

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Budget Scrutiny Recommendations

Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel - Priority 1					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Recommendation	Cabinet Response Required	Cabinet Response
PC2	Children in Need of Support and Protection and Children in Care, Quality Assurance, Early Help	Further details of the proposed budget reductions arising from the rationalisation of the management of Children's Centres	None.	No	
PC2	<p>Reduce Operational Costs</p> <p>a) De-designing vacant social worker posts where support could be delivered by family support workers.</p> <p>e) Reducing the costs of running children's centres through reducing the management costs.</p>	<p>Further assurances were requested about whether proposals for the use of family support workers and reducing the management costs of running children's centres were realistic. Further information was also requested about the potential risks involved.</p> <p>The Committee were concerned about the level of risk that this could expose the Council to and were also concerned about the impact of reducing the number of managers and on standards of care.</p>	Further information requested.	Yes	<p>De-designating two vacant social worker posts in the No Recourse to Public Funds team is low risk, and the impact to families will be positive. Ongoing statutory social work support is seldom required as families are able to care for their children appropriately. There will continue to be social workers in the team who will complete an initial assessment of the family and if there are issues of significant harm or child protection there is a pathway to stepping cases back up for a social work intervention. The delivery of support by non-social work qualified staff is a very common approach in most other authorities.</p> <p>The Children's Centre re-structure does not reduce the number of posts but reduces costs as a result of a review of the posts and</p>

## Appendix 7

					<p>the way the operate.</p> <p>The revised arrangements for the management structure will strengthen consistency of approach across the three centres as each of the managers will have their areas of specialist focus such as childcare. This will drive continued improvement.</p>
PC3	<p>Reduce the cost of placements.</p> <p>e) Ensure that children with Special Educational Needs and disabilities placed in out of borough schools are receiving independent travel training to encourage independence where appropriate.</p>	<p>Concerns were raised about whether this saving was achievable and further information was requested about the potential risks involved in a reduction of the transport provision for vulnerable children.</p>	<p>Further information requested.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Generally, travel training is both important for good adulthood outcomes and long term cost savings and should be a focus for all young people with disabilities in the appropriate age groups (e.g. from year 6 and upwards where possible and definitely from year 10) unless there is a risk assessment that indicates that a child cannot have a travel buddy or be travel trained.</p> <p>Young people state that independent travel is their most commonly occurring high priority request if you ask what they want to do.</p> <p>Conversely this is often an outcome that parents feel naturally nervous about. To counteract this, we have introduced the summer travel training scheme, which forms part of the respite offer, and also travel buddies as an interim offer where appropriate.</p>

## Appendix 7

Capital	Fortismere School	<p>Further details of the proposal, including the amount of funding that would be required next year.</p> <p>The Committee requested that further information come back to OSC as well as Housing and Children's Panels.</p>	There wasn't enough information available to scrutinise this proposal.	No	
<b>Comments:</b>					
Panel Members stated that they felt that the proposals within the MTFs appeared to be achievable and realistic. They also welcomed the transparent and collaborative approach and the income generation that was proposed.					
<b>Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel – Priority 2</b>					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Recommendation	Cabinet Response Required	Cabinet Response
PA1	Charging for Managed Account	<p>The Equality Impact Assessment on the introduction of charges for the administration of Appointeeship clients to be provided. Further information to be provided on the proposed annual charges compared to the equivalent annual charges levied by broadly comparable local authorities. This should include any known evidence about whether charges by other local authorities have caused any financial harm to individuals.</p>	None.	No	

## Appendix 7

PA1	Charging for Managed Account	Clarification was requested on the cost of the charges involved.	Further information requested.	Yes.	See below
PA1	Charging for Managed Account		The Committee requests that Cabinet reconsider charges for Appointeeship clients, and the suitability of making savings in this area. It was felt that the cost of charges was very high and that these would disproportionately be met by residents receiving benefits.	Yes	<p>For Appointeeships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only clients with savings will be charged. A maximum charge of £650 per year for those people with over £16,000 savings.</li> <li>• If client has no savings then the fee will not be applied.</li> <li>• It is proposed that those with savings below £1,000 will not be charged.</li> <li>• The implementation of the charge will be monitored so that people are not put at risk by the introduction of the charge.</li> <li>• The proposal is subject to consultation with service users and their representatives.</li> <li>• Safeguards exist to ensure no hardship is experienced as a result of these charges.</li> </ul> <p>For Self Funders:</p> <p>An individual has already been financially assessed to fund the cost of their own care, therefore they would have the financial means to fund a management fee.</p>

## Appendix 7

PA5	Care Negotiation Activity and Adults Care Packages	<p>Figures on the projected savings from this proposal to be clarified in writing.</p> <p>That information on potential risks to this proposal, including modelling of potential savings and the number of clients be provided.</p>	None.	No	
PA5	Care Negotiation Activity and Adults Care Packages	<p>Further assurances were requested about the potential impact on the level of care received by residents. The Committee requested further information about the risks and mitigations involved, as these were not picked up in the information provided to OSC. Once those savings have been made, how will people in semi-independent care and supported living settings be assessed - to ensure that they are in the correct setting and are receiving the care provision detailed within their care package?</p>	Further information requested.	Yes	<p>2019/20 = £116k 2020/21 = £344k Total = £460k</p> <p>The risks to this proposal are related to non-achievement of savings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In negotiation, the levels of care commissioned and delivered are found to be in balance</li> <li>• Needs are found to have changed, with additional costs being identified to meet these needs</li> <li>• Savings made are marginal rather than fundamentally addressing the cost of the package</li> </ul> <p>All client's needs are reviewed annually as part of the statutory review process. Support packages may be amended if the client's needs have changed.</p>

## Appendix 7

PA6	Transfer of High Cost Day Opportunities	That full details of the capital costs associated with this proposal be brought back to OSC during the 2020/21 budget setting process.	That consideration be given to the potential risk of the savings not being delivered to the amount and/or timescale projected. This was due to concerns that some service users and their carers/families may be deterred from returning to services in Borough because of a perception that this was being carried out as part of a budget reduction process with lower cost services. Consideration should be given to addressing these concerns.	Yes	<p>Any re-design process is complex and the possibility of delay or slippage has been built in by not assuming any savings until 2020/2021 at the earliest.</p> <p>The co-design group being set up for this project will include users, carers and staff. This group will have the opportunity to raise and challenge the perception that the main driver for this project is cost. Historically, some out of borough packages are high cost and without local competition may remain higher than necessary. The redesign will focus on ensuring that services commissioned locally will meet identified levels of need.</p> <p>The co-design process will consider issues in the round including: value for money, reduced travel time, increasing the number of local day opportunity places in borough, increasing choice, improving outcomes, increasing variety. Engaging with users and carers early on should mitigate the potential risk of the proposal especially given that anxiety in carers has in the past unnecessarily been raised by other persons/groups not directly involved.</p>
-----	---	--	---	-----	--

## Appendix 7

PA7	Sexual Health Projection	Further information requested from about how residents from hard to reach communities will be given the information around self-testing. How will the uptake of these services be measured?	Further information requested.	Yes.	Haringey has a variety of ways to self test; pharmacies, on line, outreach service. Hard to reach communities generally come to know about the services via Embrace UK or sexual health outreach service, through seeing a poster in the pharmacy or via the London HIV awareness campaign (do it London). We have a strong network of professionals who are trained up to talk about sexual health i.e. homeless agencies and BUBIC, faith leaders. Young people are likely to access self testing via partners like youth services who deliver the C Card scheme and via web-searching.
General Query	<p>Care Package Savings.</p> <p>There were concerns about the carry forward of £2.4m of savings from 2018/19 in relation to care packages, which was in addition to a further £2m saving identified for 2019/20.</p>	<p>Concerns were expressed about the amount of money being taken out of this area. The Committee requested assurance from Cabinet about how these savings would be achieved and the feasibility of making those savings in light the amount of carried over savings from 2018/19.</p>	Further information requested.	Yes.	<p>Priority 2 have proposed total savings of £4.4m in 2019/20, made up of –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £2.4m ASC care packages – joint savings plans are being developed by heads of service for Adults, Learning Disabilities and Mental Health</li> </ul> <p>This is not a carry forward of unachieved savings but is pre-agreed saving from the previous MTFS.</p> <p>The new savings identified £2m for 2019/20 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £0.67m Public Health</li> <li>• £0.60m Housing-related Support</li> <li>• £0.12m charging for managed accounts</li> <li>• £0.14m fast-tracking financial assessments</li> <li>• £0.18m capitalisation of CAS</li> </ul>

## Appendix 7

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £0.12m in-house negotiator</li> <li>• £0.18m other ASC</li> </ul>
General Query	That the impact of savings were being considered at a partnership level.	Assurances were requested from Cabinet that discussions were taking place with partners at a strategic level to ensure that joint funding arrangements with the CCG were fully considered. Assurances requested that any potential reduction in services wouldn't be disproportionately met by the Council.	Going forward, where CCG funding decisions impact on Adult Social Care or have a joint funding involvement, then this CCG budget will be scrutinised alongside the Councils budget by the Adults and Health Budget Scrutiny Monitoring meetings and then by OSC Budget Scrutiny.	Yes	<p>We have a long history of working together to ensure that the financial pressures the public sector faces do not adversely impact on our residents.</p> <p>Our joint working (e.g. through the Better Care Fund Schemes) has not only helped reduce budgets it has also seen improvements in outcomes – for example the number of people being delayed in hospital has reduced considerably.</p> <p>There are major challenges ahead but our joint work on areas such as Community First, Locality Based Provision and Discharge to Assess, all seeks manage joint budget pressures whilst improving the outcomes for our residents.</p> <p>On a practical level we have joint budget and savings plans with the CCG to ensure a joined up and cooperative approach to reducing costs, delivering VFM services and managing preventable demand.</p> <p>Any specific information required from the</p>

## Appendix 7

					CCG should be addressed to the CCG, Director of Commissioning, Clare Henderson.
In relation to the capital budget, the relevant finance officer was not available at the panel meeting so instead there were a number of questions from the panel that officers agreed to follow up.					
Capital Scheme 213	Canning Crescent Assisted Living	Does the £6.7m allocated for this scheme include the CCG funding or is the CCG funding additional to this?	Further information requested.	Yes	The £6.7m is the estimated cost of completing the conversion works. This will in part be funded by the CCG grant of £0.95m, so it includes the CCG funding.
Capital Scheme 214	Osborne Grove Nursing Home	How has the allocation of £10.75m for this scheme been arrived at given that the feasibility study has not yet been completed?  £200k of capital spend is identified for 2018/19 on the supplementary information sheet. What was this for?	Further information requested.	Yes	To derive a budget estimate an estimated per square metre rate for construction was used and it was multiplied by an estimated number of square metres.  The £200k is to cover the cost of the feasibility study into the options for the OGHN.
Capital Scheme 215	Hornsey Town Hall	How many affordable housing units will be purchased, will these be managed by Homes for Haringey and on what terms is the affordable housing available to people?  What is the breakdown of bedrooms for each of these	Further information requested.	Yes	Eleven (11) affordable homes will be purchased. They will be managed by Homes for Haringey, and we are currently considering whether they will be let as general needs Council homes or as specialist supported housing. The breakdown of the homes is one 3 bed flat and ten 1 bed flats; this mix is because of the complexities of designing within the

## Appendix 7

		housing units?			confines of the listed building and already has full planning permission.
--	--	----------------	--	--	---

Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel - Priority 3					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Recommendation	Cabinet Response Required	Cabinet Response
PL1	Additional HMO Licensing Scheme for HMO	The Panel sought assurances from Cabinet that the additional HMO licensing scheme would be tenant focused and that the Council would monitor its impact on tenants, such as eviction rates and homelessness.	Assurances requested.	Yes	<p>The main aim of Additional HMO Licensing is to provide a safe, well managed environment for tenants to live. It is not the aim of licensing to displace tenants from their homes and there is no evidence from our previous schemes within Haringey or from working along-side borough partners who have scheme in place, that this is a concerning outcome of such schemes.</p> <p>We always try to work with our landlords when a situation arises that may cause a tenant or tenants to lose their tenancy. This only happens in cases where the tenant is living in overcrowded conditions or does not have adequate space or amenities to live comfortably and safely in the HMO. In these circumstances the tenant is usually being exploited by the landlord and it is in the best interest of</p>

## Appendix 7

					<p>the tenant/s that we apply our standards for such accommodation. In these cases a tenant would never be forced to move with no notice (unless they were at imminent risk and then there would be measures in place with our own services to assist with alternative accommodation). The landlord is always advised that a tenant can remain until the natural end of their tenancy to prevent unnecessary sec 21 eviction proceeding and to give tenants time to find alternative accommodation.</p> <p>In many situations the officers will work with landlords to try and reconfigure existing properties to continue to accommodate the number tenants that they have residing at a property.</p> <p>Through connected communities funding we have employed two housing needs officers whose role it will be to work alongside landlords and tenants to provide early interventions such as housing advice, guidance and legal advocacy when needed, to help to maintain/ sustain tenancies. These officers will support tenants who face difficulties with their tenancies (can't pay their rent, having problems with other tenants etc) and signpost if needed to other services for support. They will support landlords who have difficult tenants to offer mediation</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

## Appendix 7

					and education to tenants who maybe causing anti-social behaviour or nuisance to prevent landlords evicting in order to solve the problem
PL1	Additional HMO Licensing Scheme for HMO	Further information was requested on how the Council would meet the stated income targets for the HMO licensing scheme, including a breakdown of the financial profiling used.	None.	No	
PL11	Flexible Police resources		That Cabinet reconsider the proposed saving in relation to flexible police resources. In particular, consideration should be given to whether this would have a disproportionate impact on the east of the borough, which had a higher number of victims of crime. Cabinet should also consider whether this proposal was reflective of the fairness agenda. The Panel felt that this saving proposal was contrary to the priorities identified in	Yes	The Flexible Police resources is a police partnership asset that can be specifically targeted, to areas of greatest need in terms of the impact on Haringey's residents and businesses. It can be considered that this proposal would have a disproportionate impact on the east of the borough, as the east has higher numbers of victims and perpetrators of crime. The Flexible Police resource represents 0.5% (6) of the total number of police officers (1200) in the North Area Basic Command Unit (Haringey & Enfield).

## Appendix 7

			the new Borough Plan around tackling crime. Fear of crime was one of the main issues identified by residents as part of the consultation in response to the new Borough Plan.		
Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel - Priorities 4 & 5					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Recommendation	Cabinet Response Required	Cabinet Response
EC2	Reduction in consultancy budget.	More details on how much is spent on consultants altogether, including through capital costs.	That consideration be given to further reducing consultancy costs and that senior managers should always examine whether functions can be carried out another way rather than through consultants.	Yes	Across Housing, Regeneration and Planning, officers will only ever use consultants where it is the most appropriate and cost-effective means to achieve our objectives, for example because a particular professional specialist service is required, or if the requirement is one-off or short-term in nature. In all cases, officers ensure that consultant expenditure is being capitalised or reallocated wherever possible
EC5	Outdoor media advertising	<p>More details on the cost of the consultancy work that has been carried out on this proposal.</p> <p>Information on how much other boroughs had been able to raise through similar outdoor advertising initiatives. The consultants have been carrying out a</p>	<p>That consideration be given to whether it would be possible to obtain some advertising revenue in 2019/20. (Income is currently projected from 2020/21 onwards)</p> <p>That consideration be given to avoiding</p>	Yes	A review by the Strategic Property Team has been completed of the potential for outdoor media income generation from our property estate. The income generation from regularising illegitimate advertising by tenants may yield minor additional revenue in 2019-20. The potential for major income generation from new advertising is not significant and only a handful of sites are thought to be suitable. The additional income would not be

## Appendix 7

		benchmarking study on this with findings expected to be available in January.	excessive street clutter when implementing the scheme.  That Cabinet should also bring forward a robust policy on the nature of advertising that is permitted through Council controlled advertising space. The Council should follow the Mayor of London's policy around advertising, which prohibits junk food advertising.		realised until 2020-21. The income generation target is similar to that achieved by other North London Boroughs but is not comparable with Central London boroughs
Capital Scheme 513	Muswell Hill Flats	N/A	That the flats should be used for social rent and not shared ownership as currently proposed.	Yes	The homes on 54/56 Muswell Hill cannot be changed to social rent – the possibility of this was previously investigated at the request of the new Administration. The Council bought them two years ago on a long lease of 999 years and it is a stipulation in that lease that they be used for shared ownership
N/A	N/A (General query)	More details on the overall Housing, Regeneration & Planning staffing budget.	None.	No	
N/A	General query – Commercial Property Portfolio.	More details on the current void rate and rental income from properties in the commercial portfolio.	There was the potential for significant expansion of the income stream from	Yes	The existing MTFS projections for additional rental income from property for 2019-20 were mostly hypothecated to the additional cost of building the property team to pre HDV capacity. However,

## Appendix 7

			the Council's commercial property portfolio and achieving this should be further up the Cabinet's agenda.		recruitment has already taken place and with capital programme commitment to improvements works to the stock we have identified that £500k additional income can be achieved against the portfolio in 2019-20, contingent on appropriate support from internal and external sources
<b>Comments</b>					
The Panel noted that they were not able to fully scrutinise the Capital section of the budget as Members felt that the information that they received did not contain sufficient detail.					
<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Priority X</b>					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Recommendation	Cabinet Response Required	Cabinet Response
N/A	N/A (General query)	Clarification on whether the capital spend on the IT and buildings upgrade was for buildings or for IT.	None.	No	
N/A	N/A (General query)	Further information to be provided on raising revenues through libraries, and the radical ways of working programme.	None.	No	

## Appendix 7

N/A	N/A (General query)	General concerns around last year's savings in relation to the decant of Alexandra House and the risks associated to a failure to let out Alexandra House.	None	No.	
N/A	N/A (General query)	Further information requested into progress against last year's saving around Shared Services and the loss of 100 posts.  This information to come back to OSC.	Further information requested.	Yes	Will be reported back to a future O&S meeting
<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Cross Cutting Issues</b>					
MTFS Proposal	Issue/Area of Concern	Recommendation	Cabinet Response Required	Cabinet Response	
N/A (General query)	That further support be provided to Scrutiny Panel Chairs to ensure a robust approach to the ongoing monitoring and scrutiny of the MTFS and budget saving proposals.	Quarterly briefings be prepared for all panel chairs on priority performance, budget, risks and mitigation.	Yes	Quarterly budget monitoring reports are available for scrutiny by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny panel. Senior finance staff will be able to attend as required to clarify financial matters that arise.	

## Appendix 7

N/A (General query)			That the Budget Monitoring Scrutiny process undertaken by the Chairs in the individual priorities and the OSC Budget Scrutiny process be re-examined in order to ensure that full Finance Officer support is available	Yes	Finance officer support will be available as outlined above.