changes will almost certainly be to widen *the health inequality gap* that already exists in Haringey, in contradiction to the Council's stated priorities. We note that the Equality Impact Assessments are at best only partially complete for all the proposed changes, and do not at present adequately or accurately reflect the impacts on the various groups with "protected characteristics". They can only be partial at this stage because the new service models are not fully developed and in most, if not all, cases there is no evidence base on which to base the impact assessments. However, what does seem very clear is that the negative impacts of these savings proposals on social care services will fall disproportionately on those who are already disadvantaged, and that the spatial impacts will be greatest on the north and east of the borough.
- ii) The proposals in relation to Public Health similarly reflect this contradiction, as regards the importance attached to *prevention* by the Council. The proposed reductions in evaluation and health intelligence, in physical and mental health



Haringey Council

promotion, the drugs and alcohol service and sexual health for example, are perverse and also impair the effort to tackle deep seated health inequalities.

4. We are particularly surprised and concerned at the reliance to be placed on the “Neighbourhood Connects” concept. There appears to be little evidence to support doing so. Neighbourhood Connects has not been properly tested so as to justify placing confidence in the ability of the scheme to support vulnerable people in the community. It was originally a short pilot project designed to combat social isolation and delivered by volunteers. It is now suggested that it is to become a new community based service model that will replace many of the services currently delivered by professional staff, often in specialist settings. To our knowledge there is no evidence base anywhere for developing “Neighbourhood Connects” in the way that is being proposed. The short evaluation report of the pilot has not been made available but our understanding is that this would not support the current proposals. The tender specification for the “Neighbourhood Connects” service is very challenging indeed, with the proposed caseload to exceed 1000 clients across Haringey, taking referrals from GPs and other health / social care professionals and reducing unplanned hospital admissions. We do not think that this project will work in the way that is intended and would like some clarity around the contingency plans and safeguards for those vulnerable people who may be left without access to appropriate services.

5. We understand that it is proposed to develop a “Community Strategy” to clarify the vision and identify the “community assets”, both physical and social, upon which reliance is placed throughout these proposals - and in our view this should be an immediate priority. There is a significant emphasis in the proposals on community based service models, the use of volunteers, building community capacity, identifying community assets and co-production of design and delivery etc. These are attractive notions, but to form the basis of a coherent strategy upon which to responsibly entrust the safety and care of vulnerable people, there is a great deal of work to be done in the borough.

It is clear from the contact we have had from those on our network in the short period of consultation allowed, that the replacement of professional services in this way is giving rise to considerable alarm and fear. We think there is an urgent need to identify resources to co-ordinate and develop this “Community Strategy” so that it is evidence based, and a robust basis for developing alternative community based services.

6. We are generally concerned also about the lack of clarity surrounding the transition to new ways of providing services. Managing the transition from the existing service models to the new services / support mechanisms will be challenging and must be well managed. In order to avoid a hiatus in services / support the new arrangements must be in place early enough to cope with demand as existing services are reduced. It is essential too that monitoring arrangements are established from the outset which enable the effect on service use and service users to be tracked and to highlight any issues /gaps that need to be addressed. We would like to see a monitoring and evaluation framework in place at an early stage and Healthwatch would want to support this by feeding back the experiences of service users in a systematic way.

I hope that these comments will be regarded constructively and look forward to receiving any comments from the Council on them. In keeping with Healthwatch Haringey’s policies, they will be made available on our website.



Haringey Council

Yours sincerely

Sharon Grant OBE
Chair
Healthwatch Haringey.
Cc Cllr Peter Morton



Haringey Local Government Branch, PO Box 68081, London, N22 9JB
Tel : 0208 489 1172 (direct line) or 0208 489 3351 (general), Fax 0208 489 2054,
E-Mail:branchsecretary@haringeyunison.co.uk

FORMAL UNISON RESPONSE TO MTFs PROPOSALS 2015-2018

Introduction

UNISON remains opposed to the draconian cuts being made across local government services. We believe these will have a disproportionate effect on the most vulnerable in society, and in the case of Haringey will result in increased social exclusion, disengagement of young people, higher crime and a fall in standards of care for the elderly and disabled. We struggle to reconcile the content of these huge cuts with the supposed aim of building a “stronger” Haringey.

We do not understand the logic of setting a three-year budgetary envelope on the eve of a general election. In doing so, Haringey’s Labour Council are indicating that they expect the



Haringey Council

budget attacks to continue for another three years to 2018, and also that they accept them. Haringey should have considered the options other Councils are proposing, and set a one-year budget. Much is made of the supposed acceptance that local government funding will decrease at the rates set out in the current Con-Dem government's Victorian approach to public spending. After May this year there is a potential for a change of government, and any new government may have different priorities to those set out by the current administration. For example, while the overall public expenditure envelope may not change, the allocations within this could well do so, as could the availability of extra funding for specific pieces of local government work such as Early Years, Youth and care for the elderly. By setting out a three year plan to close, cut and privatise key services, Haringey is giving no indication to the current or future government that the attacks on local government funding are both unfair and unacceptable.

Additionally, it is clear any future government intends to review the method of funding local authorities. Such an exercise could lead to a reversal of the current direction of travel, which has seen money removed from the more deprived local authorities (such as Haringey), whereas more affluent areas have been affected to a much lesser degree in cash terms.

It is not enough for our Council to accept the current attacks on funding, wring their hands and then implement the sort of cuts that are proposed. It must consider alternatives and it must consider them now before the damage proposed becomes a reality. If Haringey Council implements these cuts, there will be no incentive for or pressure on an incoming government to provide the Borough with the funding it needs.

We also have serious concerns about the language that has been used in the documentation relating to the cuts. For example, there are multiple references to making Haringey "stronger" and "better". It is simply ridiculous to claim that taking £70 million out of the budget and closing such vital services will in any way be an improvement. The consequences for residents, particularly the most vulnerable, are likely to be dire.

Consultation

Our most pressing concern at this point is that the consultation period should be extended. You will be aware that on 29th October 2014, the Supreme Court found that Haringey's consultation on changes to council tax was unlawful. Although this was a different issue, the principles in terms of what is considered to be a meaningful consultation are the same. These are as follows:

- That consultation must be at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage.
- That the proposer must give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit intelligent consideration and response.
- That adequate time must be given for consideration and response.
- That the product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into



Haringey Council

account in finalising any statutory proposals.

We believe that the consultation as it stands would not fulfil these criteria. Only four weeks have been allowed for it, which includes two weeks for the Christmas and New Year break. Many people did not receive the documentation until after Christmas. Consultation meetings were arranged for the week commencing 5th January 2015, straight after the holiday period. The documentation is complex and much of the information is not clear. It is not reasonable to expect people to be able to read, understand and respond to the proposals in this timescale.

However, what is even more concerning is that many of the people who are affected by the proposals in priority 2 have learning disabilities and autism. The information has not been provided in an accessible format for them, so most of them will not be able to understand it, let alone respond to it. It is well known that people with these disabilities need longer to process, understand and interpret information. This is complex information, and the amount of time that that has been provided is utterly inadequate.

We understand that some so-called consultation meetings have been arranged for service users with learning disabilities, seemingly at the last minute. We have been told that no accessible information was made available to the service users at these meetings, and that they were largely unable to understand what was being put to them. We also understand that the consultation meetings were carried out by an external organisation that is also a provider of social care services, and has been known to take over (or at least attempt to take over) outsourced services. Therefore, we would suggest that there might have been a potential conflict of interest in this organisation carrying out the consultation.

Management have tried to defend the short timescale of the consultation and the lack of detail by saying that it is not a consultation on individual service proposals, and that following agreement of the budget there will be detailed consultations on each service proposal. The problem with this is that the overall cut in the budget is so huge, and many of the individual service cuts so significant, that once the budget has been set there will be very little room for change. It will be all but impossible to formulate any alternative proposals once the budget has been set, therefore any consultation that takes place after this point is highly unlikely to be able to change any particular proposal, and as such would probably not meet the criteria for being meaningful.

Our position is that it is this current consultation on the budget that is the key consultation, and that it is this which will determine the key decisions, therefore it needs to be long enough to allow all those affected to process the information and respond to the proposals. On this basis, it is clear that the consultation period needs to be extended beyond 18th January.

Outsourcing

There are plans to outsource/privatise some services. The terms social enterprise and social investment model have been used in the documentation. We have a number of concerns about this, which are as follows:



Haringey Council

- 1) There is no guarantee that any such body will want to take over the services. What happens if no organisation that wants to do this can be identified? Will the services then close? If so, isn't it the case that a separate consultation will be required, as this will be a departure from the original proposal?
- 2) What will happen if a social enterprise is then taken over by a private company? A service will then have been fully privatised, even though this may not have been the original stated intention.
- 3) Outsourcing services to any body, even a social enterprise, means that there is no longer any local and democratic accountability or control.
- 4) What happens if an organisation takes over a service and then runs out of money or simply decides that it no longer wants to provide the service? Will the council have to step in and rescue it? There have been previous examples of this happening in the council; over a decade ago, all the residential homes in the borough were outsourced to CSS, a not-for-profit organisation. This was a disaster, and the services eventually had to be taken back in-house by the council. Our concern is that companies can take on these services without taking on any of the risk, because they know that the council will be forced to step in if things go wrong. There is then less incentive on them to provide a decent service.
- 5) There is really only one way that outsourcing saves money – by cutting staff pay and conditions. Social enterprises can be just as vicious as private companies at doing this. The private care sector is notorious for low wages, zero hours contracts and poor working conditions. Social enterprises are likely to use the same methods to cut costs. There is a clear relationship between poor conditions for staff and poor quality of care.
- 6) We would advise you to look at what has happened at Barnet Council, where social care services have been transferred to Your Choice Barnet. This is a Local Authority Trading Company rather than a social enterprise, but many of the issues are similar. Some of the potential concerns we have highlighted above have actually occurred in Barnet, including running out of money and trying to cut staff pay. This should serve as a warning against trying anything like this in Haringey.

UNISON opposes all forms of outsourcing, including to social enterprises.

Alternatives

The council is trying to tell staff, service users and residents that “there is no alternative” to the cuts. In fact, there are alternatives:

- 1) Council tax could be increased. A small increase in this, particularly for the better off, would be preferable to decimating services.



Haringey Council

- 2) Set a one year budget and use reserves to eradicate or minimise the need for cuts in this budget
- 4) The council currently spends approximately £20,000 a day on external consultants, which amounts to around £5 million a year. Some of them are on ludicrous daily rates that bear no relation to the duties they actually perform. In some cases we believe that they are using Starbucks-like tax avoidance methods, meaning they pay less tax in percentage terms than the lowest paid in Haringey. There are also far too many potential conflicts of interests in these arrangements. We believe that there is scope for huge savings in this area. All contracts with consultants and interim managers should be terminated.
- 5) Terminate arrangements with highly paid private sector partners such as Agylisis and Impower, companies whose only role appears to be to create costly solutions to problems they have identified. These often involve high cost IT solutions which we suspect will need to be procured from companies with established links to those who are proposing them.
- 6) The Council should review and monitor the costs of running the ALMO with a view to bringing the unified service back in house under direct council management.
- 5) Not making cuts would save a huge amount on redundancy costs.
- 6) Councillors could challenge the government in relation to Haringey's settlement.

Priority 1

The proposals for “priority one” which are in effect services for Children are short-sited and unclear. They include proposals to cease, outsource, or reduce the full range of services designed to improve outcomes for Children. In common with the other proposals we are concerned at the lack of meaningful information as to how these will be achieved or the impact on the service reductions proposed. There are vague references to delivering services in other ways but a complete lack of detail as to what these other ways may be!

The headlines in the consultation document include “improve access to affordable childcare” and “strengthen Children’s Centres and improve access to services” which appears to be in direct contradiction to the proposal to cut the budget for Children’s Centres by 1.44 million. There is a complete lack of detail as to how these savings will be achieved and how this will result in better services and outcomes. We are concerned that the consultation appears to not have reached parents and users of Children’s Centres and have received some evidence that staff have been discouraged from providing copies of documents which in many cases are not accessible as they appear only to have been produced in English. Children’s Centres are accessed by many parents whose first language may not be English. In respect of the Childcare element of the Early years offer there is once again a complete lack of detail or evidence base. We believe the Children’s Centre programme has been an unmitigated success and one Haringey should be rightly proud of, we therefore wish to express our grave concerns at comments attributed to



Haringey Council

Councillors and Senior Officer of the Council which appear designed to talk down this success and to soften the community up to cuts such talk is disingenuous when it is taken into account that the service already suffered large scale reductions in earlier budget rounds.

The proposals for Youth services appear designed to largely end the provision of a universal youth offer. Again there is reference to reviewing the delivery model which we assume is consultant speak for privatisation in one form or another. The merging of the budgets of Youth with Youth Offending in the consultation document makes it almost impossible to understand what it is that the Council wishes to deliver. We are aware that Young People have expressed grave concerns about the lack of accessible information in order to allow them to respond to the consultation. It appears superficially that the Council intend to cut a sum equivalent to the total current expenditure on Youth Services. We are gravely concerned at the potential impact on outcomes for Young people and an increased level of disengagement and alienation that will result from these proposals.

On Youth Offending the proposals are lacking details or clarity. It is of concern that they may represent a reduction in the service to statutory levels rather than the current enhanced offer. While this may on paper deliver savings we contend that reduction in prevention and risk management is likely to lead to higher demand for the statutory interventions. This would appear to be at odds with the ethos of early intervention, in particular we are concerned at potential impacts on issues such as young gang criminal involvement. It is our understanding that an element of this service is funded by the Youth Justice Board in any case.

The savings from early help appear challenging, while we broadly agree that earlier intervention results in improved outcomes for children these will require significant investment and engagement. There is a lack of clarity about how this will save money and we believe these savings may take several years to be achieved. Moving to an early intervention model is not in itself a bad thing but when it is combined with an assumption of significant savings we are concerned that the impact may be negative.

The reductions in social work and social care staffing appear arbitrary and we are concerned they are not realisable. Much has been made of the fact that many of the staff are agency workers but the reality is they have been put in place in order to deal with overwhelming workloads and increased scrutiny. We all want better outcomes for Children who are engaged with the Social care system but due account needs to be taken of the need to have a sufficient workforce to deliver this.

We note under the SEND reforms a proposal to re-tender the home to School transport with an assumed attached saving. We are seeking an assurance that any saving will be made off the back of the profits of the company NOT the pay and conditions of the staff delivering the service. This retendering must take account of the Council's policy on the living wage and build this into the contract.

The proposals for Haselmere are lacking in detail, the inference seems to be privatisation in some form we would wish to put on record our opposition to any such proposals.



Haringey Council

The Traded service proposals appear to place at risk the viability of the services covered, there is a recognition that if the Council increase costs in order to reduce the subsidy that Schools will move away from these services. The services are good quality and it appears to us that the Council may be setting them up to fail as the service may wither on the vine.

Pendarren House : We are surprised and disappointed to see this proposal on the table, the cost of £220k is minuscule in the Council budget. We are concerned that a reduction in the subsidy may result in some more deprived children no longer being able to afford to attend. For some in the Borough Pendarren may be the only experience they get of seeing life outside of the Borough.

We note the options appraisal carried out but this has yet to be shared with ourselves in contravention of agreements between the Trade Unions and the Council. We remain opposed to any leasing or other privatisation of the facility as this would inevitably reduce its ethos and commitment to young people in Haringey since a profit motive would emerge. We strongly believe the offer at Pendarren needs to be strengthened and retained as an in house service. If investment is needed this could be found by small reductions in capital projects elsewhere, consideration should also be given to public-public solutions such as a shared service with another Borough.

In conclusion the proposals for Priority 1 will have the opposite outcome to that desired and we particularly object to the attempts to dress these cuts as service improvements.

Priority 2

We are dismayed to see that the proposed cuts will effectively mean the end of social care services being provided directly by the council. Most services will be closed, and the remainder will be outsourced/privatised.

In terms of service users and their families, the cuts are likely to have a devastating impact. You will be cutting services for the most vulnerable, services they rely on to stay safe and well, to have a decent quality of life, and to avoid isolation and loneliness. This is likely to cause great harm to both the users of the services and their families/carers, who will have much more pressure put on them. The cuts are likely to be a false economy in the long run, as people will probably end up needing even more care and support at a later date due to services being removed.

UNISON completely opposes the proposals for cuts made in Corporate Priority 2.

The Haven, the Grange and the Haynes are lifelines for the people who attend them. For many of these people, going to their day centre is the only social interaction they have, as well as the only stimulation they receive. Closing the Haven, and reducing the availability of dementia day care, is clearly going to leave many vulnerable people without a service. This is likely to lead to isolation, depression and other serious consequences. The use of Neighbourhood Connects is not going to be able to compensate for the loss of day services.



Haringey Council

The closure of three day centres for people with learning disabilities and autism will have a devastating impact on both those who use the service and their parents/carers.

Osborne Grove is a successful and well-regarded service and we do not understand why there is a proposal to shut it. Also, Linden Road provides an essential service for vulnerable adults with learning disabilities. These closures will mean that the council will no longer directly provide any care homes, and that vulnerable people will have no option but to use private sector services that are often poor quality.

The cuts in social work and care management are likely to lead to huge and unsustainable increases in work for the remaining staff, as well as risks to vulnerable people.

Cuts proposed in mental health and in care purchasing packages will create risks for those whose services are reduced, and could lead to possible harm. There are claims that these changes will lead to greater independence and other improvements, but we are concerned that this is an attempt to gloss over the impact of the cuts. The fact is that the intention is to save significant sums of money from these cuts, and it is difficult to see how this can be done without creating the risk of harm to vulnerable people.

In relation to care purchasing for residential care, the problems with high costs are caused by the fact that almost all residential care is purchased from the private sector, which exists only to make money and over which the council has no control. This situation has been both created and worsened by the closure of local authority care homes. It may well be the case that some providers charge fees that are excessively high, and it may be reasonable to try and reduce those costs. However, our concern is that this may have a negative impact on residents, particularly if providers claim that they can no longer afford to provide a service to them. We are also concerned that providers may try to compensate for any reductions in funding by cutting the pay and conditions of staff, which are usually already poor. We would like to know how the cost of residential care packages managed to get so out of control.

Reablement, and the increased use of it, is mentioned several times. Reablement is the use of short-term input, usually after discharge from hospital, with a view to improving someone's situation so they do not need long term support. Whilst this can be useful in certain cases, such as if someone has had a fall, it is also limited in its usefulness and scope. It has no real relevance to people with long-term conditions and it certainly cannot be a replacement for the kind of services that will be cut if these proposals go through.

It appears that the voluntary sector will be expected to cover some of the huge gaps in services that will result from these proposals. We do not understand how the sector will be expected to do this when it is facing a cut of £1.4 million.

Priority 3

We recognise the potential to increase parking income recovery but believe this will be challenging. There is also potential for adverse public reaction to increases in parking charges and in particular consideration needs to be taken on the potential impact on lower paid residents and staff. We are pleased to note that the Council has recognised savings



Haringey Council

from contracts but would hope these have not had an adverse effect on staff employed by the vehicle contractors who tend to be low paid and overwhelmingly BAME.

We wish to place on record our complete opposition to the proposal to consider privatisation of the parking enforcement service. The Service is a high profile one and the experiences in other Boroughs of privatisation have been negative both for staff and for residents as there has been clear evidence of a profit motive becoming dominant. For staff there have been a combination of poor pay and often evidence of discrimination within the workforce, Haringey need to be aware of these issues and UNISON's position remains that services are most effectively delivered in-house, any options appraisal exercise must not be driven by the cheapest option being the best option.

While we welcome some of the proposals for Parks in terms of looking for more work from outside of the Council Parks we have serious concerns about the following. The commitment to significantly increase commercial income from Parks infers that Parks will be less available to the local community than at present. Specifically that whole parks or areas of parks will be closed in order to allow profit making to take place, this is of concern as Parks are an invaluable resource for the Community not least those with Children as they represent a place where they can take part in activities without having to pay an entrance fee.

We are concerned at what appears to be a proposal to outsource parks management in some form whether this be a Social enterprise, Community Interest Company or outright privatisation the effect will be the same a loss of ownership and control over Parks services. It is of concern that volunteers are to be further promoted presumably in the name of empowerment. The reality of a move from direct provision for the workforce has been seen in other previous privatisations pay falls and commonly staff turnover increases as the new employer "encourages" staff protected by TUPE to leave so that cheaper staff can be hired. This pattern has been seen across local government and in Haringey.

As with all such exercises there are costs associated with options appraisals and if chosen procurement options. We feel that the service which was last reviewed as recently as 2012 would be better off if these costs were instead given to the service to promote and develop their offer.

In respect of the cleaning contract it is disingenuous to show no staffing impact, in fact it is clear there will be a staffing impact in that Veolia will be forced to make people redundant to make these savings. A drop in street cleanliness is likely to lead to a reduction in the resident empowerment the Council is seeking. In short faced with rubbish on their streets the residents are less likely to have regard to promoting social responsibility.

We have similar concerns about the impact of proposals on street recycling and the Neighbourhood Action team. These reduction will limit the Council's ability to deal with dumping for example.

The proposals for Wolves Lane appear designed to create space for Dignity to make further profits by expansion of the cemetery. This would in effect be privatisation of current publically owned land. The impact and disruption caused by the closure on service users



Haringey Council

with Learning Disabilities is yet another blow for this group on top of the huge proposed cuts in Adults.

Similarly to waste management it is disingenuous to suggest there is no staffing impact this is solely because of the NLWA running the site. We have concerns about the removal of facilities from Tottenham in favour of retaining these in the west of the borough.

Priority 4

The reduction in the availability of consultation for planning to statutory minimums presents risks in our opinion. This is particularly in the context of increasingly ambitious plans for Tottenham which may include large scale demolition and rebuilding

The proposal under planning to increase use of fixed term contracts and consultants suggests potential increased costs. There will also be a reduction in opportunities for staff development. It appears to be potential privatisation by the back door.

There appear to be further privatisation proposals for Economic Development, we believe that before this approach is taken consideration should be given to a service improvement plan for an in-house provision. It is clear there may also be TUPE implications arising from these proposals and we seek an assurance that the Council agreement on potential outsourcing will be followed in full. If the film office is self funding it is simply wrong to close and re-procure this.

It is disappointing that the Council wishes to reduce its involvement in carbon reduction programmes. Haringey was rightly a leader in dealing with environmental issues and as the report recognises there is a very real risk of the target not being met as a result of the proposed cuts. This would truly be short termism of the wordt kind.

With Alexandra Palace again we assume there are potential staffing reduction from the cut in subsidy. There will be a need to ensure the fabric and services are protected we remain concerned Haringey is effectively the bank of last resort should the current company fall into difficulties.

On a rare positive we welcome the HLF bid to improve Bruce Castle but we are concerned once again to see this is to potentially cease to be run by the Council.

The investment in Tottenham is much needed but we are concerned at some of the potential negative impacts on the Community. This is specifically in relation to the potential “gentrification” of the local area resulting in long standing residents and potential residents being priced out. Of particular concern are the proposals related to Council Housing which remain unclear. Our position is unequivocally that at the end of the process the Council must have more and better Council housing stock. We do not believe so called “affordable” housing is accessible to the vast majority of residents in Haringey.

Priority 5



Haringey Council

We welcome the proposals for a licencing scheme on private sector rental properties. This is much needed and we hope that it will be adopted and rolled out speedily. We similarly welcome proposals for a Private lettings and management agency.

The reduction in temporary accommodation will only in reality work if the causes of the need are addressed effectively.

We reserve our position on unified housing synergies until more details are provided of the proposals. We remain firmly of the opinion that savings can best be achieved (and service improvements) by winding up the management arrangement and bring housing management back into the Council.

Enabling Savings

We have serious concerns at the proposals for a reduction of 72 FTE within Customer Services. Clearly such a high level of job losses would be detrimental to the ability to deliver an effective customer services offer. There has been a complete lack of effective consultation on how the changes to delivery will negate the need for these posts to date. Once again the Council is spending significant amounts of money on a private company to tell it how to make savings, perhaps this would be better spent on investing in the services to make the improvements. We are concerned at the lack of effective public consultation on the new service offer and the over reliance on investment in technology: what is the Plan B if the money cannot be found or if the magic bullet fails to deliver. There needs to be an urgent equalities impact assessment on these proposals so as to ensure the most vulnerable and socially excluded do not suffer a reduction in service.

We reserve our position on the Muswell Hill Library proposals as the content of these is unclear.

The Libraries savings are a great concern, Libraries in our view are similar to Parks in fulfilling a vital role in social inclusion. We are concerned the Councils commitment not to close libraries is being delivered by reducing floorspace and potentially changing use of the Libraries to a more customer service based one. We note the document makes little or no comment on the proposal to reduce the size of Marcus Garvey library in order to accommodate services currently delivered at Apex House. There has been a lack of transparency in these proposals both in terms of staff consultation and public consultation. There needs to be a recognition of the professional status of Librarians and Libraries rather than an attempt to hide cuts as transformation. We remain particularly concerned that there has been a lack of risk assessment of the issues arising from changes of use in Library building as well as a lack of an equality impact assessment.

We are concerned at the lack of consultation or detail to date on the shared service centre proposal/BIP. So called back office functions are all too commonly viewed as easy targets for savings but it needs to be recognised these teams have already achieved considerable savings. A reduced central support could have unintended consequences such as increased risk to Council budgets through reduced monitoring as well as equality issues arising where the automation requires the public to access services and complete processes electronically. Once again we are concerned at the huge expenditure to date on consultancy on this project.



Haringey Council

Within the BIP project sit the current revenues and benefits service where there is a great deal of public interest and involvement. We remain unconvinced that automation can deliver the savings proposed, as with a number of other services it is the case that the bulk of Housing Benefit costs are covered by the subsidy grant. One obvious way of reducing costs would be to revisit the issue of Council Tax reductions as the reality is there is a high cost attributed to collection of small amounts of money from individuals. This is of course aside from the human cost and stress caused to many of the most vulnerable in Society, it is morally wrong that while the Council proclaims to be protecting people by freezing Council Tax it fails to take account of the impact of attempting to recover money from the poorest in the Borough.

We remain committed to defending services across the Borough and opposing attempts to privatise or outsource these. The proposals in the MTFs fail to deliver for the residents and they fail to deliver for staff. The consultation process is deficient and lacking in the opportunity to provide real alternatives.

Sean Fox & Chris Taylor on behalf of Haringey UNISON



Response by Markfield to the Haringey Council consultation on its draft corporate plan, Jan 2015

Markfield is a voluntary sector organisation that has been running for over 35 years in Tottenham, working with disabled children and adults and their families. We provide short breaks services for children (after school clubs and playschemes) and social clubs and travel training for adults with Learning Disabilities and/or Autism, as well as information advice and support to families. Over a thousand people a year use our services, the overwhelming majority are Haringey residents. We have several contracts with LBH for the provision of services and receive support through the Voluntary Sector Investment Fund. This bedrock of funding we receive from the council enables us to bring in significant additional funds into the borough – eg. we have secured over a £million from lottery, government and trust funding over the last 5 years to provide services to Haringey residents.

We support the council's stated aims of the corporate plan – to give the 'best start in life for every child', and to 'support people to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives, with control over what is important to them'. In particular we strongly endorse the cross cutting theme that is stated in the plan of emphasising early intervention and prevention. *However*, the key actual proposals in the corporate plan and budget relating to services for disabled children and adults will, in our view, have exactly the opposite effect.

The proposed cuts to spending on local services will have a very detrimental impact on our service users, and also on our ability as a local voluntary sector organisation to survive:

Disabled children

The council's budget for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities is proposed to be reduced by 26%. The budget papers on the council website do not fully explain how this reduction will be made – beyond stating that services will be more 'family focused and localised'. Short breaks (respite) provision is one of the services that falls under this budget heading, so we are very worried that short breaks provision will be cut. If this is the case it would be damaging and short sighted – because short breaks are one of the key interventions that can prevent family breakdown. National research (Every Disabled Child Matters) has shown that investment in short breaks provision saves money in the long run – because it reduces stress on families, and reduces the likelihood of family



Haringey Council

breakdown. In Haringey it has been recognised that the significant reduction over the last 5 years in the number of disabled children being placed in expensive foster care and residential placements has been achieved because of the investment in short breaks under the Aiming High for Disabled Children programme.

Adults with Learning Disabilities (LD)

The budget proposes a reduction of 48% in spending on day opportunities for adults with LD. In the budget document and in the consultation meetings council officers have emphasised that they want to look at new and innovative ways of including people with LD more in the community, and to expand employment opportunities. We fully support this sentiment; the creation of innovative services and community participation for people with LD has always been at the heart of our mission as a charity. We have had a block contract from LBH for many years to provide such services and we want to continue to work in partnership with the council. However it is completely unrealistic to think that such a huge reduction in public investment in these services over a short space of time can be achieved without detrimentally affecting this vulnerable group of disabled people.

Being able to socialise and take part in meaningful activities is not a 'luxury extra' for disabled people – it is essential to maintaining physical and mental health. If these needs are not met they will not just disappear - if people cannot take part in appropriate social activities this will lead to higher levels of stress, and physical and mental illness. Having friends and social contacts is also a vitally important aspect of safeguarding vulnerable adults. Therefore to halve the investment in day opportunities is very short sighted, as it will simply shift pressure onto family carers and the health service, and increase the risk of abuse.

There has been understandably a lot of attention focussed in the local media coverage and in the consultation meetings on the plan to close 3 of the council run day centres – as a very tangible example of the loss of services. We would also like to highlight an aspect of the proposals that has been less discussed and explained – but will affect an even larger number of people with LD – all those living in residential homes and in supported housing (which includes most of the people who come to Markfield social clubs under our block contract with LBH). In the budget proposals and in the consultation meetings it has been stated that in future the housing providers will be expected to fund 'day opportunities' for such residents/tenants (ie. the residents will *not* qualify for funding for this through a personal budget). However at the same time the council is seeking to significantly cut the levels of funding to housing providers (through care purchasing efficiencies). Therefore it is not realistic that providers will be able to fund adequate day opportunities. So the likely result of this policy will be that people with LD will be stuck in their homes and will have little or no opportunity to go out to do activities in the community. This is a huge step backwards in the human rights of disabled people. It will also jeopardise the financial viability of the very successful Markfield adults social clubs for people with LD.

Safeguarding

The proposal to reduce the budget for social work staff by 25% is very worrying. There are not enough social workers at the moment in the learning disability partnership, which means that there can be extremely long delays in transitions assessments, for example. We are concerned about the impact on safeguarding of such a large reduction in social work capacity.

Impact on carers



Haringey Council

The unpaid care provided by family carers saves many billions to the public purse nationally. Markfield provides support to carers who are under massive pressure and many who are close to breaking point. What can often make the difference to enable carers to 'keep going' are services such as short breaks and day opportunities. These services are an essential part of prevention and early intervention. It is already extremely difficult to access these services – families tell us that they find that the routes to apply for them are complex and very well hidden. Eligibility criteria are very tight already - only those with critical or substantial needs qualify. This is why the proposals for these unprecedented cuts to local social care services for disabled adults, and the implied threat to cut spending on short breaks for disabled children, have created such a huge level of anxiety, despair and anger among carers – many of whom have responded individually to the consultation, and why, for example, over 6000 people in ten days have signed the petition to 'Save our Autism Services in Haringey'.

Voluntary Sector Investment Fund

The ending of the voluntary sector investment fund (HVSIF) in August 2015 will affect Markfield badly. We have received £50k per year under this fund over the last three years, which has partly ameliorated the loss of our core grant in 2012. The HVSIF pays for provision of advice surgeries to carers, and the bulk of the funding is used to pay for after school club places for children with additional needs and siblings. One of the reasons why the children's services we run are high quality is that we run services consistently throughout the year and can employ a permanent play development manager to co-ordinate this. The loss of the HVSIF will remove around a third of the funding from our play services, and will jeopardise the whole financial viability of these services.

It has been emphasised at the voluntary sector consultation meeting that the council envisages a much bigger role for the voluntary sector in the provision of services in Haringey going forward. Taken at face value this is good news for organisations like Markfield. However, there is very little in the budget proposals that explains what actual resources are being put into commissioning services from the voluntary sector. As explained above, the reality of the huge cuts to spending on services for disabled people that are set out in the council budget proposals will be to seriously undermine the viability of our organisation to survive.

Sarah Miller
Director
Markfield



Haringey Council

Mental Health Support Association
Tottenham Town Hall
Town Hall Approach Road
N15 4RY

Consultation Response to London Borough of Haringey's' Medium Term Financial Plan
We acknowledge that LBH are in a position, whereby they will be in receipt of less central government funding than previously. This has resulted in plans to save £70 million over the next 3 years with £30 million being reduced from the adult social care budget. The Mental Health Reference Group has considered these proposals and would like to have the following comments included as part of the public consultation.

Neighbourhood Connectors

- We are concerned that new and different ways of working with those using learning disability, mental health and older persons services including the enablement model and use of “Neighbourhood Connectors” need to be firmly embedded and confidence gained in the way they work before older services are withdrawn.
- We have not seen an accurate evaluation of the pilot “Neighbourhood Connectors” project including outcomes, how they were measured, how the budget was worked out and it's' on going sustainability.
- Relapse rates, hospital admissions and numbers of clients on the Care Programme Approach (CPA) are not available for its' use in a mental health setting. How “Neighbourhood Connectors “will be extended from involving older persons to those with mental health needs is not laid out both in the service specification for “Neighbourhood Connectors” nor the Councils consultation documents.
- We acknowledge that social isolation is of equal importance in both groups.
- If the project is to be self-financing at the end of year 1, we would like to know whether clients will need to have a personal budget to access these services. We would like a detailed assessment of how personal budgets will work in this situation bearing in mind that there has been varying decisions made on what exactly a budget holder may spend their budget on?
- Support as well as Information ,for service users to access services is essential. This needs to be recognised.



Haringey Council

- Internet based databases should not replace face to face support .

Better Care Fund

- The overlap between health and social care costs are to be met by the Better Care Fund but it is not documented how much money there is available and whether this is to be ring fenced. This is surely a vital link within all the proposed changes.

Housing

- Reorganisation of housing related support is recognised as being a need for some time. The relationship between positive mental health and wellbeing with accommodation is acknowledged by all.
- There are concerns that clients who have high needs may find themselves feeling unready to move on but encouraged to do so without necessary support. The lack of good quality affordable housing in Haringey is evident and we would like to see how accommodation needs of this vulnerable group will be met. Will clients “moving on “be given preference on waiting lists?”. We foresee a greater need for “floating support” and would like to see how this need will be met
- For many years mental health service users have had to move home at each stage of their recovery as their care needs change. We welcome the idea of “care following the person rather than the building.
- At the moment we are not aware of data showing relapse rates at intervals after discharge from “floating support”. This would be useful information to view.
- There is a well -documented need for smooth transitioning of young people with mental health needs who are entering adult services. This crucial period needs to be recognised as an area when accommodation needs should be looked at extremely carefully.

Equality Impact Assessment.

- We note the Equality Impact Assessment . It has not taken in to consideration the high number of young males from BME communities with severe and enduring mental health needs living in the east of Haringey. These changes will no doubt impact on them in their usage of housing related support.
- The consultation document in both its’ e-version and hard copy is available in English only. We do not feel that this has allowed the consultation to be as open and inclusive as it could be.



Haringey Council

Haringey 3 year plan consultation contribution from a Learning Disabled resident of Haringey and Member of Haringey People First self advocacy group.



You will note the picture includes the holding of a red Learning Disability Partnership Board communication card. This represents a firm NO to the proposed cuts, especially to 3 out of 4 day centres and 25% cut in social workers. The group feel very strongly about the affect these cuts would have on fellow clients and wanted to represent the many of those that do not have the ability to communicate for themselves, This red No card is being held up for them so that they can be included in this consultation and so that their voices can be heard.

Dear Councillors and those considering Haringey's 3 year plan proposal.

Some of the below content has previously been sent to Beverley Tarka (Interim Head of Adult Social Care), Zina Etheridge (commissioning manager) and Michael Murphy (interim



Haringey Council

head of the LD community team in Haringey), Beverley was the only one that had the grace to respond as an individual despite each e-mail asking each of them to provide answers on their own input into the drawing up of these proposals. Disappointingly, Beverley only chose to answer a small percentage of the questions to the clients she is paid to represent. I hope that as the letter was formed by me supporting the clients to get their feelings and thoughts onto paper that others will choose to actually listen to all of the questions and find the answers that are obvious to us and in so rejecting the drastic proposals being considered currently on the most vulnerable in our society.

The members of the group feel let down by council management/councillor's and MP's and those responsible for drawing up this proposal. They asked me what the persons high up in LD service management and provision have done to represent the deep concern and cuts in services that this year 3 year proposal plan represents. They wanted to know what BT/ZE and MM's input was into the drawing up of these proposals, they all presumed that their first reaction would have been one of worry and concern, just like us. They want to feel that as they are protectors and key holders to the vital services they receive, that they have represented them, their first reactions surely could not have been, "wow, this is going to be great for the learning disability community".

As we have not received adequate answers from our first point of contact on matters like this. Please detail what you have done to represent the community you are employed to safeguard and provide life opportunities for in terms of what did you do to try and stop un person centred proposals like closing 3 out of 4 day centres and reduction in social workers even being put into the proposal in the first place?

As referred to by Beverley Tarka at the last PB on 10-12-14 when discussing the important and vital role advocacy played in consulting with Whitehall Street residents when that service was in the process of being "reprovided", the local authority knew how traumatic this change would be for residents, as with the life altering cuts potentially being imposed on clients now and so in response to this the council organised multiple consultations (at least 3 for this single building consultation) events supported by independent advocates as well as 'one to one' advocacy to support residents to have their voice's heard at separate and convenient times for those individuals. Group events are especially difficult for those with LD to contribute to which is why at PB's we break up into groups where individual time can be spent with the client. As Beverley mentioned at the last PB, this is very much similar except on a dramatically bigger scale. With this in mind then, **will the same vital/necessary independent advocacy/need be provided to each and everyone of those day centres clients on a one to one basis in order to make sure that those being affected by these proposals get the opportunity to have their input into this process.**

At the time, Haringey Mencap had to produce easy read literature for the Whitehall St consultation with clients, in the interest of making information available to everyone despite their level of need, **will the local authority be making an accessible easy read version of their 3 year plan proposals unedited** and what that will mean for clients so that



Haringey Council

they can be empowered to understand these changes and subsequently have their say on their own lives and their services?

Elif spoke to me about how when she moved to Enfield with her mother she lost all her friends overnight as she no longer accessed Markfield Friday Night and Haringey services, she still feels the impact of this now. She said the clients in the day centre's have been mixing and socialising together for years and years, if they do not see each other in **their** day centres, when will they see their friends. Many of them will lose life long friends overnight. **What will you do to ensure that this does not happen?** These services are not luxury add ons, not one single client has had any control on whether they have a learning disability and these services offer opportunities that the society we professionals operate freely in cannot. e.g. choice, inclusion and accessibility.

In considering the proposal comment.

“ The overall aim of the service re-design will develop a range of integrated health and social care community services that will support social inclusion, ensure that people are treated fairly and will enable people to access mainstream community activities wherever possible, enabling them to lead full and active lives in their communities. “ page 13

Where is the evidence for this fantastical statement. As mentioned at the last HLDPB on the 10-12-14, there is a presumption by council professionals that the Haringey we live in will be able to absorb and provide opportunities for these clients now potentially left with no day service provision. The work of Haringey People First in terms of disability hate crime, transport and the media, already show you that the society we live in is not inclusive and filled with opportunities for people with LD. Everything has to be fought for. Please actually listen to those that have to operate in society and deal with the lack of accessibility and inclusion for those with a LD.

The big society being promoted currently is words on paper, nothing more than an ideological fantasy.

With this in mind Haringey People First members have asked **what extra/new/additional money and services will the council provide to make sure that people are able to access day time activities, opportunities and that ability to make friends?**

One of the recommendations on page 12 makes reference to *“improve the availability of day centres and befriending opportunities for local people”*

How can this be dared to be written into the plan when it has been clearly stated that $\frac{3}{4}$ day centres are proposed to be closed. Also how does it dare to say that decisions will improve the opportunities of befriending when such proposals directly work in reducing opportunities to maintain friendships, please note the voice of Elif, an actual former Haringey resident on the affect a family decision to move out of borough had on her. The



Haringey Council

situations are directly comparable. Overnight, people's social networks of support and friendship could be scrapped.

Also, can you please advise why the HLDPB E-mail that was sent to all members of the HLDPB to form their consultation response on has no reference to 3 out of 4 day centres possible being cut as detailed by Beverley Tarka at the former mentioned partnership board meeting, for those that are able to read and absorb information it would be more valuable for us to be consulted on all of the proposals as opposed to those that have been selected for highlight.

Question 3 states that given the financial challenges, what do you think of our objectives and plans for adults as set out on pages 10-13.

The group reject in total commitment that any proposals to cut services for vulnerable residents of Haringey should be overwhelmingly rejected. There is no justifiable fiscal or moral argument which can justify any sanction of the proposals to remove Day centres that provide vital, essential, accessible, appropriately staffed and places of friendship for the vulnerable residents of Haringey. We also fully reject any plans to cut social workers who are the frontline key holders and safe guardians of these services for Haringey Residents.

Your time and effort in answering these questions from Haringey Learning Disabled Clients and including their thoughts and feelings for consultation on these cuts proposals is greatly appreciated.

Many thanks,

Mark Heath on
member

Haringey 3 year
Learning Disabled
who is co-chair of
Partnership Board
First self advocacy



Behalf of Haringey People first

plan consultation contribution from a
resident of Haringey Dianne Smith
Haringey's Learning Disability
and supporter of Haringey People
group.



Haringey Council

You will note the picture includes the holding of a red Learning Disability Partnership Board communication card. This represents a firm NO to the proposed cuts, especially to 3 out of 4 day centres and 25% cut in social workers. The group feel very strongly about the affect these cuts would have on fellow clients and wanted to represent the many of those that do not have the ability to communicate for themselves, This red No card is being held up for them so that they can be included in this consultation and so that their voices can be heard.

Dear Councillors and those considering Haringey's 3 year plan proposal.

Some of the below content has previously been sent to Beverley Tarka (Interim Head of Adult Social Care) , Zina Etheridge (commissioning manager) and Michael Murphy (interim head of the LD community team in Haringey), Beverley was the only one that had the grace to respond as an individual despite each e-mail asking each of them to provide answers on their own input into the drawing up of these proposals. Disappointingly, Beverley however only chose to answer a small percentage of the questions to the clients she is paid to represent. I hope that as the letter was formed by me supporting the clients to get their feelings and thoughts onto paper that others will choose to actually listen to all of the questions and find the answers that are obvious to us and in so rejecting the drastic proposals being considered currently on the most vulnerable in our society.

The members of the group feel let down by council management/councillor's and MP's and those responsible for drawing up this proposal. They asked me what the persons high up



Haringey Council

in LD service management and provision have done to represent the deep concern and cuts in services that this year 3 year proposal plan represents. They wanted to know what BT/ZE and MM's input was into the drawing up of these proposals, they all presumed that their first reaction would have been one of worry and concern, just like us. They want to feel that as they are protectors and key holders to the vital services they receive, that they have represented them, their first reactions surely could not have been, "wow, this is going to be great for the learning disability community".

As we have not received adequate answers from our first point of contact on matters like this. Please detail what you have done to represent the community you are employed to safeguard and provide life opportunities for in terms of what did you do to try and stop un person centred proposals like closing 3 out of 4 day centres and reduction in social workers even being put into the proposal in the first place?

As referred to by Beverley Tarka at the last PB on 10-12-14 when discussing the important and vital role advocacy played in consulting with Whitehall Street residents when that service was in the process of being "reprovided", the local authority knew how traumatic this change would be for residents, as with the life altering cuts potentially being imposed on clients now and so in response to this the council organised multiple consultations (at least 3 for this single building consultation) events supported by independent advocates as well as 'one to one' advocacy to support residents to have their voice's heard at separate and convenient times for those individuals. Group events are especially difficult for those with LD to contribute to which is why at PB's we break up into groups where individual time can be spent with the client. As Beverley mentioned at the last PB, this is very much similar except on a dramatically bigger scale. With this in mind then, **will the same vital/necessary independent advocacy/need be provided to each and everyone of those day centres clients on a one to one basis in order to make sure that those being affected by these proposals get the opportunity to have their input into this process.**

At the time, Haringey Mencap had to produce easy read literature for the Whitehall St consultation with clients, in the interest of making information available to everyone despite their level of need, **will the local authority be making an accessible easy read version of their 3 year plan proposals unedited and what that will mean for clients so that they can be empowered to understand these changes and subsequently have their say on their own lives and their services?**

Elif spoke to me about how when she moved to Enfield with her mother she lost all her friends overnight as she no longer accessed Markfield Friday Night and Haringey services, she still feels the impact of this now. She said the clients in the day centre's have been mixing and socialising together for years and years, if they do not see each other in **their** day centres, when will they see their friends. Many of them will lose life long friends overnight. **What will you do to ensure that this does not happen?** These services are not luxury add ons, not one single client has had any control on whether they have a



Haringey Council

learning disability and these services offer opportunities that the society we professionals operate freely in cannot. e.g. choice, inclusion and accessibility.

In considering the proposal comment.

“ The overall aim of the service re-design will develop a range of integrated health and social care community services that will support social inclusion, ensure that people are treated fairly and will enable people to access mainstream community activities wherever possible, enabling them to lead full and active lives in their communities. “ page 13

Where is the evidence for this fantastical statement. As mentioned at the last HLDPB on the 10-12-14, there is a presumption by council professionals that the Haringey we live in will be able to absorb and provide opportunities for these clients now potentially left with no day service provision. The work of Haringey People First in terms of disability hate crime, transport and the media, already show you that the society we live in is not inclusive and filled with opportunities for people with LD. Everything has to be fought for. Please actually listen to those that have to operate in society and deal with the lack of accessibility and inclusion for those with a LD.

The big society being promoted currently is words on paper, nothing more than an ideological fantasy.

With this in mind Haringey People First members have asked **what extra/new/additional money and services will the council provide to make sure that people are able to access day time activities, opportunities and that ability to make friends?**

One of the recommendations on page 12 makes reference to *“improve the availability of day centres and befriending opportunities for local people”*

How can this be dared to be written into the plan when it has been clearly stated that $\frac{3}{4}$ day centres are proposed to be closed. Also how does it dare to say that decisions will improve the opportunities of befriending when such proposals directly work in reducing opportunities to maintain friendships, please note the voice of Elif, an actual former Haringey resident on the affect a family decision to move out of borough had on her. The situations are directly comparable. Overnight, people’s social networks of support and friendship could be scrapped.

Also, can you please advise why the HLDPB E-mail that was sent to all members of the HLDPB to form their consultation response on has no reference to 3 out of 4 day centres possible being cut as detailed by Beverlay at the former mentioned partnership board meeting, for those that are able to read and absorb information it would be more valuable for us to be consulted on all of the proposals as opposed to those that have been selected for highlight.

Question 3 states that given the financial challenges, what do you think of our objectives and plans for adults as set out on pages 10-13.



Haringey Council

The group reject in total commitment that any proposals to cut services for vulnerable residents of Haringey should be overwhelmingly rejected. There is no justifiable fiscal or moral argument which can justify any sanction of the proposals to remove Day centres that provide vital, essential, accessible, appropriately staffed and places of friendship for the vulnerable residents of Haringey. We also fully reject any plans to cut social workers who are the frontline key holders and safe guardians of these services for Haringey Residents.

Your time and effort in answering these questions from Haringey Learning Disabled Clients and including their thoughts and feeling for consultation on these cuts proposals is greatly appreciated.

Many thanks,

Mark Heath on Behalf of Dianne Smith, Co-chair of Haringey's Learning Disability Partnership Board)

Haringey 3 year plan consultation contribution from a Learning Disabled resident of Haringey Elif Alper who is a member of Haringey's Learning Disability Partnership Board and supporter of Haringey People First self advocacy group. (I was not able to meet with Elif during this period and so she asked me to hold a red card up on her behalf.)





Haringey Council

You will note the picture includes the holding of a red Learning Disability Partnership Board communication card. This represents a firm NO to the proposed cuts, especially to 3 out of 4 day centres and 25% cut in social workers. The group feel very strongly about the affect these cuts would have on fellow clients and wanted to represent the many of those that do not have the ability to communicate for themselves, This red No card is being held up for them so that they can be included in this consultation and so that their voices can be heard.

Dear Councillors and those considering Haringey's 3 year plan proposal.

Some of the below content has previously been sent to Beverley Tarka (Interim Head of Adult Social Care) , Zina Etheridge (commissioning manager) and Michael Murphy (interim head of the LD community team in Haringey), Beverley was the only one that had the grace to respond as an individual despite each e-mail asking each of them to provide answers on their own input into the drawing up of these proposals. Disappointingly, Beverley however only chose to answer a small percentage of the questions to the clients she is paid to represent. I hope that as the letter was formed by me supporting the clients to get their feelings and thoughts onto paper that others will choose to actually listen to all of the questions and find the answers that are obvious to us and in so rejecting the drastic proposals being considered currently on the most vulnerable in our society.

The members of the group feel let down by council management/councillor's and MP's and those responsible for drawing up this proposal. They asked me what the persons high up in LD service management and provision have done to represent the deep concern and cuts in services that this year 3 year proposal plan represents. They wanted to know what BT/ZE and MM's input was into the drawing up of these proposals, they all presumed that their first reaction would have been one of worry and concern, just like us. They want to feel that as they are protectors and key holders to the vital services they receive, that they have represented them, their first reactions surely could not have been, "wow, this is going to be great for the learning disability community".

As we have not received adequate answers from our first point of contact on matters like this. Please detail what you have done to represent the community you are employed to safeguard and provide life opportunities for in terms of what did you do to try and stop un person centred proposals like closing 3 out of 4 day



Haringey Council

centres and reduction in social workers even being put into the proposal in the first place?

As referred to by Beverley Tarka at the last PB on 10-12-14 when discussing the important and vital role advocacy played in consulting with Whitehall Street residents when that service was in the process of being "reprovided", the local authority knew how traumatic this change would be for residents, as with the life altering cuts potentially being imposed on clients now and so in response to this the council organised multiple consultations (at least 3 for this single building consultation) events supported by independent advocates as well as 'one to one' advocacy to support residents to have their voice's heard at separate and convenient times for those individuals. Group events are especially difficult for those with LD to contribute to which is why at PB's we break up into groups where individual time can be spent with the client. As Beverley mentioned at the last PB, this is very much similar except on a dramatically bigger scale. With this in mind then, **will the same vital/necessary independent advocacy/need be provided to each and everyone of those day centres clients on a one to one basis in order to make sure that those being affected by these proposals get the opportunity to have their input into this process.**

At the time, Haringey Mencap had to produce easy read literature for the Whitehall St consultation with clients, in the interest of making information available to everyone despite their level of need, **will the local authority be making an accessible easy read version of their 3 year plan proposals unedited and what that will mean for clients so that they can be empowered to understand these changes and subsequently have their say on their own lives and their services?**

Elif spoke to me about how when she moved to Enfield with her mother she lost all her friends overnight as she no longer accessed Markfield Friday Night and Haringey services, she still feels the impact of this now. She said the clients in the day centre's have been mixing and socialising together for years and years, if they do not see each other in **their** day centres, when will they see their friends. Many of them will lose life long friends overnight. **What will you do to ensure that this does not happen?** These services are not luxury add ons, not one single client has had any control on whether they have a learning disability and these services offer opportunities that the society we professionals operate freely in cannot. e.g. choice, inclusion and accessibility.

In considering the proposal comment.

" The overall aim of the service re-design will develop a range of integrated health and social care community services that will support social inclusion, ensure that people are treated fairly and will enable people to access mainstream community activities wherever possible, enabling them to lead full and active lives in their communities. " page 13

Where is the evidence for this fantastical statement. As mentioned at the last HLDPB on the 10-12-14, there is a presumption by council professionals that the Haringey we live in will be able to absorb and provide opportunities for these clients now potentially left with no



Haringey Council

day service provision. The work of Haringey People First in terms of disability hate crime, transport and the media, already show you that the society we live in is not inclusive and filled with opportunities for people with LD. Everything has to be fought for. Please actually listen to those that have to operate in society and deal with the lack of accessibility and inclusion for those with a LD.

The big society being promoted currently is words on paper, nothing more than an ideological fantasy.

With this in mind Haringey People First members have asked **what extra/new/additional money and services will the council provide to make sure that people are able to access day time activities, opportunities and that ability to make friends?**

One of the recommendations on page 12 makes reference to *“improve the availability of day centres and befriending opportunities for local people”*

How can this be dared to be written into the plan when it has been clearly stated that $\frac{3}{4}$ day centres are proposed to be closed. Also how does it dare to say that decisions will improve the opportunities of befriending when such proposals directly work in reducing opportunities to maintain friendships, please note the voice of Elif, an actual former Haringey resident on the affect a family decision to move out of borough had on her. The situations are directly comparable. Overnight, people’s social networks of support and friendship could be scrapped.

Also, can you please advise why the HLDPB E-mail that was sent to all members of the HLDPB to form their consultation response on has no reference to 3 out of 4 day centres possible being cut as detailed by Beverlay at the former mentioned partnership board meeting, for those that are able to read and absorb information it would be more valuable for us to be consulted on all of the proposals as opposed to those that have been selected for highlight.

Question 3 states that given the financial challenges, what do you think of our objectives and plans for adults as set out on pages 10-13.

The group reject in total commitment that any proposals to cut services for vulnerable residents of Haringey should be overwhelmingly rejected. There is no justifiable fiscal or moral argument which can justify any sanction of the proposals to remove Day centres that provide vital, essential, accessible, appropriately staffed and places of friendship for the vulnerable residents of Haringey. We also fully reject any plans to cut social workers who are the frontline key holders and safe guards of these services for Haringey Residents.

Your time and effort in answering these questions from Haringey Learning Disabled Clients and including their thoughts and feeling for consultation on these cuts proposals is greatly appreciated.



Haringey Council
Many thanks,

Mark Heath on Behalf of Elif Alpar, Member of Haringey's Learning Disability Partnership Board)

Haringey 3 year plan consultation contribution from a Learning Disabled resident of Haringey Michael Brookstein who is co-chair of Haringey's Learning Disability Partnership Board and Member of Haringey People First self advocacy group.



You will note the picture includes the holding of a red Learning Disability Partnership Board communication card. This represents a firm NO to the proposed cuts, especially to 3 out of 4 day centres and 25% cut in social workers. The group feel very strongly about the affect these cuts would have on fellow clients and wanted to represent the many of those that do not have the ability to communicate for themselves, This red No card is being held up for them so that they can be included in this consultation and so that their voices can be heard.



Haringey Council

Dear Councillors and those considering Haringey's 3 year plan proposal.

Some of the below content has previously been sent to Beverley Tarka (Interim Head of Adult Social Care) , Zina Etheridge (commissioning manager) and Michael Murphy (interim head of the LD community team in Haringey), Beverley was the only one that had the grace to respond as an individual despite each e-mail asking each of them to provide answers on their own input into the drawing up of these proposals. Disappointingly, Beverley however only chose to answer a small percentage of the questions to the clients she is paid to represent. I hope that as the letter was formed by me supporting the clients to get their feelings and thoughts onto paper that others will choose to actually listen to all of the questions and find the answers that are obvious to us and in so rejecting the drastic proposals being considered currently on the most vulnerable in our society.

The members of the group feel let down by council management/councillor's and MP's and those responsible for drawing up this proposal. They asked me what the persons high up in LD service management and provision have done to represent the deep concern and cuts in services that this year 3 year proposal plan represents. They wanted to know what BT/ZE and MM's input was into the drawing up of these proposals, they all presumed that their first reaction would have been one of worry and concern, just like us. They want to feel that as they are protectors and key holders to the vital services they receive, that they have represented them, their first reactions surely could not have been, "wow, this is going to be great for the learning disability community".

As we have not received adequate answers from our first point of contact on matters like this. Please detail what you have done to represent the community you are employed to safeguard and provide life opportunities for in terms of what did you do to try and stop un person centred proposals like closing 3 out of 4 day centres and reduction in social workers even being put into the proposal in the first place?

As referred to by Beverley Tarka at the last PB on 10-12-14 when discussing the important and vital role advocacy played in consulting with Whitehall Street residents when that service was in the process of being "reprovided", the local authority knew how traumatic this change would be for residents, as with the life altering cuts potentially being imposed on clients now and so in response to this the council organised multiple consultations (at least 3 for this single building consultation) events supported by independent advocates as well as 'one to one' advocacy to support residents to have their voice's heard at separate and convenient times for those individuals. Group events are especially difficult for those with LD to contribute to which is why at PB's we break up into groups where individual time can be spent with the client. As Beverley mentioned at the last PB, this is very much similar except on a dramatically bigger scale. With this in mind then, **will the same vital/necessary independent advocacy/need be provided to each and everyone of those day centres clients on a one to one basis in order to make sure that those being affected by these proposals get the opportunity to have their input into this process.**



Haringey Council

At the time, Haringey Mencap had to produce easy read literature for the Whitehall St consultation with clients, in the interest of making information available to everyone despite their level of need, **will the local authority be making an accessible easy read version of their 3 year plan proposals unedited and what that will mean for clients so that they can be empowered to understand these changes and subsequently have their say on their own lives and their services?**

Elif spoke to me about how when she moved to Enfield with her mother she lost all her friends overnight as she no longer accessed Markfield Friday Night and Haringey services, she still feels the impact of this now. She said the clients in the day centre's have been mixing and socialising together for years and years, if they do not see each other in **their** day centres, when will they see their friends. Many of them will lose life long friends overnight. **What will you do to ensure that this does not happen?** These services are not luxury add ons, not one single client has had any control on whether they have a learning disability and these services offer opportunities that the society we professionals operate freely in cannot. e.g. choice, inclusion and accessibility.

In considering the proposal comment.

“ The overall aim of the service re-design will develop a range of integrated health and social care community services that will support social inclusion, ensure that people are treated fairly and will enable people to access mainstream community activities wherever possible, enabling them to lead full and active lives in their communities. “ page 13

Where is the evidence for this fantastical statement. As mentioned at the last HLDPB on the 10-12-14, there is a presumption by council professionals that the Haringey we live in will be able to absorb and provide opportunities for these clients now potentially left with no day service provision. The work of Haringey People First in terms of disability hate crime, transport and the media, already show you that the society we live in is not inclusive and filled with opportunities for people with LD. Everything has to be fought for. Please actually listen to those that have to operate in society and deal with the lack of accessibility and inclusion for those with a LD.

The big society being promoted currently is words on paper, nothing more than an ideological fantasy.

With this in mind Haringey People First members have asked **what extra/new/additional money and services will the council provide to make sure that people are able to access day time activities, opportunities and that ability to make friends?**

One of the recommendations on page 12 makes reference to *“improve the availability of day centres and befriending opportunities for local people”*



Haringey Council

How can this be dared to be written into the plan when it has been clearly stated that $\frac{3}{4}$ day centres are proposed to be closed. Also how does it dare to say that decisions will improve the opportunities of befriending when such proposals directly work in reducing opportunities to maintain friendships, please note the voice of Elif, an actual former Haringey resident on the affect a family decision to move out of borough had on her. The situations are directly comparable. Overnight, people's social networks of support and friendship could be scrapped.

Also, can you please advise why the HLDPB E-mail that was sent to all members of the HLDPB to form their consultation response on has no reference to 3 out of 4 day centres possible being cut as detailed by Beverlay at the former mentioned partnership board meeting, for those that are able to read and absorb information it would be more valuable for us to be consulted on all of the proposals as opposed to those that have been selected for highlight.

Question 3 states that given the financial challenges, what do you think of our objectives and plans for adults as set out on pages 10-13.

The group reject in total commitment that any proposals to cut services for vulnerable residents of Haringey should be overwhelmingly rejected. There is no justifiable fiscal or moral argument which can justify any sanction of the proposals to remove Day centres that provide vital, essential, accessible, appropriately staffed and places of friendship for the vulnerable residents of Haringey. We also fully reject any plans to cut social workers who are the frontline key holders and safe guarders of these services for Haringey Residents.

Your time and effort in answering these questions from Haringey Learning Disabled Clients and including their thoughts and feeling for consultation on these cuts proposals is greatly appreciated.

Many thanks,

Mark Heath on Behalf of Haringey People first member (Michael Brookstein)

Haringey 3 year plan consultation contribution from a Learning Disabled resident Sylvia Brookstein of Haringey and Member of Haringey People First self advocacy group.



Haringey Council

You will note the Learning communication proposed cuts, 25% cut in strongly about fellow clients those that do themselves, them so that and so that their



picture includes the holding of a red Disability Partnership Board card. This represents a firm NO to the especially to 3 out of 4 day centres and social workers. The group feel very the affect these cuts would have on and wanted to represent the many of not have the ability to communicate for This red No card is being held up for they can be included in this consultation voices can be heard.

Dear Councillors and those considering Haringey's 3 year plan proposal.

Some of the below content has previously been sent to Beverley Tarka (Interim Head of Adult Social Care) , Zina Etheridge (commissioning manager) and Michael Murphy (interim head of the LD community team in Haringey), Beverley was the only one that had the grace to respond as an individual despite each e-mail asking each of them to provide answers on their own input into the drawing up of these proposals. Disappointingly, Beverley however only chose to answer a small percentage of the questions to the clients she is paid to represent. I hope that as the letter was formed by me supporting the clients to get their feelings and thoughts onto paper that others will choose to actually listen to all of the questions and find the answers that are obvious to us and in so rejecting the drastic proposals being considered currently on the most vulnerable in our society.

The members of the group feel let down by council management/councillor's and MP's and those responsible for drawing up this proposal. They asked me what the persons high up in LD service management and provision have done to represent the deep concern and cuts in services that this year 3 year proposal plan represents. They wanted to know what BT/ZE and MM's input was into the drawing up of these proposals, they all presumed that their first reaction would have been one of worry and concern, just like us. They want to feel that as they are protectors and key holders to the vital services they receive, that they have represented them, their first reactions surely could not have been, "wow, this is going to be great for the learning disability community".



Haringey Council

As we have not received adequate answers from our first point of contact on matters like this. Please detail what you have done to represent the community you are employed to safeguard and provide life opportunities for in terms of what did you do to try and stop un person centred proposals like closing 3 out of 4 day centres and reduction in social workers even being put into the proposal in the first place?

As referred to by Beverley Tarka at the last PB on 10-12-14 when discussing the important and vital role advocacy played in consulting with Whitehall Street residents when that service was in the process of being "reprovided", the local authority knew how traumatic this change would be for residents, as with the life altering cuts potentially being imposed on clients now and so in response to this the council organised multiple consultations (at least 3 for this single building consultation) events supported by independent advocates as well as 'one to one' advocacy to support residents to have their voice's heard at separate and convenient times for those individuals. Group events are especially difficult for those with LD to contribute to which is why at PB's we break up into groups where individual time can be spent with the client. As Beverley mentioned at the last PB, this is very much similar except on a dramatically bigger scale. With this in mind then, **will the same vital/necessary independent advocacy/need be provided to each and everyone of those day centres clients on a one to one basis in order to make sure that those being affected by these proposals get the opportunity to have their input into this process.**

At the time, Haringey Mencap had to produce easy read literature for the Whitehall St consultation with clients, in the interest of making information available to everyone despite their level of need, **will the local authority be making an accessible easy read version of their 3 year plan proposals unedited and what that will mean for clients so that they can be empowered to understand these changes and subsequently have their say on their own lives and their services?**

Elif spoke to me about how when she moved to Enfield with her mother she lost all her friends overnight as she no longer accessed Markfield Friday Night and Haringey services, she still feels the impact of this now. She said the clients in the day centre's have been mixing and socialising together for years and years, if they do not see each other in **their** day centres, when will they see their friends. Many of them will lose life long friends overnight. **What will you do to ensure that this does not happen?** These services are not luxury add ons, not one single client has had any control on whether they have a learning disability and these services offer opportunities that the society we professionals operate freely in cannot. e.g. choice, inclusion and accessibility.

In considering the proposal comment.

" The overall aim of the service re-design will develop a range of integrated health and social care community services that will support social inclusion, ensure that people are treated fairly and will enable people to access mainstream community activities wherever possible, enabling them to lead full and active lives in their communities. " page 13



Haringey Council

Where is the evidence for this fantastical statement. As mentioned at the last HLDPB on the 10-12-14, there is a presumption by council professionals that the Haringey we live in will be able to absorb and provide opportunities for these clients now potentially left with no day service provision. The work of Haringey People First in terms of disability hate crime, transport and the media, already show you that the society we live in is not inclusive and filled with opportunities for people with LD. Everything has to be fought for. Please actually listen to those that have to operate in society and deal with the lack of accessibility and inclusion for those with a LD.

The big society being promoted currently is words on paper, nothing more than an ideological fantasy.

With this in mind Haringey People First members have asked **what extra/new/additional money and services will the council provide to make sure that people are able to access day time activities, opportunities and that ability to make friends?**

One of the recommendations on page 12 makes reference to *“improve the availability of day centres and befriending opportunities for local people”*

How can this be dared to be written into the plan when it has been clearly stated that $\frac{3}{4}$ day centres are proposed to be closed. Also how does it dare to say that decisions will improve the opportunities of befriending when such proposals directly work in reducing opportunities to maintain friendships, please note the voice of Elif, an actual former Haringey resident on the affect a family decision to move out of borough had on her. The situations are directly comparable. Overnight, people’s social networks of support and friendship could be scrapped.

Also, can you please advise why the HLDPB E-mail that was sent to all members of the HLDPB to form their consultation response on has no reference to 3 out of 4 day centres possible being cut as detailed by Yourself at the former mentioned partnership board meeting, for those that are able to read and absorb information it would be more valuable for us to be consulted on all of the proposals as opposed to those that have been selected for highlight.

Question 3 states that given the financial challenges, what do you think of our objectives and plans for adults as set out on pages 10-13.

The group reject in total commitment that any proposals to cut services for vulnerable residents of Haringey should be overwhelmingly rejected. There is no justifiable fiscal or moral argument which can justify any sanction of the proposals to remove Day centres that provide vital, essential, accessible, appropriately staffed and places of friendship for the vulnerable residents of Haringey. We also fully reject any plans to cut social workers who are the frontline key holders and safe guarders of these services for Haringey Residents.




Haringey Council

Your time and effort in answering these questions from Haringey Learning Disabled Clients and including their thoughts and feelings for consultation on these cuts proposals is greatly appreciated.

Many thanks,

Mark Heath on Behalf of Haringey People first member (Sylvia Brookstein)

Haringey 3 year plan consultation contribution from a Learning Disabled resident Patrick Smalling of Haringey and Member of Haringey People First self advocacy group.



You will note the picture includes the holding of a red Learning Disability Partnership Board communication card. This represents a firm NO to the proposed cuts, especially to 3 out of 4 day centres and 25% cut in social workers. The group feel very strongly about the affect these cuts would have on fellow clients and wanted to represent the many of those that do not have the ability to communicate for themselves, This red No card is being held



Haringey Council

up for them so that they can be included in this consultation and so that their voices can be heard.

Dear Councillors and those considering Haringey's 3 year plan proposal.

Some of the below content has previously been sent to Beverley Tarka (Interim Head of Adult Social Care) , Zina Etheridge (commissioning manager) and Michael Murphy (interim head of the LD community team in Haringey), Beverley was the only one that had the grace to respond as an individual despite each e-mail asking each of them to provide answers on their own input into the drawing up of these proposals. Disappointingly, Beverley however only chose to answer a small percentage of the questions to the clients she is paid to represent. I hope that as the letter was formed by me supporting the clients to get their feelings and thoughts onto paper that others will choose to actually listen to all of the questions and find the answers that are obvious to us and in so rejecting the drastic proposals being considered currently on the most vulnerable in our society.

The members of the group feel let down by council management/councillor's and MP's and those responsible for drawing up this proposal. They asked me what the persons high up in LD service management and provision have done to represent the deep concern and cuts in services that this year 3 year proposal plan represents. They wanted to know what BT/ZE and MM's input was into the drawing up of these proposals, they all presumed that their first reaction would have been one of worry and concern, just like us. They want to feel that as they are protectors and key holders to the vital services they receive, that they have represented them, their first reactions surely could not have been, "wow, this is going to be great for the learning disability community".

As we have not received adequate answers from our first point of contact on matters like this. Please detail what you have done to represent the community you are employed to safeguard and provide life opportunities for in terms of what did you do to try and stop un person centred proposals like closing 3 out of 4 day centres and reduction in social workers even being put into the proposal in the first place?

As referred to by Beverley Tarka at the last PB on 10-12-14 when discussing the important and vital role advocacy played in consulting with Whitehall Street residents when that service was in the process of being "reprovided", the local authority knew how traumatic this change would be for residents, as with the life altering cuts potentially being imposed on clients now and so in response to this the council organised multiple consultations (at least 3 for this single building consultation) events supported by independent advocates as well as 'one to one' advocacy to support residents to have their voice's heard at separate and convenient times for those individuals. Group events are especially difficult for those with LD to contribute to which is why at PB's we break up into groups where individual time can be spent with the client. As Beverley mentioned at the last PB, this is very much similar except on a dramatically bigger scale. With this in mind



Haringey Council

then, **will the same vital/necessary independent advocacy/need be provided to each and everyone of those day centres clients on a one to one basis in order to make sure that those being affected by these proposals get the opportunity to have their input into this process.**

At the time, Haringey Mencap had to produce easy read literature for the Whitehall St consultation with clients, in the interest of making information available to everyone despite their level of need, **will the local authority be making an accessible easy read version of their 3 year plan proposals unedited and what that will mean for clients so that they can be empowered to understand these changes and subsequently have their say on their own lives and their services?**

Elif spoke to me about how when she moved to Enfield with her mother she lost all her friends overnight as she no longer accessed Markfield Friday Night and Haringey services, she still feels the impact of this now. She said the clients in the day centre's have been mixing and socialising together for years and years, if they do not see each other in **their** day centres, when will they see their friends. Many of them will lose life long friends overnight. **What will you do to ensure that this does not happen?** These services are not luxury add ons, not one single client has had any control on whether they have a learning disability and these services offer opportunities that the society we professionals operate freely in cannot. e.g. choice, inclusion and accessibility.

In considering the proposal comment.

“ The overall aim of the service re-design will develop a range of integrated health and social care community services that will support social inclusion, ensure that people are treated fairly and will enable people to access mainstream community activities wherever possible, enabling them to lead full and active lives in their communities. “ page 13

Where is the evidence for this fantastical statement. As mentioned at the last HLDPB on the 10-12-14, there is a presumption by council professionals that the Haringey we live in will be able to absorb and provide opportunities for these clients now potentially left with no day service provision. The work of Haringey People First in terms of disability hate crime, transport and the media, already show you that the society we live in is not inclusive and filled with opportunities for people with LD. Everything has to be fought for. Please actually listen to those that have to operate in society and deal with the lack of accessibility and inclusion for those with a LD.

The big society being promoted currently is words on paper, nothing more than an ideological fantasy.

With this in mind Haringey People First members have asked **what extra/new/additional money and services will the council provide to make sure that people are able to access day time activities, opportunities and that ability to make friends?**



Haringey Council

One of the recommendations on page 12 makes reference to “*improve the availability of day centres and befriending opportunities for local people*”

How can this be dared to be written into the plan when it has been clearly stated that ¾ day centres are proposed to be closed. Also how does it dare to say that decisions will improve the opportunities of befriending when such proposals directly work in reducing opportunities to maintain friendships, please note the voice of Elif, an actual former Haringey resident on the affect a family decision to move out of borough had on her. The situations are directly comparable. Overnight, people’s social networks of support and friendship could be scrapped.

Also, can you please advise why the HLDPB E-mail that was sent to all members of the HLDPB to form their consultation response on has no reference to 3 out of 4 day centres possible being cut as detailed by Beverley Tarka at the former mentioned partnership board meeting, for those that are able to read and absorb information it would be more valuable for us to be consulted on all of the proposals as opposed to those that have been selected for highlight.

Question 3 states that given the financial challenges, what do you think of our objectives and plans for adults as set out on pages 10-13.

The group reject in total commitment that any proposals to cut services for vulnerable residents of Haringey should be overwhelmingly rejected. There is no justifiable fiscal or moral argument which can justify any sanction of the proposals to remove Day centres that provide vital, essential, accessible, appropriately staffed and places of friendship for the vulnerable residents of Haringey. We also fully reject any plans to cut social workers who are the frontline key holders and safe guarders of these services for Haringey Residents.

Your time and effort in answering these questions from Haringey Learning Disabled Clients and including their thoughts and feelings for consultation on these cuts proposals is greatly appreciated.


Many thanks,

Mark Heath on Behalf of Haringey People first member (Patrick Smalling)

Haringey residents say “no” to cuts to day services and “no” to a reduction in Social workers, please think about the affect of these proposals on the vulnerable people’s lives that lie behind the numbers and words of such funding cuts proposals.



Haringey Council



young people's consultation service
12 Middle Lane, Crouch End, London N8 8PL
tel 020 8348 5947 fax 020 8341 1684

Charlotte Pomery
Assistant Director Commissioning
Commissioning Unit
River Park House
225 High Road
London N22 8HQ

January 18th 2015

Dear Charlotte,

Re: Building a Stronger Haringey Together – Budget Consultation

I am writing to you in relation to the Budget Consultation process currently underway and the call for responses which closes today.

We fully appreciate the considerable pressures placed on the Council by the cuts in central government funding and are fully aware that difficult decisions have to be made about the size and shape of services in the coming years. We are very encouraged by Claire Kober's reported refusal to 'simply manage decline' and fully endorse the five key priorities set out in the Three-Year Corporate Plan - 'Building a Stronger Haringey Together'.

As a service dedicated to improving the mental health and well-being of young people and families, we particularly welcome the centrality given to prevention and early intervention in the three year plan and its stated aim to enhance health, resilience and self-reliance. These are at the heart of what Open Door aims to achieve in its own work with young people and families and we are already actively involved in the Early Help initiative and are optimistic about its future in the borough. We also welcome the proposal in the corporate plan to diversify service providers and to commission organisations which can deliver



Haringey Council

innovative and creative solutions. As active members of the voluntary sector in the borough we fully recognise the important contribution made by the sector and the value it adds to statutory provision.

Whilst we are broadly positive about much in the Corporate Plan we have some concerns about how the local authority will manage to balance what one might characterise broadly as a 'self-help'/'enabling' approach - which also envisages an increased role for volunteers - with the need for specialist services delivered by appropriately skilled professionals. This is less about protecting jobs, than it is about recognising that the multiple and complex needs of many Haringey residents require high quality specialist input.

In the Corporate Plan there is a great deal of emphasis on information and advice through which young people, parents, etc. will be able to identify their needs and make 'informed choices' about what help they might need and to signpost them. The obvious concern is whether there will be sufficient services to actually signpost people to.

Our concern about how this might look in practice is perhaps best illustrated by our own situation. For some years, Open Door has received limited funding from the Council towards its transitional service for young adults, aged 18-24. We managed to hold on to 45% of funding following the first round of budget cuts. This relatively small amount - £9,500 - has been crucial not only in allowing the delivery of therapy (by staff and volunteers) but also in providing seed money from which we bring in additional resources, more than tripling our budget for this work. As you know, this funding stream will be cut from April 1st. We have been invited to bid for a couple of Mental Health tenders in Haringey and had hoped that we would be able to develop this much needed service. However, the emphasis in these tenders is essentially on information, advice, education, sign-posting, anti-stigma, etc. This is of course valuable, preventative, early-intervention work and fits within the remit of Public Health. Amongst other things, providers are instructed to, 'enable people to disclose their mental health problems in a supportive atmosphere'. Our issue with this is what happens next, if services like Open Door are no longer there to provide specialist mental health support and treatment.

It might well be that the Local Authority no longer sees this as its function and that this belongs exclusively in the Health Service. If this is the case there needs to be clarity and effective joint commissioning. Failing this, a campaign, which we will gladly join!

I do not wish to reduce everything to our own situation but feel that this example captures our concerns as well as our hope that the Council will continue to offer support to organisations who can demonstrate effectiveness both in terms of outcomes and financial sustainability.

We understand that there will be further opportunities for consultation with providers and users of services which we look forward to participating in.

With good wishes,



Haringey Council

Julia Britton
Consultant Child & Adolescent Psychotherapist
Director

Health and Social Care Sub Group of the Haringey Forum for Older People.

This is the joint submission of Health and Social Care Sub Group of the Haringey Forum for Older People. We have a number of points to make. 1. it is unnecessary for the Council to push through a 3 year budget plan. They are only obliged to produce a 1 year budget plan. Given the possible change in central government from May 2015 it would be prudent to formulate budget plans for further years after the May election. 2. it is almost impossible to comment on the impact of this proposed budget when there is no detail whatsoever on the mechanism of achieving these proposals. We point out that there has been no usable impact or risk assessment made available. We would also point out that the period of consultation and availability of the document has been poor to say the least. 3. Nowhere are any transitional plans mentioned let alone detailed. For cuts of this extent to be viable and not adversely affect the vulnerable a transitional plan MUST be in place before the first cut is made. 4. Your strapline ' Building a stronger Haringey together' is completely misleading when your cuts are at the expense of the most vulnerable in our borough. Your five objectives in this area are totally at odds with your proposals - what you will get is a community of residents that will live healthily for less time, who will not feel supported to live independently and who will not be helped at an early stage to maintain their CURRENT health and well being. 5. This budget proposal does nothing to further the mental health of the population of Haringey. One of the main priorities of the Health and Well Being Board is to concentrate on improving mental health in the borough - including combating social isolation, instead your proposals will exacerbate this and other mental health issues. 6. With the cuts to social care in the Haringey Budget you will INCREASE the burden on our NHS services in the borough. It is already difficult to marry up the free NHS service with a means tested social care service. The result will be that Haringey residents will be unable to access NHS health services that they need because patients have not been assimilated back into the community. 7. In many parts of your proposal there is an assumed reliance on volunteers and the voluntary sector. Yet on the other hand in the same document you are slashing the voluntary sector funding by 50%. Utterly incompatible. You will need to fund the organisation of all these volunteers, someone will need to recruit these volunteers, they will need training and checks. This does not come for free and without the controls in place you expose adults and families to abuse. This is totally against your vision under priority 2. We strongly feel that your proposals are empty rhetoric reflecting adversely on the vulnerable of Haringey.



CYPRLOT COMMUNITY CENTRE. HARINGEY

Building a Stronger Haringey Together Three-Year Plan & Budget Consultation For Residents & Businesses

Comments & Replies from Cypriot Community Centre (CCC) including Cypriot Elderly & Disabled Group & Day Care Services (CEDG)

Question 2 covering pages 4-9

The larger community centres with the right facilities, e.g. the CCC has a Youth Floor, can be used to provide “After School” facilities.

In addition, they can be used for Education to run play schemes in the holiday periods. The latter used to happen at the CCC but this does need funding i.e. for CRB accredited youth workers.

Simple games and clever “fun” tutoring could be provided on site but external trips which would involve “risk assessment” responsibilities could be avoided.

Page 2 Statement”Extend the range of services on offer to cater for more Haringey residents, for example, by providing employment support help with English Language skills and housing advice”.

The Housing Related Supporting People schemes at present funded by Haringey Council to the B&ME organisations (which include the CCC and the CEDG – Cypriot Elderly & Disabled Group & Day Services who are “Housed” at the CCC) already provide housing and housing related advice.

The CCC is also inundated with requests for employment support, job information, liaison with our Haringey Job Centres, etc.

We would like to recommend the continuation of the funding for these services beyond 2016.

The CCC is also seeing a growing number of residents from EU countries, in particular from Greece, whom we should encourage to attend English classes. Ideally, these can be held in “community friendly” central points, e.g. CCC.



Page 7 Community centres can be used and seen as “attractive”, for After School Learning but would need tutors and overheads to be met by the Council.

1

**Building a Stronger Haringey Together cont.
CCC's * & CEDG's comments cont.**

**Question 3 covering pages 10-13 Objectives & Plans for Adults, i.e.
Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives**

Our Council to avoid using private companies who provide “chilled” or “frozen” for Meals-on-Wheels (MoW). This is because many residents needing MoW have slight dementia and there can be heating problems, i.e. how to heat food safely.. In addition, when one of our Muslim Turkish-Cypriot clients, who is also diabetic, ordered a meal, he was sent a meal which contained a whole range of additives and he was sent a pudding which was not for someone with diabetes.

The CCC's MoW service provides daily, freshly cooked nutritional meals plus a separate diabetic menu (non- pork to also meet the needs of Haringey's Muslim residents. These hot meals also provide a contact point for isolated residents, e.g. knowing that someone “cares” about them, and will report any mishap to the appropriate service or agency. Additionally, this provides peace of mind for family carers who work during the day or live a long distance from their elderly parents who live in Haringey.

People discharged from hospital into the community particularly need this support.

Centres with Drop In areas such as the CCC provide a 363 days a year safe and warm environment.

Day care services such as the CEDG which provides transport as well as other “personal” support and welfare advice and accessing, advocacy support, are vital to retain residents' independence within the community and support, where they exist, for carers. For the clients' health, both mental and physical, Activities. Exercises. Chiropody, conversation, reminiscing, etc. are also provided. Therefore, we would encourage and welcome our Council to continue referrals to the CEDG to maintain and support residents within the community.

GPs – the CCC and CEDG already have excellent relations with our GPs – indeed across the borough and, in particular, those who have language skills. This could be developed further.



Haringey Council

We agree that the NHS should be encouraged to work closer with us, i.e. the Council and the community – to help retain and support residents in the community. Dare we say this, but also financially!

The CCC is a One Stop Centre and, bolstering our advisory service would avoid residents having to shop around and getting “lost” in the process. In addition, in the CCC’s case, the residents also receive cultural and linguistic support and advice.

Other services, such as Housing, Police, can and do provide outreach sessions at the CCC. This could be further developed.

Question 4 – Clean & Safe Borough pages 14-19

Apart from providing a safe and warm environment through the year, the CCC has a good liaison with our local police and encourage them to call in whenever possible. In addition we have a good relationship with the Metropolitan Police Greek Staff Association.

We would like to see our Council using our local Cypriot Press and Media more regularly regarding information re council services and developments.

We would like to see more ordinary and larger litter bins throughout Haringey and especially in our parks and “common” areas, e.g. Ducketts Common.

The CCC has a contract with British Pest Control and we believe other establishments should be encouraged to do the same for the protection of residents/users.

Pages 18 Agree with these proposals.

Page 19 The CCC has excellent facilities and equipment for training and we would like further usage of our facilities by both the Council and the Health Authority. This also applies to

Question 5 – Create Employment Opportunities pages 20-22

We agree with jobs and targeting the Wood Green area.

In fact, the CCC is in a key area to provide support services in the Wood Green area. The CCC provides a “community friendly” environment to learn about job opportunities and vacancies. Therefore, perhaps “Job/Employment Surgeries” could be held here.

At this point, although we are primarily a Cypriot Community Centre, we welcome anyone who feels that they can benefit from our services and facilities and relevant developments, i.e. we are

Inclusive and not exclusive

Susie Constantinides Chair, Cypriot Community Centre



Haringey Council

Chris Stylianou Manager/Co-ordinator, Cypriot Community Centre
John Constantinou Service Manager, Cypriot Elderly & Disabled Group & Day Care
Services

Haringey Learning Disabilities Partnership Board

Dear Cllr Morton,

As members of the Haringey Learning Disabilities Partnership Board, we are shocked and alarmed at the plans for major cuts to services for adults with severe learning disabilities. Planned cuts include:

- Closure of 3 of the 4 day centres for people with LD/autism;
- Closure of Linden Road residential home
- Reductions in spending on individual care packages and residential placements for vulnerable adults of just under £10m (around a fifth of the budget);
- Reduction in the number of social workers by a quarter;
- Removal of council funding for daytime activities for people living in residential homes and supported housing.

We believe that these proposals represent an abandonment of the Council's commitment to protect its vulnerable residents. Furthermore, we believe that, if these cuts are implemented, the Council will be unable to comply with its legal responsibilities under the Care Act 2014. We are fully in favour of exploring new and better ways of enabling people with LD to live fuller lives and we accept the importance of promoting *prevention and early intervention* (as stated in the Corporate Plan). However we believe that the proposed cuts in funding for services will achieve *exactly the opposite result*. Evidence from research carried out by the LDPB (see below) shows that these budget cuts will make the lives of people with LD much harder, and put family carers under more pressure, leading to a greater potential for family breakdown, abuse and neglect.

Impact of the cuts

The Corporate Plan asserts that that the 'impact on residents' of cutting £30 million (a third) from the adults social care budget will be 'improved well being'. However, no evidence has been put forward by the Council to back up this wholly unrealistic assertion. The LDPB undertook substantial research in May 2014 into the views of people in Haringey with LD, their family carers, and staff who provide LD services. This research has now been published.* Our study found that:



Haringey Council

- People value highly existing local services such as day centres, social clubs, and supported housing. People with LD said they would be 'upset', 'sad', 'angry', 'anxious', 'lonely' and 'isolated' if services were withdrawn. Many said that cuts to their services would have an adverse impact on their health.
- Carers regard these services as essential to their own well-being, as well as to the well-being of the person they care for. A key finding was that cutting services that help carers to carry on supporting people at home would not actually save money - because it would result in many carers no longer being willing or able to fulfil this role, with the result that more expensive services, such as 24-hour or residential care, would then be needed.

Closure of day centres

Three out of the four centres providing day activities for people with LD are set to close, with the loss of skilled, experienced and dedicated teams of staff. The Corporate Plan asserts that 'community-based activities' will replace the provision currently provided by day centres. The plan offers no evidence that there will be capacity to support the genuine inclusion of people with LD in mainstream community activities in the absence of a centre from which this can be organised. We fear that these closures will result in more people with LD – and in particular those with more complex needs and challenging behaviour – being stuck at home. The resulting isolation and boredom are likely to have adverse effects on their physical and mental health – as well as imposing a greater burden on families and carers. After ceasing to fund access to day centres for people in residential care and supported housing, the council expects housing providers to support daytime activities, but without providing additional funding. Some providers may be unable to provide such services, and it is not clear how the council could monitor these provisions – especially in view of the proposed cuts in social worker staff.

Cuts to individual care packages

Under the Care Act it is unlawful for local authorities to use reviews of individual care packages as a mechanism for reducing support - *unless* there has been a reduction in the actual level of need. Yet the council is proposing to reduce by a fifth the budget for such packages. It does not explain why it expects the levels of need to fall so dramatically.

Driving down contract costs: a 'race to the bottom'

The council aims to drive down the costs of commissioned services to match those of the cheapest in London. There is likely to result in a 'race to the bottom' in terms of quality of services. The Plan does not give details of how it can ensure that the quality of care is maintained.

London Living Wage

The quality of care is intrinsically linked to the training, skill and commitment of the workers delivering that care, and decent pay and conditions are an important element of this. The Plan makes no reference to the council's previously stated aim to achieve London Living Wage accreditation. Has this commitment been abandoned?



Access to and objectivity of assessments

The LDPB currently receives regular reports from the carers' forum about the great difficulty families are experiencing in gaining access to social workers, and about delays in assessments (notably in relation to 'transition' to adult services). The plan to cut social work numbers by a quarter will only make this situation worse. We are also concerned that social work managers are being urged to have 'uppermost in their minds' the need to make budget savings, potentially to the detriment of their professional duty to the individual client.

Access to advocacy

We are concerned about plans to reduce advocacy services:

- The new contract allocates only £50k for all advocacy needs of vulnerable groups, including people with LD, mental health service users, and dementia sufferers, and their carers. This is inadequate to meet the requirements stipulated in the Care Act.
- The remit of the new advocacy support offer is narrower and more restricted than the previous arrangements. People will be unable to refer themselves but will have to be vetted by the council, which has a clear conflict of interest in cases where people are seeking advice in relation to challenging council decisions.

Provision of support for the Partnership Board

We would like to place on record our shock and dismay at the way the decision to withdraw the contract providing support for LD members on the LDPB has been handled by the council. The lack of consultation, lack of information and hasty decision-making have been distressing for all involved and have resulted in the loss of valued and skilled advocates. (We note that the Interim Director of Adult Social Care has made an apology to the board in relation to this matter.)

Consultation period is too short

We are concerned that the council has arranged a very short time for consultation over these proposals. A consultation period arranged over the Christmas break makes meaningful consultation with those affected by these cuts very difficult.

We urge the Cabinet to reconsider the proposed cuts to services for vulnerable adults, and we request the following:

- Clarification of the council's position on the London Living Wage.
- A commitment that all families and users of services are *routinely* informed of their legal rights under the Care Act before any changes to support packages are considered. They should be informed that reviews *cannot* be used to cut support *unless* there is evidence of a change in the level of the person's needs. They should also be told how they can challenge council decisions on care packages.



Haringey Council

- That the council provides (anonymised) data to the LDPB on the results of reviews to care packages, indicating changes to levels of funding and support.
- That the council commissions independent research into the impact of any cuts/changes in service provision on vulnerable residents and publishes the results on its website.
- That the council publishes data on delays to assessments of eligibility for adults social care, and sets a target for length of time from an assessment being first requested to it being completed (under the Care Act this must be timely and reasonable).
- An extension to the consultation period on the draft Corporate Plan.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Miller and Mary Langan

on behalf of the carers, service users and voluntary sector representatives on the Haringey Learning Disability Partnership Board

cc.

Haringey Councillors

David Lammy MP

Lynne Featherstone MP

* *'The impact of cuts in services for people with learning disabilities in an inner city borough', in Learning Disability Today: November/December 2014 Pavilion Publishing Ltd*



Older Peoples Reference Group response to proposed Council cuts

Dear Councillor Morton, and Councillor Kober,

I am writing now, to you both as lead on health and wellbeing and as Council leader, on behalf of the Older Peoples Reference Group [OPRG] which is constituted to relate to the Adults Partnership Board with the Council and CCG representing older people as users, and also now as joint partners in services. As you know I have written to you, Councillor Morton, earlier this month with a first response. I am now able to summarise below the results of discussion by the OPRG and of our views following the open consultations which you had at some of the sites.

Our position on the intended closures outlined is that:

A] **The Haven** must remain as the essential service which it is. You will have heard how people with mild dementia, and those for whom it is their main point of contact outside the home depend on the place, the staff, and the friends they have there. All the social and psychological research of which we are aware underlines the value of contacts beyond the home and of regular stimulation in a social setting, amplified by nutrition, for those in isolated and in depression inducing circumstances. As both family and domiciliary care are now so stretched, both through demands of living standards for many not rising [or actually falling] and eligibility criteria for home care and delivery being so limiting, we cannot see how closure of day centres can be compensated by short term measures such as re-ablement. Re-ablement is important but it is no way a substitute for day care and vital contact, as it is a specific service for recovering individuals.

B] **The day centres** for people with dementia, Haynes and Grange, must remain. They are literally a lifeline for many people. Again I am sure you must now be aware of this, having heard from carers.

C] **Osborne Grove** nursing home should not be run down as it provides for a vital residential care need which will not diminish no matter efforts which are made to provide more preventive care -- which we support-- as all the current projections are for more older people, and the clinical knowledge base advises that frailty and dependency in later life are increasing. There is also space under-used in Osborne Grove which can of course be put to good use.

D] **Staff reductions** should not be made as there is enough evidence that present staff loads are over-stretched and any further reduction will have a very high risk of losing important skills and experience as well as lack of direct care which needs to be provided by trained professionals. Family, volunteer involvement, co-working and space for re-



Haringey Council

ablement are all worth pursuing -- as the Priority 2 document suggests -- but they cannot be regarded as substitutes for funding to be taken away and the loss of professional input; what's more these are un-costed, without transitional plan, and any impact assessment on the most vulnerable people.

E] Older people are sometimes themselves **carers for** younger people, for instance **those with learning disabilities**, and the intended closure of three day centres for people with learning disabilities, is extremely alarming for people who are anxious enough about their children's prospects when they as parents or carers will no longer be alive. And as 24 hour continuous care is in short supply, the OPRG opposes the closure of Linden House and the running down of day centres for some of the most vulnerable people in the borough. We re-iterate the shock at this expressed by those in the Learning Disability Partnership Board.

F] Our position is that older people in Haringey have not only a right to life, but a **quality of life** -- and we take that as directly implied by the **Health and Wellbeing Strategy** currently promoted by both Haringey Council and the CCG, and the priorities identified within that. We understand these priorities are now under review. We see "empowering adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives" meaning that professionals and other staff will help do that, NOT that we just manage amongst ourselves, have more volunteers, and are commissioned at a distance. We are stating that we consider that this MTFs framework and the three year £70 million savings and cuts programme is putting this aspect of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy at **unacceptable risk** for older adults [and indeed others such as young people with the taking away of youth services].

G] Of the alternatives put forward we understand well enough why the Council should seek to develop **social enterprises**, and indeed we would welcome local social enterprise in preference to some of the larger corporate firms which now engage in domiciliary and other forms of care, often employing staff well below a living wage, or even minimum wages in some cases. **Neighbourhood Connects** is cited as one such alternative. But how can you put up a pilot programme well below £1million in funding as replacement for about £16.9 million cuts set out for residential care, funding for physically disabled people [some of whom are elderly], social workers, care packages, and reduced funding for the voluntary sector [£1.4 million there alone, yet the voluntary sector is held up as the future of provision]?

H] We also understand that the **Better Care Fund** is due to come on line, and that the Council will have new responsibilities under the **Care Act**, from April 2015, and more from April 2016, including rights of all adults to assessment for care when asked for, and the Council's requirement both to engage and make provision. There is as yet uncertain committed funding for this, and an election in the offing, so why now state how much you will take away, before you even know what income is coming in, and before operational costings of significant changes have been done? And under the **NHS and Social Care Act** there are new duties, particularly related to public health functions to be taken on, yet you intend to make savings amongst public health staff? Now that the Shadow Secretary of State for Health has said he will repeal the NHS and Social Care Act if put in government after May this year, and will take further measures to **integrate health and**



Haringey Council

social care, this seems all the more reason not to give up a £70 million reduction in funding now. In the year ahead there are bound to be some significant adjustments to all the central calculations for local authority funding and indeed the assumptions of less spending on welfare, so **why now of all times ask the most vulnerable people in the borough to give up much of their social care?**

1] There are other areas of these cuts, **not just in Priority 2**, which will seriously affect elders. Reductions in respite and in childrens centres affect grandparents too. Losing recycling points will seriously disadvantage those with limited mobility. The housing strategy needs re-thought. Enfield for instance have found a way round the restrictions on Right to Buy diminishing housing stock. The determination to make so much more access to services through on-line means does really disadvantage many older people further, and the moreso those very people who are currently not visible and cannot afford computers or the learning costs for use. We do not oppose better and more technology --- particularly given that tele-care and alarm systems are important for frail elders, and many of us do use on-line technology but that cannot be put forward as the only or main preference for access.

I am writing separately on the question of the economic and financial alternatives which the Council does not seem to wish to consider.

But at this point the OPRG wishes to point out the following:

1] You could **consider a Council Tax rise**, and even given the strictures put on that by current central government, there is a strong argument for people paying a little more, especially the better off, and not penalising further the poorer people in the borough by your only active Council Tax policy of trying to get moneys back from those who can ill afford it. We note that this latter has been challenged in a Supreme Court judgement. We also note that Islington Council is raising Council Tax and reckons to alleviate harsher measures by doing so.

2] You could consider a **one year budget legally now**, while we think you have not allowed nearly enough time for consultation on this one, and could also postpone the budget setting until March.

3] Constructing a three year financial course now, predicated on budget savings from the core elements of social care and some environmental care, is not only **morally the wrong course but financially unnecessary** unless your main aim is in fact to reduce the role of the Council to a commissioning authority with little or no direct provision.

4] There are **Reserves** you could use, and take more imaginative, and legal, ways of constructing the revenue and capital budgets so that core statutorily backed functions are not adversely affected.

5] You should spend significantly **less on consultants** who are not accountable and there is no proof of value for money for us. Co-operative working with residents groups and various associations in the borough on shared budgetting proposals would be much better.

And you could **approach the trades unions** about preferred ways of working differently with staff job descriptions and jointly with community based organisations.

6] There is **no transitional funding plan** and volume costs estimates to meet expected needs, and **impact assessment**, which should precede --- not come after, as at present -- any proposed large scale budget reduction.



Haringey Council

7] There are safeguarding implications for vulnerable adults you have not included in this framework, and we consider that dangerous both morally and legally.

8] There are better ways in which you could **use planning gain income**, and not yield to development corporation priorities.

We would happily meet with you or other councillors to consider both the impact and alternatives should you wish.

These possibilities assume you do not intend to challenge the current government policies.

We would prefer that you did challenge them on our behalf, and we simply do not believe that the threat of commissioners would be worse than you are doing. On a personal note, as someone who lived and worked as a chief officer through that threat in the Thatcher years, I think it is wrong for you to say you have no alternative but to do what the government plans for local government and to make Haringey stronger by doing it this way. That is frankly an incredible statement.

On the basis of the foregoing and such feedback as you have listened to in the very short time for consultation to date, the OPRG urges you to think again and not make these projected cuts.

Yours sincerely,

Gordon Peters

Chair, Older People Reference Group, and member of Haringey Older Peoples Forum



Haringey Council

Marcusandmarcus.co.uk

Dear Councillor Morton,

I have just been made aware of the proposed cuts and efficiency savings to the Adult Learning Difficulty budgets for the next three years.

We are a local provider of specialist services for Adults affected by a Learning Disability / Autism and Complex Behaviours. We currently employ around 230 support staff. We pay our support staff a minimum of £8.50 to £10 per hour. As an Organisation we have frozen support staff wages for the past 4 years.

As Councillor you must be aware of the costs of living within a London Borough like Haringey ie. Renting a single bedroom [what you would ordinarily refer to as a “Box Room”] costs approximately £350 per week.

Note that this is for a room within a house with no access to a Living Room etc. ie. all rooms including the Living Room are let out!!

A double room costs anything from £550 to £600 per month.

These figures are for Tottenham and not Crouch End or Muswell Hill. Factor into the above transport and food and very soon support staff would not be able to live in Haringey.

This being the case, the cost to travel to work would correspondingly increase if they live out of Haringey.

Know that parts of the Borough are already out of reach for frontline support staff eg. Crouch End, Muswell Hill, Highgate, Bounds Green etc.

Add to this, the recent gentrification of Tottenham with “City workers” has made buying a terraced house in Tottenham impossible for even civil servants – a terraced house costs around £500,000.00 to £600,000.00.

Whilst I appreciate that efficiency savings are necessary, decimating services to the point of no return or creating a climate ripe for a local “Winterbourne Scandal” would certainly not be in anyone’s agenda!!

I think that it is important for decision makers to be in touch with local providers and understand the true cost of employing, training and supporting staff. We recently organised an Open Day to recruit staff.

Typically, we would get applicants from the local Jobcentres. The Open Day in question was specifically set up to recruit staff to support a young man with a diagnosis of Autism and



Haringey Council

Complex Behavioural issues. The parent of this young man asked to be involved in the Open Day. We had 25 attendees and at the end of the day, the feedback from the parent was "...I would not employ any of them I saw today to even take care of my dog"!!! It was a slap in the face for the staff who had organised the Open Day and quite soul destroying. Whilst it would be easy to jump and label the parent as "unreasonable or difficult" – I am fortunate that I know this parent quite well and he is far from difficult nor unreasonable.

By the way, the proposed rate of pay for the staff was £10 per hour!! Factor into this a conversation I had with a recent ex-Commissioner in Haringey who told me that it was possible to employ support staff at the National Minimum Wage.

Whilst it is always possible to employ someone at the National Minimum Wage, would you like someone who cannot read, write or speak basic English, who is unreliable with their time keeping to support your vulnerable son or daughter?

Know that we are not talking about recruiting staff to deliver meals or merely dispense medication or to give someone a bath. We are talking about providing support to people with complex behavioural and communication needs, people who struggle with using and understanding communication, people who respond to consistency of staffing, people who struggle with social interaction. Employing someone who is unreliable, someone who turns up for work one day and not the next, someone who has excuses for being late every time – is but only going to heighten levels of anxiety and challenging behaviour.

Know that the people we support do not choose to be born with a Learning Difficulty or Autism or both. What some of them do know is to use a range of difficult behaviours such as screaming, aggression to property and or persons, self-harm, faecal smearing etc to communicate their unmet needs and a system that responds to this, using tokenistic approaches is a system that is not fit for purpose.

There has been lots of talk of the use of "Zero Hour" contracts within our sector of late. Typically, "Zero Hour" contracts give companies tendering for "Block Contracts" a competitive edge. My experience of employing support staff for the past 18 years is that unless staff are given Fixed Term Contracts, it is not uncommon for staff on "Zero Hour" contracts to place their name on the register of every Employment Agency going and thereon respond to the first employer who calls them offering the most tempting pay. Again, employing such staff to support someone with complex behavioural issues who needs consistency of staffing is only going to further teach them to use inappropriate behaviours to communicate their needs.

Whilst I cannot tell the Council what to do and what not to do, I am concerned about the use of "Block Contracts" to achieve efficiency savings. I am not sure if the ideas of Personalisation and Block Contracts are compatible at all??



Haringey Council

As explained above, I have been providing services within Haringey for the past 18 years. When I started in 1996, it was not uncommon for most people with complex needs to be placed out of Borough as there weren't local services to meet their needs.

The notion of a person being sent miles away from his or her family just because of their disability is not something to be proud of. I am aware that the Borough has tried at various times to bring such people back to the Borough, but with sky high local property prices and increased costs of living, unless we have a coherent commissioning plan and one that is sensibly funded, we are on the road to destroying and dismantling existing services and dis-incentivising entrepreneurship.

As a Company, we have been part of the process of making savings for the Borough eg. we brought back CN from Suffolk – saving Haringey about £2000 per week – this is just one example!

Should you wish to discuss the email above, I would be more than willing to arrange to meet you.

Edward Marcus
Director

MARCUS MARCUS

www.marcusandmarcus.co.uk



The following responses were also received:

Hornsey Housing Trust

As a long established housing association working exclusively in the borough and providing homes and services to elderly and vulnerable people, Hornsey Housing Trust very much welcome the opportunity to work with Neighbourhood Connects to deliver high quality services from our 5 sheltered schemes, in light of the closure of your day centres. We are currently operating a dementia pathway service in partnership with the Alzheimer's Society, which is providing support and guidance to our residents as well as people suffering from memory loss in the local community. This could be an opportunity to develop partnerships with Neighbourhood Connects to reduce social isolation through befriending opportunities. As a contractor providing housing related support services to residents so that we can develop their capacity to live independently in appropriate accommodation, we are well placed to review the appropriateness of care packages and consider alternative approaches. We look forward to working in partnership with Neighbourhood Connects.

Haringey Education Business Partnership

The Haven has offered work experience to children within the borough of Haringey for the past 15 years and is one of the few places left who offer this opportunity to give young people an insight into working and working in a social care setting. This has proven especially powerful for those wishing to do a Health and Social Care course and make a career of this once they have left school. We have also had good results from placing children with Special Needs at The Haven, with one student moving into the world of catering after being inspired by the cook at The Haven.

I understand that there is a proposal to close this valuable asset and would ask you to reconsider this proposal. This would not only be appreciated, I am sure, by the older people who attend but would be a tragic loss for young people who will not have the opportunity of a work experience placement at The Haven.

Haringey Autism

I view with great dismay and trepidation phrases used in section 17 of the documenting outlining proposed cuts in social care to be debated tonight.

To drive down service providers costs to those of 'higher performing authorities' is in fact to drive down costs to the level of the lowest level providing authorities, and is merely clever use of wording to disguise the reality of forcing providers to hire at minimum wage or little above that and expect them to be able to provide consistent, trained and safe staffing for



Haringey Council

our most difficult, complex and vulnerable adults in a sole working environment. All of the providers I spoke to who specialise in autism assured me it was not possible to do well or safely. I believe it is not possible to do, merely for the less scrupulous organisations to dupe the council into believing it possible at the tendering stage, then leaving the council to pick up the pieces when it goes very wrong.

This is a concern we have raised before with Continuing Care and Adult LD leads and have been engaged in an autism working group on where we have at length put forward our concerns regarding cuts for this group.

I am deeply disturbed to see this issue rising again with no consultation with the very autism working group set up for this purpose by Claire Kober.

AMBITIOUS ABOUT AUTISM

Dear Jason

I hope you don't mind me emailing you directly with Ambitious about Autism's response to Haringey's consultation, however, as Clare Bull may have mentioned, I'm not convinced that the submission sent correctly when I attempted to complete the online form last Friday. We had a very short response to the consultation which I have included below:

Priority 1

- The needs of children, young people and adults with autism should be protected and their access to statutory services should not be restricted as a result of budget cuts. The National Audit Office estimates that supporting young disabled people to live more independently can reduce lifetime support costs by £1million per person. Supporting them to access work reduces lifetime costs to the public purse by £170,000 per person, and increases the person's income by 55 – 95%. Cutting support for young people with autism is a false economy.
- In September 2014 the Children and Families Act came into force. This places a number of new duties on local authorities regarding children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). We are concerned that there is no clear strategy for SEND within the proposals and no real detailed plan for Haringey to be able to ensure that it meets the requirements under the Children and Families Act.

Priority 2

- Ambitious about Autism believes that cutting grants to voluntary agencies will have an impact on Haringey's early intervention and preventative aspirations. Smaller voluntary agencies may not be in a position to tender for contracts, leaving a gap in provision of services such as advice and support.

Please do let me know if you have any questions or if you need any further information.

Best wishes



Haringey Council

Rachel

Rachel Duffon
Director of External Affairs
Ambitious about Autism

From Autism Working Group

Re: Cuts to services for people with autism and complex needs in Haringey

We are shocked to hear of the proposed major cuts to services for vulnerable adults in Haringey, made public on 11 December in the Council's draft corporate plan and medium term financial strategy. These cuts will bear very severely on people with autism and complex needs and have been announced without any review of need. Furthermore there has been no attempt to consult with all those (including people with autism, their families and carers and staff in various support services) who are going to be affected.

You will recall that, on 5 November 2013 and 16 January 2014, you met family members and carers who were concerned about the use of reviews of care packages to drive down costs, without giving due consideration to the particular needs of the individuals concerned. In the course of these discussions, it was accepted that the council would not reduce funding without a comprehensive review of needs. It was also accepted that the further implementation of policy in this area would proceed in consultation with an Autism Working Group, formed with a view to establishing an Autism Partnership Board. Yet, despite engaging over the past year in a series of meetings with council officers in pursuit of these objectives, we now discover plans to implement even more drastic and wide-ranging cuts.

- **Care packages**

The council plans to reduce spending on individual care packages and residential placements for vulnerable adults by almost £10m (around 20% of the current budget). This is likely to result in pressure to transfer individuals to supported living projects run by the lowest cost providers – who rely on poorly paid staff, often lacking in relevant skills and experience, with limited training opportunities. This will lead to a high turnover of staff and a loss of continuity and quality of care. Some individuals with complex needs and challenging behaviours will be transferred 'into the community' – in some cases into the care of ageing parents and other carers. Contrary to the presumption that this will provide a higher level of care, it is likely to put more pressure on families, resulting in crises in which emergency care becomes necessary. This is not only a false economy, it is also likely to lead to admissions to 'Winterbourne View'-type institutions – exactly what the recent Bubb Report aims to avoid. Furthermore if these cuts are implemented, we believe the council will be unable to comply with its legal responsibilities under the Care Act 2014, which include strengthening support for carers.

- **Day opportunities**

The council plans to close three of the four day centres in the borough, including the one at Roundway, the only day service in Haringey designed for people with autistic spectrum conditions. This is justified by the presumed superiority of services provided in the community over 'buildings-based' services. But some people with autism (who may



Haringey Council

experience high levels of anxiety and present challenging behaviours) need the sort of consistent and structured service currently provided in a secure and familiar place with staff who have relevant training and experience – and who have built up relationships with the people using their services. Furthermore, there is often limited scope for community-based activities and people may find themselves seeing a succession of poorly-paid carers (often lacking in training or experience).

- **Social workers**

The plan to cut social work staff by 25% will increase the risk of people with autism being subjected to diverse forms of abuse and exploitation. Even at current staffing levels social workers are struggling to provide adequate safeguarding procedures for vulnerable adults in the community; the cuts are likely to make a bad situation worse.

- **Consultation**

We are concerned that the council's engagement with the autism community in the borough has acquired the character of a series of perfunctory and token gestures. The proposed meeting of the Autism Working Group in November was cancelled at short notice and no further meeting has been arranged. We were not even consulted about the allocation of the Autism Innovation Fund Capital Grant. In all these circumstances, it seems that these committees and meetings have come to serve a more useful service in legitimising the council's pursuit of the policies of austerity rather than advancing the interests of people with autism in the borough.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Langan Parent Member Autism Working Group

Michael Fitzpatrick Parent Member Autism Working Group

Martin Hewitt Parent Member Autism Working Group

Hilary Gedroyc Parent Member Autism Working Group

Vida Black Parent Member Autism Working Group

Julia Yang Parent Member Autism Working Group and Haringey Autism Branch Officer

Anna Nicholson Member Autism Working Group and Policy and Participation Officer

National Autistic Society

Sue Hessel Family Carer



Haringey Council
Labour Party policy

From Harringay Trader's Association

The HTA would like to comment on the draft Corporate Plans proposed for the next three years.

Whilst we understand that the Council now has to manage the decline on funding cuts from central government for the next three years, we want to ensure that priorities are considered and given to the business rate payers within the Borough, to help and support businesses both large and small.

We feel our members deserve greater transparency and support from the Council. We would like the Council to engage and work with the businesses to tackle any issues and help nurture and develop Town Centre strategies to deliver healthy and vibrant high streets and town centre.

We are in general support of the response submitted by MHTG and would like to further stress the importance of a business Czar, and developing a localised Town Centre policy for each individual Centre, to recognise the various destination USP.

Mr Shef Mehmet

Chair of Harringay Traders Assoc



Haringey Council

From Steve Hitchins, Chairman, Chairman of Whittington Hospital NHS Trust

Congratulations on producing this document which is much clearer in its vision for Haringey than many others I have seen for other councils and coming as it does at a very financially challenging time for your Council. Thank you.

Thank you for the opportunity to be engaged and involved with the Corporate Plan. I should say at the outset that we at Whittington Health are very pleased to be involved in this way and want to play our part in delivering this ambitious but achievable plan.

The comments here are mine and I haven't discussed them in great detail with Executive Directors but I hope they are helpful and supportive and they certainly match our developing approach.

I've read the plan and with special interest in the Priority 2 regarding health where this is particularly the case as you will see in our developing clinical strategy about which we will also be consulting soon. (The last of our public engagement events is at the Bernie Grant Centre on Wednesday 21st January at 6pm)

I was particularly pleased to see early intervention and prevention as well as the emphasis on working with the voluntary sector. In both of these areas we are also beginning to focus our attention.

For example we are now encouraging our Emergency Department to monitor excess alcohol geographically to report poor licensing practice. And also trips and falls by older people to see if it's poor street lighting, blocked by overgrown trees or broken pavements and report them to Highways. We hope that this contributes to prevention!

And on Wednesday 28th January we are hosting an event to which we have invited over 200 voluntary and community groups from Haringey (and Islington) to meet with us to discuss their participation in delivering our clinical strategy.

How to use the public health budget and measure the difference it makes effectively is a challenge. I have been disappointed but not surprised by the lack of impact on health outcomes that millions of well-meaning leaflets, posters and adverts have produced. Now responsibility for this lies with local government which causes me to be optimistic because much more innovation is likely from you than from the NHS!

I would be interested in exactly what you had in mind with the further introduction of technology. I think this is most likely to be successful when linked with volunteering support. I am aware of the increasing use of telemedicine by some Haringey GPs but as ever those in greatest need are often the least able to articulate their complaints especially by phone. As with many new approaches the people most likely to take advantage are those already following good practice in their own healthcare. We would like to use much



Haringey Council

more technology in our community services and are monitoring a number of NHS pilots around the country.

The plan is bold and ambitious which promises a strong future for Haringey. My one slight concern is possibly raised by the presentation in five priorities. It seems that each is more independent of the others than is of course the case. There are no barriers only links between poor housing, mental health, physical health and say, poor educational achievement and the quality of the local environment. There is a good attempt to address this in the draft cross-cutting themes but here I wondered if you would be interested in discussing how Whittington Health might become directly engaged.

For example Objective 5 on page 60 is commendable but the measure of success column reinforces my comment above about how ineffective the public health budget has been over the past fifteen years. Is there an opportunity here for an innovative pilot (eg preventing type 2 diabetes), targeted (eg Black Caribbean men?) linking public, voluntary and private sector partners (eg dieticians, food shops, leisure centres, district nurses, community health centres, pharmacists, football clubs, advice and community groups) in a big push?

I am talking to our consultants to encourage some new thinking. It seems to me that one experiment that might make a significant difference and establish a different approach to simply more of the same!

We at Whittington Health are keen and enthusiastic to play a significant role in delivering your corporate plan for the residents of Haringey.

Thank you again for the chance to comment and be involved.



Haringey Council

Haringey Children's Centres Alliance

Cuts to Haringey children's centres

On 16 December, you spoke at the Cabinet meeting to explain your proposal to cut 42% of the children's centres' already very constrained budget.

We are aware of the reality of needing to make efficiency savings and the pressing financial constraints and understand the realm of difficult decisions faced because of this. However there is a concern that the need to refocus monies has with it brought a hurried response and dismissal of the excellent and vital work that exists within the current setup. We are asking for clear indications to what alternative model is proposed and how this thinking was informed.

Within your speech Haringey's children's centres were presented as neither offering qualitative nor quantitatively valued services, with the suggestion that centres were not engaged in early intervention and that people did not use centres. We do not believe this is the case and we have responded below to your comments.

A significant concern is that we are not aware of any evidence to support this viewpoint. The local authority has made no meaningful attempt to consult with governors, parents or staff about possible changes until now, but the consequences will be far reaching for families. It has taken years to build up effective and experienced teams and develop the services that many parents rely on and that benefit the wider Haringey community. It would be an immense shame and counter to the first priority of the Cabinet's Corporate Plan to throw it all away.

We would ask that this letter is included as a formal response to your current budget consultation.

Participation

Regarding use and take up, most centres have very high rates of user registration, and high numbers of users. They have sophisticated and well developed outreach strategies.

Most centres have exceeded LA agreed targets in relation to registration and user engagement, the majority of centres having registered and engaged with a 'large majority' (65-79%), 'very large majority' (80-96%) or 'overwhelming majority' (97-100%) of all children ages 0-4 in their respective reach areas, which is fantastic and should be a cause for celebration. It is our understanding that the regular monitoring by your officers in Children's Services confirms this. To move forward we ask that if that is not the case, where is the evidence for this? And which of the 16 centres across Haringey are you concerned about?

Range of early intervention services provided

You introduced your speech by saying you wanted to talk about 'the way we're trying to remodel children's services so we have much more focus on early help, early intervention, to prevent the really sad cases that end up with us being very expensive for us, very



Haringey Council

difficult for families.’ You went on to say you wanted to ‘try and provide more support at an earlier stage, both from our services and from families and communities, so it’s building up families, building up communities’.

These remarks were concerning as children’s centres strive to and successfully achieve high levels of help, early intervention and support for families. Centres are engaged in this work every day, offering both targeted and universal services. To note a few examples:

- They work with families on the child protection register, attend child protection conferences and often provide the critical information and subsequent support
- They provide immediate support to families where there has been domestic violence, which including assisting in organising refuge placements, liaising with police, housing and social services.
- They help families who have been made homeless and have other problems. One example involved providing a safe place for a homeless pregnant mother of a young child. The children’s centre referred her to the relevant social care team and took her to their office for a meeting. The LA found temporary accommodation and the children’s centre organised basic supplies such as bedding, toiletries, baby wipes, food and drink along with supporting the family through the whole process i.e. not leaving their side until they were settled.
- They support families where there are mental health problems which often need multi-agency involvement. This can include the children’s centre assisting finding safe placements for children if their mother needs to be sectioned
- They routinely do home visits to new mothers and encourage them to use centre resources. Where there are concerns they act as eyes and ears for other services linking especially with health and social care.
- Centres provide drop in groups, stay and play learning sessions, ESOL classes, family learning, and where possible also provide early learning for two year olds funded through the government’s two year old programme. Centre staff also use drop in groups and stay and play sessions to engage in early intervention and early help with individual families. It is through the universal groups that families build their trust in the staff and are therefore able to make disclosures in a safe environment.
- Centres are used for contact visits where looked after children can see their parents, and often centres are involved in working with those families. As an example of this ‘on the ground’ work a centre supported an absent father to being to re-engage with his young child whom he had not seen for some time and introduce him to his baby whom he had never met before.
- Community outreach happens all the time, with families routinely signed up and registered.
- Centres use every engagement to encourage families to register their children for 2, 3 & 4 year old early education.

We acknowledge that not all this work is visible, and the work is done by very small teams indeed. Children’s centres took a 50% cut in 2011/12 but because of the dedication of the teams and the collective imagination of those who fought for them, they survive and provide these very wide ranging and hugely valued services.

We consider this work to be incredibly important early intervention.



Haringey Council
Reaching families

You said 'Also, whether actually having 16 children's centres, which are static premises, is the best way to help families, and if we shouldn't be going out, to where families gather, whether they're in supermarkets, or wherever they are, and trying to provide more support in their community. So that's what we're trying to do with children's centres.'

Children's centres are by definition fixed sites. When developed by the Labour government the intention was that families with under fives had a non-stigmatising centre to enjoy, and from which they could receive key services which helped ensure the best start in life for children in the crucial early years. This approach was at the heart of Sure Start.

The children's centres provide a huge and changing variety of services for families and the local community (see above) in positive and supportive environments. Most crucially, they are local and easily accessible – vital for parents pushing a buggy, who have very young children, need help, are isolated or want their young child to have a safe place to play. For parents with no money then the children's centre can be a real lifeline.

Midwives, health visitors, Job Centre plus, CAB, Future Proof money and debt advice, Housing Advice and many other agencies all use children's centre premises to offer services to families. There are baby weighing sessions, ante and post natal appointments, counselling, and mental health support. They are used by children's social care for contact visits where children who are looked after can see their families in a controlled and safe environment.

Given the huge variety of activities and services, centres are both cost effective and inexpensive.

Your comments could be taken to suggest that there is no outreach being done by staff in children's centres and that you are critical of that lack. We would ask you to share the evidence on which you base this. Our experience is that outreach is ongoing with great and continuing efforts being made to find and register the hardest to reach families. If it is believed outreach is inadequate has this been raised, and if so, when and what action has been taken?

Evidence base for your comments

We are concerned that you may have been inadequately briefed and invite you to and fellow councillors to engage with us to discuss if there have been problems, and poor levels of participation, to explore what steps have been taken to support centres.

You suggest that the work being done can be better achieved by going out to supermarkets. Outreach to families is very much part of our remit, but for issues of confidentiality and child protection it is important that more than one model of working is proposed.

We welcome the opportunities for such dialogue to explore together examples of work elsewhere where supermarkets or other locations are being effectively and successfully used in the way you suggest. Can you tell us if your team visited anywhere to see the



Haringey Council

practice? Have issues such as confidentiality, ratios, child protection, safeguarding and the need for families and children to have meeting and playspace been considered? Are social care contact visits being held in these locations? And has account been taken of the demographics of who goes to which supermarket? Has any impact assessment been done?

Childcare Subsidy

You also spoke about the funding provided for subsidised child care provided through children's centres. As this funding does not come from the revenue support grant – it is provided through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) - cuts on this budget would be **additional** to the £1.440m cuts to children's centres that you are already proposing. The subsidy supports wraparound and extended childcare provided through the three nursery schools and the five larger children's centres.

It is apparent from what you say, and the limited background text on the website, that you think removing subsidy will enhance childcare provision. How and where this will happen is unclear. Can you tell us if your team have done any modelling regarding removing the subsidy and the impact it would have on the viability of centres?

This, in turn, links to the amount of income generated through fees, so we would also ask what work has been done to research fee structures to inform your proposal to remove/alter the childcare subsidy. Can your officers provide the background work they have done on this which might support centres in delivering the quality childcare? For example, introducing sliding fee scales which are more reflective of people's income and ability to pay may have a very positive impact in income generation, viability and fairness. From the Early Help Partnership board papers now available it would appear no such work has been undertaken.

The childcare subsidy contributes to keeping families in work, many of whom are in Tottenham. What is your plan for the DSG funding to improve childcare for more people and have you considered the cumulative impact on centres of what are effectively two reductions, which together amount to almost £3m?

Haringey's nursery schools

Amongst its childcare offer Haringey is fortunate to have three nursery schools that provide high quality integrated care and education. In addition, these centres are children's centres offering the wide range of services related to the overall care of children to support children's growth, development and well-being. This full services integrated model is recognised as being very powerful in the findings of the House of Commons Education Committee (2013 – 2014).

These centres provide excellent outcomes for children and families. They also have the capacity to act as teaching centres and network hubs with fully integrated services. The nursery schools have established a training and development consortium that is currently working with more than 30 PVI providers as part of the Being Two project. There is a close working relationship with Haringey's Early Years team and the training programs



Haringey Council

complement one another. The strength of the model is that lead practitioners from within the nursery schools are able to provide peer-to-peer support and provide training to early years providers in the nursery schools.

The childcare subsidy contributes to the capacity of the nursery schools to be outward looking and to develop local network of early education and childcare providers and to raise quality throughout the system.

A small conundrum regarding the government's target for increasing places for two year olds. How will these cuts assist you in creating more places for two year olds to meet government targets? If you reduce children's centres, withdraw subsidy and funding, you will lose places. So how will you create the 800 new places you are required to provide on top of the ones you will lose? And how will you ensure quality and consistency?

Consultation

The online consultation on these far-reaching, serious cuts opened on 18 December and will close on 18 January. Taking into account the Christmas break, in reality the consultation period has been just two weeks. Papers from your Early Years Partnership Board reveal that these ideas have been discussed for well over a year, but there has been no discussion with either governors or parents. The meetings being held this week were only organised after pressure was exerted, and dates were sent out after schools and children's centres had broken up for Christmas. The Schools' Forum has an early years working party. A report could have brought to the Schools' Forum about the childcare subsidy since this is DSG funding and presumably therefore, accountable initially to the Schools' Forum. This opportunity has not been taken.

Neither has there been any report from officers or Haringey 54,000, yet the funding is complicated, interlinked, and getting it wrong could decimate centres and the whole fabric of their work. It has taken over five years to build up the Children's Centres and many more prior to their development to build the multi-agency integrated working on the ground. The cost of losing the staff expertise and relationships with families will be huge not just financial but in experience, continuity and skills. This way of working takes years to develop but a very short time to destroy. Once gone, it is unlikely to be rebuilt and a vital infrastructure supporting social regeneration will be lost.

We would ask you to reflect on this, and consider if you really think Haringey is truly complying with the four requirements for consultation as spelled out by the Supreme Court in its October decision regarding consultation in Haringey. At minimum we would ask that the consultation period is extended to allow parents, families, staff and users to contribute their views.

Plans for alternative provision

If these cuts are implemented the question then arises of what happens afterwards, and what exactly is being planned to put in their place. The cuts are being proposed in connection with Priority 1 of the corporate plan: "Enable every child and young person to have the best start in life, with high quality education". But making cuts will not in itself



Haringey Council

meet that priority. What alternative model is proposed? Where are the background papers which inform the thinking? What detailed plans are there? There is no such detail in the corporate plan, but there must be detailed plans which inform that document.

In order for a consultation on the proposed cuts to be meaningful, the Council must, **as part of the consultation process**, provide detailed plans for the alternative provision that is to be made.

As a Labour Council, have you taken into account the commitments by the Labour Party regarding childcare and Sure Start should they win the general election? The BBC reports Tristram Hunt saying on January 8, that 'We will increase free childcare for working parents with three- and four-year-olds from 15 to 25 hours, making a real difference to hard-pressed parents'. The Labour Party website states that Labour will allocate a further £800m to do this. Such additional guaranteed government funding would drive a review of the childcare subsidy and could lead to some very positive outcomes. Has any work started on developing some models?

We would suggest that this increase in the free hours, should it happen, would have a significant positive impact on the childcare subsidy. Wouldn't it make sense to model this, and look at the potential of a means tested sliding fee scale before agreeing any cuts which would harm irreversibly these centres. The general election is a few months away and childcare is a major issue so why agree destabilising and potentially destructive cuts now?

Labour Party Policy

Labour Party policy also states that 'We will renew and reinvigorate Sure Start, reforming the way local services work together to shift from sticking-plaster services to radical early help, to provide good quality support to all families that need it'.

It seems perverse timing to take steps a few months before the general election that will destroy the children's centres that have been at the heart of Sure Start and would make it much harder for a Labour government to deliver on its policy.

Concerns and summary

We are wishing to work together to address the need to reduce or redirect resources in an open and positive way, to have a frank and genuine dialogue that consults about possible changes and how the consequences will be far reaching for families.

Funding from the Dedicated Schools Grant as well as from the Council has been used to develop Early Help over two to three years and yet despite requests from the Schools' Forum to see an action plan about how it will work nothing has yet been forthcoming. Meanwhile, the children's centres are working with families and partners, providing valued and real services, building networks and continuing to develop and improve what they do. Parents are full of praise for the support they give. The funding for Early Help could be used to develop their work further whilst holding on to early intervention principles. We appreciate meetings are happening this week, but these do not bring everyone together. Given the complex mix of services within and between centres we think this is



Haringey Council

vital, and as governors and parent representatives we are asking for an open meeting with you, Cllr Arthur and any other councillors as soon as possible and certainly before any decisions are taken.

We understand the Cabinet is discussing the budget proposals again on 10 February so a meeting before then would be very helpful.

We look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible so a meeting date can be confirmed.

Natalie Merritt, Chair of Governors, Woodlands Park Nursery School & Children's Centre and Downhills Link Children's Centre

Andrew Sich, Chair of Governors, South Haringay Infant School & The Ladder Children's Centre and Stroud Green Link Children's Centre

Martin Mulube, Chair of Governors, Rokesly Primary School & Children's Centre

Judith Pow, Chair of Governors, Campsbourne School & Extended Services

James & Anna Jameson, parent representatives, Stonecroft Children's Centre

Yvonne Denny, Chair of Management Board, Triangle Children, Young People & Community Centre

Zena Brabazon, Chair of Governors, Seven Sisters Primary School & South Grove Children's Centre

Andrew Bethell, Chair of Governors, Earlsmead Primary School & Children's Centre

Asher Jacobsberg, Vice Chair of Governors, Welbourne Primary School & Children's Centre

Marilyn Francis, Chair of Governors, The Willow Primary School and Broadwater Farm Children's Centre

Melian Mansfield, Chair of Governors, Pembury House Nursery School & Children's Centre and Bruce Grove Link Children's Centre

Kaye Dunn, Vice Chair of Governors, Rowland Hill Nursery School & Children's Centre

Annex D



The Budget Process:

- 1.1.1 The questions and comments raised around the budget process are noted. Three issues about the overall budget process were prominent – the setting of a three-year-budget, the proposal to freeze rather than raise Council Tax and the overall consultation process. All the available evidence points to a continued challenging financial environment for local government, and all local authorities including Haringey, regardless of the result of the General Election with all major parties committed to deficit reduction. Labour's Shadow Chancellor Ed Ball noted on January 5th that he does not foresee changes to current spending plans for local government.
- 1.1.2 The Council has to plan strategically over the next three years with many of the savings proposed requiring significant long-term changes in the way services are delivered. A single year budget would involve significant uncertainty for staff, stakeholders and residents, and put at significantly great risk the long term delivery of services and service improvements.
- 1.1.3 Haringey already has relatively high level of council tax compared with most London councils. The Government provides councils with an incentive to freeze council tax rates, which means that if we had increased levels to the maximum allowed before a referendum (2%) we would have only received an extra £600,000 in revenue once the loss of the incentive is taken into account.

The consultation process:

- 1.1.4 In response to comments around the consultation process, it must be emphasised that there will be no significant changes in services based on this consultation alone. Where major changes to service users are proposed after budget setting, detailed plans will come forward and decisions will only be made after much more detailed consultation which will take into account all the options available to the Council, including Equality Impact Assessments. The current process allow us to consider whether plans should be developed, and if they are, allow us to take on board feedback and where possible ensure that future proposals are co-designed with the community.

Young people and families:



Haringey Council

Youth services:

- 1.1.5 Concerns were raised during the consultation process about the future of Bruce Grove Youth Centre. No proposal in the draft MTFS or Corporate Plan requires the closure of the centre. Bruce Grove Youth Centre will remain open. The Council will work with young people to develop the strategy for youth services and Young People in future. A draft strategy will be issued for consultation in March.

Children's Centres:

- 1.1.6 In response to concerns raised about the proposed reduction in the number of Children's Centres, it is proposed to allow for a longer period of consultation and engagement with users, stakeholders and parents who do not currently use centres to further develop the proposals on Children's Centres. This will also enable the Council to continue to work with the community in co-designing any proposed changes to the future operating model. Formal consultation proposals will be issued following that further engagement. However, the budget envelope is recommended to remain as set in the MTFS.

Pendarren Outdoor Education Centre:

- 1.1.7 The Council agrees with the views expressed that Pendarren is a valuable educational resource. While the Council has no desire to see this diluted, we do need to consider how we can reduce operating costs.

Children with complex needs:

- 1.1.8 The Council is proposing changes to services for children with complex needs, which will reflect the wider policy changes in the reforms under the Children and Families Act. We will conclude our options appraisal of respite services, including the residential respite offered through our in-house provision at Haslemere, and review our passenger transport policy. Detailed proposals will come forward for any changes that are made.

Adults and healthy living:



Adults with complex needs:

- 1.1.9 Having regard to the responses set out in the consultation, the Council has a responsibility to embed the changes set out nationally through the advent of the Better Care Fund, the Care Act and the SEND reforms of the Children and Families Act. This puts an increasing emphasis on early intervention, integration and joining up services around residents. In addition, the pressures on the public purse mean that we cannot continue to do things the way we have previously we need to promote health in all our policies, work with communities and transform our services.
- 1.1.10 Our experience in Haringey has demonstrated that people prefer to live ordinary lives in the community where they have the opportunity to have control over their lives. This includes people with complex needs.
- 1.1.11 We believe that the current model is not sustainable. In developing a three year plan we have been able to set out our vision, moving away from incremental budget cuts, to considering the changes that need to take place to deliver, within reducing budgets, equitable, inclusive support, for those who need services.
- 1.1.12 Haringey is committed to supporting the most vulnerable people in the Borough but difficult decisions have to be made because of the scale of the budget challenge.
- 1.1.13 People who are in receipt of adult social care, or who may need adult social care, have an assessment of need and the Council has a duty to meet assessed need. There is nothing in the medium term financial plan which changes that position. Everyone has the right to respect and dignity, and care packages that support this.
- 1.1.14 However, we have listened to what people have had to say and are now recommending that, on the basis of the consultation feedback, the proposal to make savings of £5.7m on care packages is removed. The Council will however, look to make changes to our reablement approach.
- 1.1.15 Promoting independence is a principle underpinning many of the proposals, as is the belief that vulnerable adults should not be segregated from the rest of society, but welcomed into and supported by it. Prevention and early intervention are central to this vision.
- 1.1.16 The Council needs to work with partners to intervene earlier but also understand the need to step care up and down as needs and the



ability of individuals, carers and families to cope also changes.

1.1.17 The Council needs to make money go as far as possible in supporting older and more vulnerable adults. When there is such pressure on the budget, to spend money on day centres that support only a small number of people with such needs is untenable and does not deliver equity and fairness. Our aim is to ensure that as many people as possible are supported to have social opportunities and support, but also that we use the money we have as wisely as possible.

1.1.18 The Council has said throughout the engagement process of recent weeks that reablement is not the answer for everyone. Where it has the potential to enable people to regain, and/or maintain, their independence, we will apply it. We believe that everyone has the right to choice and independence and it is right and proper that we support people to achieve that. We currently support younger adults with complex needs through enablement, which is a pathway which is about developing life skills so that people can engage safely in aspects of community life, and to develop goals to improve health and quality of life.

1.1.19 There is no suggestion that we will move away from assessing people's needs and ensuring that they receive services in accordance with those needs, but believe our assessment is as much about understanding people's strengths and potential and enabling people to realise that. We need to focus on early help and prevention to ensure people can live as independently as possible for as long as possible.

The Voluntary Sector:

1.1.20 We recognise the important role of a vibrant and diverse voluntary and community sector in the borough - and indeed, we commission numerous voluntary services across the council. Feedback has confirmed this understanding that local voluntary organisations are often well placed to deliver prevention and early intervention and to build individual and community capacity in line with our core objectives and across the reach of the Corporate Plan. We are keen to develop further our partnership with the sector, many elements of which are not funded by the Council, to strengthen our approach and to build on the many assets in the community. We believe the Corporate Plan offers a number of opportunities for further commissioning of the voluntary sector as we continue to move towards prevention and early intervention; we will continue to work with the sector to foster innovative approaches which are sustainable and draw in new investment to the borough.



Haringey Council

Environment and community safety:

- 1.1.21 Points were raised about the future performance of the street cleaning service which will be taken on board in any future redesign of the service. It is also recommended that a review is carried out on the future of the Park View Road Reuse and Recycling Centre before any changes are made, which would enable us to give consideration to concerns raised about the impact any closure would have on fly-tipping.
- 1.1.22 The Council will also continue to engage with the community around park events and ensure that, where events are organised, they are done so with the minimum of disruption.

Growth and employment:

- 1.1.23 The consultation responses on Corporate Plan Priority 4 (Drive growth and employment from which everyone can benefit) were wide-ranging, reflecting the different strands of work that come together in this Priority. The council was particularly pleased to receive feedback from some of individuals and groups who are centrally involved in the borough's economic life, including the Muswell Hill Traders Group, and to receive constructive suggestions on how the overall vision for this Priority can be achieved.
- 1.1.24 Some respondents raised concerns about a range of issues including the impacts of regeneration on existing residents and businesses; the quality and salaries of new jobs being created; and the importance of tailoring support to town centres and both existing and prospective businesses. These issues are important to the council and will be at the heart of our plans as we implement this. Unsurprisingly, other proposals were raised which are not currently part of our plans; some have already been considered and not pursued for a variety of reasons, but others have clear potential merit and will be considered further.
- 1.1.25 Overall, while there were questions about the detail of implementation, the majority of feedback gave support to the broad approach the council has proposed for this priority. The council has therefore made only minor changes to the wording of the Corporate Plan itself – to ensure consistency with the recently published Economic Development and Growth Strategy – and will address many of the issues raised in the consultation feedback as it develops its plans for implementation.

Housing and communities:



- 1.1.26 The consultation responses on housing and communities demonstrated how passionately residents feel about access to high-quality housing and what the council can do to improve standards across Haringey.
- 1.1.27 In general, respondents supported the council's ambitions to build its own homes and for more shared ownership options to be among those. There was also support for the council's proposals for a private landlord licensing scheme and for getting empty homes back into use.
- 1.1.28 Common issues raised by respondents included a concern about the level of affordable housing in the borough, a need for more social housing and repairs to existing council housing, and concern that regeneration would price people out of the area.
- 1.1.29 At the heart of the council's proposed Housing Strategy is a focus on providing more high-quality affordable homes, with a mix of ownerships and tenures to support balanced and diverse communities. The council is committed to building more than 100 social rent and shared ownership properties in the next three years on small plots of underused land, as well as exploring options with communities at larger sites, through our Housing Investment and Estate Renewal Strategy, to see what the options are to bring long-term improvements. We are also investing money into the Decent Homes programme to improve existing council homes. Housing management is important to us too, and we maintain high standards for our own Council tenants and leaseholders, and set that expectation for local Housing Associations and landlords.
- 1.1.30 The Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework sets out our commitment to improving existing homes and building thousands of new high-quality homes – both to support existing communities' right to a modern home and to meet housing demand.

Muswell Hill Library

- 1.1.31 The range of views expressed are noted and The Council will ensure, should proposals be developed, that the community are involved in decisions around potential re-location and the future use of the site itself.
- 1.1.32 On wider issues, the budget recommendations set out a commitment to retain library services across the borough.



Haringey Council

Marcus Garvey Library/Customer Services:

1.1.33 Concerns are noted. Through proposals coming forward we will give an assurance that any additional services that are delivered to improve customer access will not reduce current library space and we would ensure that any reconfiguration improves and modernises the space for young learners.

Equality Impact Assessments (EQIAs):

1.1.34 Every effort has been made to ensure that the draft EQIAs developed for the savings proposals were as complete as possible at this stage. EQIAs will be developed further as new operating models, service and policy changes are considered, consulted on and implemented over the lifetime of the three year MTFs.

2. Changes to the Corporate Plan:

2.1.1. The information below sets out changes that have been made to the Corporate Plan.

Priority 1: Children and Families

2.2. Targets will be set for each indicator, which will include indicators for quarterly analysis. This will give greater transparency to outcomes that are being delivered.

Priority 2: Adults and Healthy Living

2.3. A new measure of success has been added around reducing social isolation, which replaces the previous measure on residents living in their own homes and communities longer.

2.3.1. A new measure of success has been added around increasing financial investment into the voluntary and community sector, looking beyond council resources alone.

2.3.2. A new measure of success has been added around improving the health and wellbeing of residents, which replaces a previous measure around increasing employment, physical activity and volunteering.

2.3.3. A previous measure on volunteering has been strengthened to make it clearer that the Council aims to increase the number of people involved in volunteering.

Priority 3: Environment and community safety



- 2.4. The title of the priority has changed from “A clean and safe borough where people are proud to live” to “A clean, well maintained and safe borough where people are proud to live and work.”
- 2.4.1. A new measure of success has been added around improving the health and wellbeing of residents, which replaces a previous measure around increasing employment, physical activity and volunteering.
- 2.4.2. A reference to sharing intelligence and information has been strengthened to make it clearer that the Council will strengthen the way we work with communities to prevent and reduce environmental and anti-social behavioural crime.
- 2.4.3. A new measure of success has been added on improving the percentage of traders who are proud of where they work.
- 2.4.4. An objective around moving towards more sustainable modes of transport by making Haringey one of the most cycling and pedestrian friendly boroughs in London now has a specific delivery plan as set out below:
- Introducing a borough wide 20mph limit,
 - Providing more cycle racks,
 - Increasing the network of dedicated cycle lanes,
 - Providing more cycle training,
 - Improving signage,
 - Improving safety measures on priority pedestrian crossings, and
 - Providing a smarter travel campaign to change behaviours, getting more people to use sustainable modes of transport.

Priority 4: Economic Growth and employment

- 2.5. Measures of success around delivering growth and creating an environment that supports investment in business and jobs have been changed to below, as in line with the Council’s newly published Economic Development Strategy.
- 2.5.1. **How will we know that we have been successful?**
- We will have made progress towards our long-term aims that, by 2030:
 - The number of jobs in Haringey has increased by 20,000 from the 2011 London Plan baseline position
 - the profile of Haringey-based jobs changes so that retail and public sector employment are less dominant, and there is a better range of jobs, including a greater proportion of jobs in the more highly-skilled sectors, such as sustainable technology, digital design and skilled/craft manufacturing



Haringey Council

- The number of jobs per square metre of employment land has increased by 20%, reflecting a shift to more intensive and productive employment

How will we measure success from 2015-2018?

- Success in the Corporate Plan period can be measured through achievement of the direct outputs listed below
- 50 new businesses established in Haringey
- 1,235 new jobs created in Haringey
- 1,000 businesses benefiting from superfast broadband technology
- We should also observe a positive trend on the key long-term indicators with:
- 8,000 more jobs in Haringey, measured against the 2011 London Plan baseline
- The expansion or establishment in the borough of at least 10 knowledge/technology-led businesses

Priority 5: Housing and communities

- 2.6. The wording has been changed in objective 1 to “We want to see a step change in the number of new homes being built.”
- 2.6.1. The wording of objective 2 to” Prevent homelessness and support residents to lead fulfilling lives.”
- 2.6.2. The wording of objective 3 has changed to “Drive up the quality of housing for all residents.”