

## Overview & Scrutiny Committee Budget Recommendations

Line reference - Detail	Scrutiny Body	Recommendation	For Cabinet response / or Information request status
<b>1. Enable every child and young person to have the best start in life, with high quality education (proposals 1-10):</b>			
<b>Item 1: Early Years</b>	C&YP Scrutiny Panel	That the Panel recommend that no final decisions be taken on this proposal until after the review of provision and full consultation has been completed.	We will be carrying out a full statutory consultation on the proposals. However we are clear that we need to make changes in this area and believe our proposals set out an enhanced design linked to a locality model and Early Help.
<b>Item 2: Services for Young People including Young Offenders</b>	C&YP Scrutiny Panel	<p>(a) That the proposals be reassessed as a high risk and that a risk assessment of them be undertaken to ensure mitigation of any potential unintended impact on spend elsewhere in the system;</p> <p>(b) That reassurance on the balance between targeted and universal provision be reviewed;</p> <p>(c) That further input be obtained from young people on the proposals;</p> <p>(d) That the proposals in respect of services for young people be withdrawn.</p>	<p>We note Scrutiny's concerns; however we know that we need to deliver Services for Young People differently in future. Our Young Peoples Strategy will set out our proposals in more detail and we will involve Young People at that point.</p> <p>We will ensure that some provision remains at Bruce Grove and by linking the service to our Early Help model we will ensure that support is there for those who most need it.</p>
<b>Item 3: Public Health – 5-19</b>	C&YP Scrutiny	That the concerns of Panel Members at the potential use of the pupil premium to address	These concerns are noted. Our Healthy Schools Co-ordinator will

	Panel	public health issues be noted.	work closely with schools to support them to identify their needs in relation to the programme and particularly how the programme improves pupil attainment and helps keep young people safe.
<b>Item 4: Impact of Early Help on Demand</b>	C&YP Scrutiny Panel	That concern be expressed regarding the achievability of the savings included in the proposals.	Scrutiny's concerns are noted however there we believe there is secure evidence that a genuine Early Help offer will provide savings across the system and improve outcomes for families.
<b>Item 5: New Delivery Model for Social Care</b>	C&YP Scrutiny Panel	That concern be expressed regarding the potential risk of the savings arising from this proposal not being achieved.	Scrutiny's concerns are noted; however we have worked closely with Service Managers and Social Work staff to come up with a robust model and are confident these savings are achievable.
<b>Item 7: Special Educational Needs and Disabilities</b>	C&YP Scrutiny Panel	That the proposal be noted with concern.	Scrutiny's concerns are noted. However we are clear that there is much scope to make savings while offering a modernised service that promotes independence and personal choice.

2. Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives (proposals 11-24);			
<b>Item 11: New pathways for older people</b>	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	<p>The Panel recommended:</p> <p>(a) That a decision about the proposed closure of the Haven Day Centre be deferred until 2016/17 and that no decision be made until a review has been undertaken to ensure the Neighbourhood Connects model is appropriate for the most vulnerable day centre users.</p> <p>(b) That before proposals for the re-provision of the Haynes and Grange Service be considered by Cabinet, further information be sought by the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing on (i) transition plans and (b) the legal covenant relating to the use of the Haynes and the social enterprise proposals.</p> <p>(c) That, in respect of Osborne Grove, further negotiations are undertaken with the CCG to increase NHS contributions to support the maintenance and further development of this intermediate care centre.</p>	<p>The Haven supports a relatively small number of people with assessed needs for social interaction, reduced isolation etc.</p> <p>We are seeking to make money go as far as possible in supporting older adults, therefore spending money on day centres that support only a small number of people with such needs when there is such pressure on the budget 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, but also that we use the money we have as wisely as possible.</p> <p>The proposal to close the Haven will be subject to its own consultation. At present the high level plan proposes that there be an examination of the role of Neighbour connectors and their involvement in a transitional phase. This will be explored in detail during the consultation on the closure.</p>

			<p>With regard to the legal covenant we can confirm that the PCT had previously and now the CCG has responsibility under the covenant for making dementia support services available. There is no specification as to <b>how</b> they should be delivered. Adult Social Care will work closely with the CCG as more detailed plans are developed and consulted on.</p> <p>The Council is working closely with the CCG on the future model of services for Older People.</p>
<p><b>Item 13: New pathways for people with learning disability – Day Opportunities</b></p>	<p>Adults &amp; Health Scrutiny Panel</p>	<p>In December the Panel expressed concern at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How these closures will impact on the current users of these day care services;</li> <li>• How these closures will impact on carers, and if there are any other alternative sources of community based support?;</li> <li>• A loss of specialist staff and continuity of staff if the day care centres are shut;</li> <li>• The potential for long-term additional costs to the Council should customers be less able to access community based activities.</li> </ul> <p>As a result of these concerns the Panel recommended:</p> <p>(a) That both the Roundway Centre and Ermine Road Centre be kept open.</p>	<p>An alternative model of service delivery which is based on a business model will be implemented.</p> <p>We are keen to explore a social enterprise model where staff skills and experience and knowledge of service users are retained. All users will receive a personal budget. However it is people who live at home with parent / carers who will be used to set up and support the initial development of the business. The expectation is that providers will provide support staff to enable people who live in residential to access day opportunities in the</p>

		<p>(b) That the Allways Centre and Central Day Centre (Birbeck Road) remain open until further information is made available for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing in relation to voluntary sector engagement and the social investment model to ensure adequate provision of service, especially for those with high level learning disabilities.</p>	<p>community.</p> <p>At present the high level proposal is to retain the Ermine service as a resource for all client groups with learning disabilities including those on the autistic spectrum. Ermine Road is a purpose built resource with well defined physical spaces which together with a continued focus on mainstream community is envisaged will have the capacity to meet requirements.</p> <p>There will be a specific consultation on the proposal to close the additional three day service sites; namely the Roundway, Central and Always sites and develop a social enterprise model of service delivery. We recognise that there is significant change in adults' services, and want service users to be able to effectively engage in that change, and also as we move to more integration between health and social care to create joined up services. We are, therefore, proposing to invest £20k over 3 years in new advocacy and support to enable users to co-produce new service models.</p>
--	--	---	--

<p><b>Item 14: New pathways for people with disabilities</b>  <b>Item 15: New pathways for people with mental health needs</b></p>	<p>Adults &amp; Health Scrutiny Panel</p>	<p>(a) That the Panel’s concerns relating to proposals 14 and 15 (listed below) be noted by Cabinet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That concern be expressed at the achievability of savings to be generated by the development of the Shared Lives services as a social enterprise.</li> <li>• That concern be expressed at the potential detrimental effects on recruitment of staff to care for clients should levels of pay be offered by providers that fall below London Living Wage levels and that further information be provided regarding pay rates offered.</li> <li>• <i>Further clarification of how Independent Living Funds will be used once these have been received was also requested by the Panel</i></li> </ul> <p>(b) The Panel recommended that all support workers / staff who care for clients be paid the London Living Wage.</p>	<p>The savings are not only predicated on the transfer of shared lives to a social enterprise model but also expansion of the scheme to increase the number of placements available. Shared Lives can realise value for money outcomes of more than a third when compared to traditional residential options.</p> <p>(a) We are working with care providers to assess, monitor and evaluate the impact of requiring the London living Wage to be paid to all staff. However our current estimates suggest that the additional cost of implementing the London Living Wage would be significant (£2m to £3m for Home Care, £8.5m for all care types) and unfortunately the Council is not in a position to fund this level of cost without additional impact on its budgets and other services.</p> <p>ILF funding will be used within Adult social care. All current recipients of ILF users will be subject to a reassessment of need. They will then be offered the assessed support as a direct payment in line with our direct payment processes and policy.</p>
--	---	---	--

<p><b>Item 16: New model of Social Work and Care Management</b></p>	<p>Adults &amp; Health Scrutiny Panel</p>	<p>That concerns be expressed at the achievability of the savings proposed and that further evidence be provided that the proposed levels are realistic.</p>	<p>We are working closely with our Health partners and learning from good practice elsewhere. This saving is scheduled for year three and we are confident that the service integration programme will be sufficiently well developed by then for these savings to be achieved.</p>
<p><b>Item 17 Care Purchasing Residential Care</b></p>	<p>Adults &amp; Health Scrutiny Panel</p>	<p>(a) That further feedback on the approach to Care Purchasing would be provided to a future meeting of Overview &amp; Scrutiny;                  (b) That further information be submitted to the Panel to confirm that quality, effectiveness and good user experience can be maintained at reduced levels of cost for contracts;                  (c) That the proposals be noted with concern.</p>	<p>Any change to care packages will be subject to reassessment of need. Our QA division works proactively to monitor standards of care in conjunction with the CQC.</p> <p>We are committed to commissioning for outcomes as a vehicle to deliver quality effective care for people who use our services. Working within a consortium will not compromise this approach to commissioning. We are committed to supporting all users of adults social care in a way which maintains dignity respect and control as much as possible</p>
<p><b>Item 18: Care Purchasing Packages</b></p>	<p>Adults &amp; Health Scrutiny Panel</p>	<p>In December concern was expressed regarding the achievability of the necessary increases in the use of the personal, community, family and voluntary sector resources required by the proposal.</p>	<p>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</p>

		<p>The Panel recommended the proposals in relation to Care Purchasing Packages be rejected and removed from the Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy.</p>	<p>nothing in the Medium Term Financial Strategy which changes that position. Everyone has the right to respect and dignity, and care packages that support this where they are eligible.</p> <p>The Council has said throughout the engagement process of recent weeks that re-ablement 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.</p> <p>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 on care packages is removed. While the</p>
--	--	---	--



			Council will look to make changes to our reablement approach, it is recommended that we remove the savings that were originally proposed.
<b>Item 19: Voluntary Sector Savings</b>	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	<p>(a) That confirmation be provided of how fairness and transparency will be addressed in the re-tendering of services.</p> <p>(b) The Panel recommended that there be no further cuts to the voluntary sector.</p>	<p>The retendering exercise will be carried out in line with Council procurement rules and the Voluntary Sector Commissioning Framework.</p> <p>This saving relates only to one part of the Council's funding for the voluntary sector. The Cabinet is seeking funding reductions across its commissioned and directly provided services. Not making this saving would result in the need for further cuts to other services and the proposal is not accepted for this reason.</p>
<b>Item 20: Healthy Life Expectancy</b>	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	There were concerns as this proposal, as indicated outcomes would be lower uptake of preventative services (e.g. smoking) which may lead to increased risk of health problems at a later date and more costly health care interventions by health or social care services.	The panels concerns are noted. Our strategic approach to health improvement and prevention of poor health behaviours will focus on three areas for action: health in all policies (such as the recent hot food takeaway planning restriction near schools) that have considerable impact at a population level; secondly increasing our work with

			communities to increase healthier behaviours (such as the Well London project); and thirdly, are our behaviour change services provided to individuals or targeted groups – the savings relate to this third category. Increasingly, our focus will be on the first two areas of action, as this is where health impact is likely to be greater.
<b>Item 23: Other public health services</b>	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	That the Panel's concerns regarding cuts in relation to the monitoring of childhood immunisations and Tuberculosis advice be noted and assurances be made to ensure immunisation levels remained appropriate and TB rates did not rise.	The panel's concerns are noted. TB services and immunisation are the responsibility of NHS England.  The saving relates to our local support to the programme. We will work with NHS England to mitigate any potential adverse impacts.
<b>3. A clean and safe borough where people are proud to live (proposals 25-45);</b>			
<b>Item 39: Future of Wolves Lane Nursery Site</b>	E&CS Scrutiny Panel	That a report back on progress with the implementation of the proposal be made to the Panel in due course and that a visit for Panel Members be arranged to the site.  <b>The Panel recommended that the cut for Year 2 is put back to Year 3 to enable investigation in to what commercial opportunities are available including opportunities for employment for young people.</b>	Having toured Wolves Lane Nursery on the 21st Jan 2015 the Scrutiny panel was reassured that the proposed review would ensure that there was a sustainable future for the majority of the services currently offered within the year 2 timeframe. The Cabinet are not, therefore, minded to re-profile the saving.

<b>4. Drive growth and employment from which everyone can benefit (proposals 46-55)</b>			
<b>Item 49: Economic Development</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That the Committee's comments, that services which were performing well should not be outsourced, be noted.	<p>We are outsourcing the film service because agency provision can more effectively deliver the continuity of service and fast response times that film companies require at equivalent or lower cost to the Council than our current arrangements (one in-house film officer).</p> <p>At this point there is no plan to outsource any other part of this service although the final structure of the service will be designed so services are provided where they are best able to deliver the Council's priorities.</p>
<b>Item 50: Environmental Resources</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That the Committee's comments of the importance of maintaining efforts to achieve carbon reduction be maintained be noted.	<p>Haringey's commitment to the 40:20 pledge – to reduce local carbon emissions by 40% by 2020 – remains.</p> <p>We are exploring ways to develop the green economy locally, including working with partners such as Durham University on innovative schemes that will deliver large-scale carbon reductions while supporting our commitment to economic growth.</p>

<b>Item 51: Reduce funding for Alexandra Palace and Park Trust</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	<p>That the following concerns be noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced funding could jeopardise the Palace Heritage Lottery Funding Project bid.</li> <li>• The Palace would continue to be subsidised at the expense of other priorities such as social care.</li> </ul>	<p>Cabinet notes the concerns raised however, the current management structure at the Palace has made good progress over the last couple of years in improving the overall operating business model.</p> <p>This should enable the proposed reduction to be managed without jeopardising the Heritage Lottery Funding bid.</p> <p>The ultimate long term aim of both the Cabinet and the Trust continues to be to move to a business model that enables the Park and Palace to be financially independent; until that time, the Council as Trustee has an obligation to ensure delivery of the original objectives set out in legislation.</p>
<b>Item 52: Heritage Lottery Fund bid for Bruce Castle Museum</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	Noted that any options and implications for Bruce Castle would be open to consultation and presented to Cabinet.	Cabinet confirm that full consultation will be undertaken on future options which would feed into any resultant Cabinet report before any final decisions are made.
<b>Item 54: Cultural Strategy</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That areas in the borough which were often ‘forgotten’ be targeted as part of the Cultural Strategy.	The benefit that Culture can bring to all communities in Haringey is clear, and Cabinet will ensure that this is acknowledged in any further work.

<b>Item 55: Jackson's Lane</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That the Committee's uneasiness about the proposal not to invest in Jackson's Lane beyond Year 1 be noted.	The Council's MTFP includes funding for a borough wide cultural strategy to be produced. This will provide Cabinet with a comprehensive view of the current landscape and options for the medium to long term. It is, however, confirmed that funding for Jackson's Lane will continue for the three year period of the MTFP.
<b>5. Create homes and communities where people chose to live and are able to thrive (proposals 56-66):</b>			
<b>Item 56: Implement selective licensing across the borough</b>	Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel	Further to the information requested: The panel agreed with this proposal, though wished to express concern that there should not be any delays to the implementation of this proposal as this may risk future income and subsequent investment in enforcement services.	Cabinet confirm that the proposal will be implemented as soon as possible and tie up with broader strategies on compliance and enforcement. Current work is under way to establish the scope of licensing, options available, legal advice and processes relating to evidence gathering and consultation.
<b>Item 59: Early intervention / Prevention (Housing Commissioning)</b>	Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel	(a) Head of Housing Commissioning Manager should investigate further the provision of rented furniture within housing support contracts and if this presented an opportunity to reduce costs; (b) Plans for the Supported Housing Review should come to Overview & Scrutiny	(a) This has been investigated and very little furniture is provided for supported housing schemes, this is generally the tenant's responsibility while for communal areas furniture is acquired via donations or using tenant association funds. The

		(Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Panel) the timing of which will be at a juncture where scrutiny can add most value and agreed with officers.	Council has not purchased furniture for some years and this does not therefore represent a savings opportunity. (b) Noted. The timing of this review has not yet been determined.
<b>Item 60 and 62 Housing Unification synergies</b>	Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel	(a) That a further update of the unification process is provided to the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel at its March meeting.	This is an ongoing process with regular attendance at Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel. Next due at the 2nd March meeting.
<b>Item 63 Repairs</b>	Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel	<p>(a) That further consideration is given to prior to the disposal of council owned stock, particularly the option to demolish and rebuild where the present condition is uneconomic to repair;</p> <p>(b) That Homes for Haringey should reassess the age at which tenant responsibility for minor repairs is relinquished (this is currently lower than standard retirement age):</p> <p>(c) That there should be no reduction in the minimum lettable standard;</p> <p>(d) That Homes for Haringey should review the penalties and sanctions imposed on those tenants (and leaseholders) who wilfully damage their property:</p> <p>(e) that the proposals for Right to Buy receipts should be extended to the purchase of empty street properties.</p>	<p>(a) Any disposals must be appropriately authorised by the Council, and arrangements are in place to ensure that all options for the continued or alternative use of council owned stock are fully evaluated before any disposal is authorised.</p> <p>(b) This refers to certain ‘tenants’ responsibility’ work being carried out for older and vulnerable people. Responsibility for minor repairs is not relinquished under the tenancy agreement but there are criteria deciding when these works will be taken on by Homes for Haringey (due to age or disability). If a tenant is physically unable to carry out the minor repair, it is expected that Homes for Haringey will continue to take on the work. The point made</p>

			<p>at Scrutiny was around people having certain work done (e.g. decorating) when they reached the age of 60, rather than 65. This is being reviewed as part of an exercise to establish who needs to have the wider menu of repairs carried out, whether this can be tightened, and what criteria to apply. The review will make recommendations by September 2015.</p> <p>(c) This refers to the planned review of the lettable standard, which decides on which works are done when a flat is empty and made ready to let. There may be some reductions in pre-letting work, with the intention to achieve better value through initiatives such as offering more decorating vouchers, or carrying out work after letting (allow quicker move-in times for new tenants). It will still be a 'lettable' standard, meaning that the properties will be ready for people to move in. This to conclude by September 2015.</p> <p>(d) Wilful damage leads to a recharge being made to the tenant or leaseholder. In extreme cases, further legal action will be</p>
--	--	--	--

			considered. It is accepted that a review of the effectiveness of these sanctions would be helpful and this will be wrapped up as part of the wider set of reviews due to report in September 2015. (e) This is being actively considered
<b>Item 64 Garage Fee Review</b>	Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel	That Homes for Haringey review parking fees on its housing estates, particularly where these occur within an existing Controlled Parking Zone.	This comprehensive review of parking charges is under way and due to report in July 2015
<b>MTFS – HRA Revenue (page 122 section 14.2)</b>	Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel	Whilst accepting that the introduction of service charges for those in supported housing would be covered by commensurate rise in Housing benefit, further reassurance was sought on the affordability of such a charge to vulnerable people (e.g. will all those affected be fully compensated).	Additional consultation sessions will be held at each of the supported housing schemes. These sessions will deal with the individuals who may be adversely affected by the changes and will include assistance with dealing with housing benefit claims and other financial matters.
<b>6. Enabling (proposals 67-74);</b>			
<b>Item 71: Muswell Hill Library Relocation &amp; Item 72: Libraries Staff Restructure</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That (a) residents' concerns should be taken into account (in relation to relocation) and that (b) the libraries self-service system should be improved. It was noted that proper consultation would take place about the future of the library including whether to improve existing facilities onsite or move to another location.	Consultation on options and proposals for Muswell Hill library will form part of the overall project plan and residents and other stakeholders will be invited to take part in this and express their views. Work has begun on scoping and costing the investment required to improve overall technology available across all the libraries. The outcome will depend on a viable business case.



<b>Item 73: BIP and Item 74: BIP Commercial Unit and Organisation Wide Supplier Savings</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That the Committee expressed that outsourcing did not always achieve efficiencies be noted.	Cabinet confirm that currently the BIP proposals do not assume outsourcing.
<b>Draft Capital Programme 2015/16 and 2017/18</b>			
<b>Item 17: Marcus Garvey CSC Remodel of Library to accommodate customer service centre</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That the Committee did not agree with placing too many services into the library building be noted, and, that there would not be adequate parking.	Further work is being done on how to offer a range of services that make it easier for residents to interact and to do business with the Council, whilst acknowledging the value that many people place on existing library facilities and limitations in space.
<b>Item 33: Bruce Grove Station match funding for Network Rail project to support improved commercial offer at Bruce Grove Station</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That Network rail be encouraged to clean Bruce grove Station.	Officers are in ongoing dialogue with Network Rail about the state of the station.