

Felicity Parker  
020 8489 2919  
020 8489 5218  
Felicity.parker@haringey.gov.uk

13 December 2012

To: All Members of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Dear Member,

Overview & Scrutiny Committee – 17 December 2012

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

**6. DRAFT PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS (PAGES 1 - 22)**

Draft minutes of the Communities Panel

Draft minutes of the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel

Draft recommendations of the Communities and Adults & Health Panels

Yours sincerely

Felicity Parker  
Principal Committee Coordinator

This page is intentionally left blank

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2012**

Councillors Adje, Bull, Reid and Winskill (Chair)

Apologies Councillor Basu

**LC14. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting. An apology for absence was received from Councillor Basu.

**LC15. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**LC16. DEPUTATIONS/ PETITIONS/ PRESENTATIONS/ QUESTIONS**

None.

**LC17. MINUTES**

The Panel noted that the 3<sup>rd</sup> and final draft of the needs analysis of the Roma and Traveller would be going out to consultation shortly. It would be possible for the draft document to be shared with residents at this stage.

The Chair reported that, following the accidental tasering of a young man in Turnpike Lane, the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had written to the Police Borough Commander requesting that the roll out of tasers within the borough be delayed pending the results of an investigation into the circumstances surrounding the incident. It was important that the use of tasers had the consent of the local community and the proposal offered the Police the opportunity to look at what had gone wrong and take on board any changes that might be required. The Police had not agreed to the proposal and their response had been communicated via their press office through a third party. The Chair indicated that he would be talking further to the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee about the issue.

Concerns were expressed regarding engagement between the Police Service and Councillors. The Cabinet Member for Communities reported that the issue of community engagement had been raised with the Police Service. The Borough Commander now had a deputy, Superintendent Mark Wolski, and he had been given a particular role in engaging with the local community. There were forthcoming changes taking place in policing within the borough and consultation with elected Members would be required as part of this.

**AGREED:**

That the minutes of the meeting of 3 September 2012 be approved.

**LC18. DRAFT MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2013-16**

The Panel agreed to admit the report as a late item of urgent business. It was late due to the need to finalise the figures within the report and urgent due to the need to

**MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2012**

fit into the budget timetable so that any recommendations from the Panel could be fully considered.

The Cabinet Member for Communities reported that there were only a small number of budget reductions for the areas within his portfolio. This was due to a large extent to significant amounts already having been taken out of the budgets for his area in previous years. The leisure outsourcing was likely to save around £500,000. In addition, future arrangements for White Hart Lane Community Sports Centre were likely to save £470,000, whilst changes to Finsbury Park Track and Gym would save approximately £50,000. It had previously been agreed to safeguard all of the borough's 9 libraries and there were currently no plans to reduce them. It was planned that the role of libraries would be developed further so that they operated as community hubs and this was currently being developed. In terms of community safety, he reported that it was now necessary to bid to the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) for funding. There were also budgetary changes to policy and complaints but reductions in funding for these areas had previously been agreed.

The Cabinet Members for Finance and for Communities, supported by officers, outlined the changes included within the budget proposals as follows:

P7: School Swimming: An increase in facility hire fees was planned to raise an additional £70,000 per annum. Benchmarking had been undertaken with other boroughs which indicated a spread of charges between £1 and £3 per child per session. On the basis of this, it appeared that there was scope for raising income. Haringey's current charge was £1.31.

P9: Mobile Library Service: This reduction was planned for 2014/15. A thorough review of the service would be undertaken prior to implementation.

P10: Leisure staffing: This budget reduction was planned for 2014/15. In the light of the outsourcing, it was considered that there was scope for savings in commissioning and clienting functions.

P12: Area Forums/Committees: This saving would be made from the deletion of the engagement function within Front Line Services.

In respect of the increases to swimming charges, it was noted that the additional cost would be borne by schools. The new charge was likely to be £2.60 - £3 per session per child. This would be looked at together with the new service provider. The charges had remained static for a number of years. It was acknowledged that there was a risk that schools would stop using the service but swimming was part of the national curriculum and this was therefore viewed as unlikely. The increased charges were considered as not being out of line with those made by comparable authorities.

The Panel were of the view that it was important to ensure that the proposed changes did not impact negatively on children but that it was unlikely that the increase would deter schools from using the service. It felt that the option of obtaining external funding to mitigate the effects of the increase should be explored. It was agreed that an update would be provided to the Panel on the impact of the changes in a year's time to ensure that this was borne out in practice.

**MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2012**

In respect of P9, the Panel were concerned at the potential impact that the proposal might have on housebound and other vulnerable people. The Cabinet Member reported that the service had 712 users who took out approximately 150,000 items per year. The figure for housebound people was approximately 14,000 items borrowed per year. The service covered streets, sheltered accommodation, housebound people, schools and children's centres. However, the number of users had been going down. The 180 housebound people who used the service all had a number of other service providers visiting them in their homes every day. Consideration would be given to alternative ways in which the service could be provided through, for example, integrating services. It was not feasible to just run the service for housebound as the numbers were too small. One possible option would be to develop a joint service with neighbouring boroughs.

The Panel noted that the figure of 150,000 for items taken out was a "guesstimate" and agreed that it would be checked. It was noted that the review that was planned and looked forward to receiving it. Engagement with users would be arranged as part of the review. The Cabinet Member for Communities agreed to share the outline specification for the review with the Panel in due course. Partners would be closely involved and that this would include Age Concern. The Panel were of the view that it was important that that partner agencies such as the London Fire Brigade, Police Service, the Clinical Commissioning Group and the Mental Health Trust and any other relevant partners were also involved and that the option of integrating with health and safety services be fully explored. It welcomed the proposal to develop a joint service with Barnet and Enfield as a potential solution.

In respect of the reduction in leisure service, it was noted that there were currently 30 staff involved in contracting and commissioning. The reduction in staffing would involve the loss of more than one post.

It was noted that the enablement team in Front Line services currently had 4 staff – 3 full time and 1 part time. It was proposed that all of the posts would be deleted. The posts had been created as part of the development of Front Line Services. Part of the reason for their creation had been to sort out the distribution lists for area forums/committees and this had now been done. In addition, they also had a role in assisting with the development of area plans and attending meetings of area forums/committees. The remainder of their time had been used on other functions. The work that they had been doing on area forums/committees would need to be picked up elsewhere within the Council.

The Panel commented that progress on area plans had been slow. This was acknowledged by Cabinet Member for Communities. In addition, a number of the actions that had been included within some area plans were things that were already being done or planned. It was open to question whether work on them represented value for money.

Panel Members questioned whether there was the capacity to effectively support area plans. Although money had been committed to facilitate this, progress still needed to be made. The Cabinet Member was of the view that the role of area forum/committee chairs was important. It was not solely about chairing meetings and there were other ways of engaging with residents.

**MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2012**

It was noted that the Panel was scheduled to meet with area forum/committee Chairs on 5 December to obtain their input on the project that have been undertaking on area forums/committees. It was agreed that the proposed reductions be discussed with them as part of this process and that the Panel comment further on this issue in the light of the response received.

In respect of investment proposal P1 (increased cost of neighbourhood planning), it was noted that there had been additional pressures on planners due to the increased statutory requirements as a result of the Localism Act and the need to be proactive in the development of local plans.

The Cabinet Member for Communities reported that the MOPAC had brought various different funding streams together. There was a lack of clarity on how much could be bid for and the timescale. An integrated bid was currently being put together and would need to be submitted by mid December. It was hoped, though, that the deadline would be moved back to mid January. Current spend was £665,000 per annum. Officers were working on a worst case scenario of there being a 30% cut. The MOPAC's two funding priorities were reducing re-offending and prevention. A rigorous process has been put in place to prepare the bid.

The Panel, whilst wishing the Cabinet Member success with the bid, questioned whether it was ambitious enough. The Cabinet Member responded that the amount that would be bid for was more than currently received and the process that had been used to develop the bid was the most thorough used by any borough.

The Cabinet Member for Finance stated that additional budget pressures had been created by the removal of Youth Justice Board assistance towards the cost of remands to secure children's homes. However, he was of the view that the Council should accept the challenge that this represented so that additional efforts could be made to reduce the number of young people being put on remand.

In response to a question on concessionary leisure charges, it was noted that these were set. They could be reviewed if need be but this would be in consultation with the new service provider.

The Chair requested details of any work that was being undertaken on whole area budgeting and integrated service development with other agencies and proposed that this be scrutinised next year. The Cabinet Member for Communities reported that there was a substantial amount of joint working within community safety. This included work on anti social behaviour, gangs and identifying crime hotspots. The MOPAC bidding process was also helping to develop joint working further. There were likely to be changes to the local policing model and this could involve a reduction in Police front desks. Joining these up with other services was one option that could be explored as a way of mitigating the effects of this.

It was agreed that the issue of pooled budgets be added to the work plan.

**AGREED:**

1. That, in respect of the increase in school swimming charges (P7);

**MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2012**

- (a). A report on the impact of the increase in school swimming charges be submitted to the Panel in a years time;
  - (b). That the option of obtaining external funding be explored;
2. That, in respect of the proposed deletion of the mobile library service (P9);
  - (a). The figure for the number of items borrowed by users of the mobile library be checked;
  - (b). The terms of reference for the review of the service be shared with the Panel;
  - (c). When completed, the review of the service be submitted to the Panel for comment;
  - (d). The options of developing an integrated service for housebound and other vulnerable people with other service providers and/or a joint mobile library service with Barnet and Enfield be explored;
3. That the proposed budget reduction to support for area forums/committees be considered further by the Panel following the receipt of feedback from area forum/committee Chairs.

**Clr David Winskill  
Chair**

This page is intentionally left blank



**MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2012**

Councillors Adamou (Chair), Mallett, Stennett, Erskine and Winskill

Co-Optee Helena Kania (LINK)

**LC23. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None received.

**LC24. URGENT BUSINESS**

None received.

**LC25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Adamou declared that her daughter is a Haringey Social Worker.

**LC26. DRAFT MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN**

**Cabinet Member Introduction**

Cllr Vanier, Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Services introduced the budget by setting the context for the service:

- There is a rising demand due to an ageing population and an increase in health challenges, for example long term conditions.
- Spend on vulnerable adults accounts for approximately 20% of the Councils spending.
- The recent Care and Support White Paper provided no decision on funding.
- Most of this service provides statutory duties and therefore cannot easily be cut.
- Challenge is how we fund the service with a lower budget and higher demand and customer expectations.

**Review of Budget proposals from Draft MTFP**

**A1** – The reduction in this post is due to the majority of the post being transferred elsewhere. In order to manage change and deliver savings the post is still currently needed due to the level of seniority and experience. It is listed as a saving for 2015/ 16; if possible it will be brought forward.

Noted that the current staff to Manager ratio across Adult and Community Services is 1:11.

**A2** – This saving relates to the integration agenda and will involve service restructuring, consultation and change management as it is a complete change in the way that the service is managed.

**MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2012**

Consideration is being given to integrating Occupational Therapy with another provider. This already happens in Boroughs such as Islington and Croydon.

Noted that people in receipt of adult social care do not mind who is delivering a service, as long as it is being delivered to a high quality standard, meets their assessed needs and is responsive.

Whilst there is no discretion in what statutory services can be delivered, there is discretion in how these services can be delivered and therefore can aim for better quality and value for money.

The preference would be with commissioning a local healthcare provider.

This saving does not include merging social work with occupational therapy posts.

There is still a lot of work to be done on this proposal and the service is still in the early stages of looking at models, including Haringey being the lead.

Models are successful elsewhere, for example Barnet, Westminster, Hammersmith and Kensington & Chelsea are integrating many of their assessments into one provider – Central London Community Healthcare (CLCH) NHS Trust.

Any model would need to ensure robust and clearly accountable local governance and management structures.

The Panel noted that any provider would need to focus on the needs of the whole Borough.

**A3** – This is also a transformational saving which will reduce a management tier and result in a generic management structure.

Concerns were raised about the extra burden that this may place on staff in a climate where there is an increased demand and a decrease in staff.

Noted that there is an aim to reduce management costs, but that there is no absolute guarantee that this would not have an impact on service delivery and staff support.

**A4** – No impact on service delivery.

**A5** – Currently vacant posts.

The Panel asked whether a risk assessment had been done in order to mitigate any risks should the efficient systems management mentioned on the savings proposal not be sufficient.

**MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2012**

It was noted that this had been considered by an external consultant commissioned by Organisation, Development and Change (OD&C) at the time of business process re-engineering taking place.

**A6/ A7** – also vacant posts.

The Panel asked whether current staff members were taking on the responsibilities of the posts which were currently vacant and due to be deleted.

The panel was informed that this is the case and also noted that the current structure is highly efficient and that current working was constantly being reviewed both with managers and with those who the service was accountable to in order to ensure the efficient operation of services.

**A8** – as above.

**A9** – This saving is due to the moving to a multi-borough contract with Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea, Hounslow, Richmond and Westminster.

The advantage would be a cost and volume discount and better value for money.

There has been a reduction in demand for meals on wheels due to a number of reasons, for example some people preferring to make their own arrangements, on-line supermarket delivery, Personal budgets and such like.

Residents needing this service will still receive it; there is no service cut.

The current post holder also offered nutritional advice to in-house residential homes, which the Council no longer has (apart from Osborne Grove Nursing Home and Linden Road).

The Panel asked about the price inflation of meals, and were informed that this has been kept very low and below the Retail Price Index (RPI).

The Panel noted that some of the boroughs mentioned as part of the tri-borough contract were known for being keen on passing on costs to service users. The Panel were informed that any contract for the provision of meals would include price control for Haringey within the contract specification, and this would be part of the agreement.

**A10** – This saving would be based on restructuring in order to rationalise the management structure.

**A11/ A12** – Both posts are currently vacant.

**MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2012**

**A13** – Is due to be covered by the Overview and Scrutiny on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2012.

**A14/ A15** – No impact.

**A16** – This saving is about helping people with learning disabilities to live in the community as opposed to large institutions. Savings achieved average a third less care costs.

The National policy direction is also about moving away from large institutions. Winterbourne View recommendations also support this move away from large institutions to more personalised supported housing. An example of this is Campsbourne which the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel considered at their Panel meeting in September.

The Panel asked whether it was possible to bring this saving forward from 15/ 16 as it is a positive saving. The Panel were informed that this would be dependent on the availability of housing.

The service is currently working on 3 more possible schemes with housing where families would like their relatives to move out of institutional care. Options are being explored for housing, but this housing needs to be within Haringey.

The Panel asked who would provide care in these homes and was informed that, as with Campsbourne, there would be a high level of input from families on what care services would be commissioned.

**A17** – The Panel were informed that out of the total £400k savings, £184k had been identified (as per circulated document). The remaining £215k would be delivered in 14/ 15.

The Mental Health posts due for deletion have been vacant for months.

Adults have discussed the deletion of these posts with BEH MHT who are aware that savings need to be made whilst being aware of the possible implications.

The service aims to minimise the impact as much as possible.

Mental Health social worker posts have not been cut over recent years, when other services have had posts cut. If the savings are not made from these, vacant posts, then they will need to come from elsewhere.

There are approximately 21 remaining Mental Health social worker posts. The vacant posts work has been taken up by existing social workers and management is ensuring that the service is still responding appropriately to demand.

**MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2012**

In terms of local comparators, Haringey is better resourced in Mental Health social workers. A national CIPFA audit shows Haringey to be about average.

The posts due for deletion are the "As Is" position as they are mainly vacant. However, the service is looking strategically with Managers and Partners.

Savings are being made with consideration to how vulnerable people can best be protected.

The Panel noted that the Principal Policy Officer post is joint funded by Public Health and that should Public Health wish, they can fully fund the post.

The Panel asked whether future demand in relation to benefit cuts had been considered and were informed that the service is away of the changes and demand. However this has to be managed within the budget set.

**NHS Grant to Support Care and Benefit Health**

This is a grant which has been given to the NHS for social care, and will continue in 2013/ 14 and 2014/ 15.

The Grant is not ring-fenced, hence a growth bid has been submitted by Adult Services.

This bid is reflected in the growth/Investment proposals in Appendix 3 of the main reports pack.

The Panel noted that the Acute sector is getting better at getting people out of hospital quicker so they can be treated within the community and that this has an impact on social care services in terms of increased demand.

Investment A2 reflects the projected increase in learning disability and mental health service users and also that that people have a higher life expectancy with more complex needs.

There are difficulties in managing the increase demand of people coming into the social care system, for example where the BEH MHT believe that someone is well enough to be treated in the community and social care is responsible for these services.

There are strategies in place in order to help to manage the increased demand in older people for example extra care sheltered housing.

**MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2012**

**Consideration of identified area(s)**

N/A.

**Conclusions and recommendations**

**A2** – The Panel **RECOMMENDS** that any moves which are made in relation to the redesign of Adult social work assessment relating to Occupational therapy and social work assessment should focus on the integration of health and social care.

The Panel further **RECOMMENDS** that Haringey Council should be the lead authority on service provision.

**A13** - The Panel noted that where there is an element of health and social care they would have liked the opportunity to ask questions on the proposed savings.

Questions which the Panel wished to be asked at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were:

- What support is being given to support the voluntary and community organisations who will be impacted by these cuts?
- The Panel would like assurances that any changes to voluntary and community organisations due to these cuts would not have a negative impact on client safety.

**A16** – The Panel welcomes the move to enable more people with learning disabilities to live independently in the community and looks forward to hearing further updates on progress.

The Panel **RECOMMENDS** that the Campsbourne model, which the Panel considered at its meeting in September, should be used as a model for other supported housing schemes.

**A17** – Whilst the Panel notes that some of these posts have been vacant for some time it has concerns that the extra burden on existing staff will not be sustainable and that this will have an adverse effect on the service provided to service users.

The Panel has concerns that a Principal Policy Officer post in the Adult Commissioning service is being cut at a time of transition when these skills may be needed.

**MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2012**

**The Panel therefore RECOMMENDS that:**

- The impact of the reduction of posts is monitored at 3 and 6 months and that steps are taken where it is found that there is an adverse effect on the service being provided.
- Public Health consider picking up the full funding of the post, at least during the forthcoming transitional period.

**NHS Grant to Support Care and Benefit Health**

The Panel welcomes the NHS Grant and recognises that the service needs an injection of funding in order to manage the demographic changes and an increase in demand.

The Panel therefore **RECOMMENDS** that the full amount of money is given to Adults in all of the remaining years of the grant.

The Panel also strongly supports making a further business case to ensure that the level of the NHS grant continues to keep pace with the increased pressures on the service.

**Health and social care integration**

The Panel is encouraged by the number of health and social care integrated services and **RECOMMENDS** acceleration in the move to greater integration in order to improve outcomes for service users and improved financial efficiency.

**Public Health**

The Panel understands that the Public Health budget is not yet available and looks forward to receiving the Public Health budget when it becomes available in order to allow the Panel to scrutinise the proposals as per its constitutional duty.

**LC27. MINUTES**

Approved.

**LC28. PANEL FORWARD PLAN**

The Whittington Health Foundation status update is to be deferred until the Panel on 2<sup>nd</sup> April due to the application being put on hold for a few months.

**MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL  
MONDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2012**

**LC29. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

**LC30. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None received.

**Clr Gina Adamou**

**Chair**



**DRAFT SCRUTINY PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to discuss and consider the Draft recommendations outlined below. Final recommendations will then be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2013 for approval and referral to Cabinet for consideration.

Line	Recommendation	Key points from the draft minutes from the Panel
<b>Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel</b>		
<b>A2</b>	<p>The Panel <b>RECOMMENDS</b> that any moves which are made in relation to the redesign of Adult social work assessment relating to Occupational therapy and social work assessment should focus on the integration of health and social care.</p> <p>The Panel further <b>RECOMMENDS</b> that Haringey Council should be the lead authority on service provision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relates to the integration agenda and will involve service restructuring, consultation and change management as it is a complete change in the way that the service is managed.</li> <li>• Consideration is being given to integrating Occupational Therapy with another provider. This already happens in Boroughs such as Islington and Croydon.</li> <li>• Preference would be with commissioning a local healthcare provider.</li> <li>• Does not include merging social work with occupational therapy posts.</li> <li>• There is still a lot of work to be done on this proposal and the service is still in the early stages of looking at models, including Haringey being the lead.</li> <li>• Models are successful elsewhere for example the Central London Community Healthcare (CLCH) NHS Trust.</li> <li>• Any model would need to ensure robust and clearly accountable local governance and management structures.</li> <li>• The Panel noted that any provider would need to focus on the needs of the whole Borough.</li> </ul>
<b>A13</b>	The Panel noted that where there is an element of	<b>N/A</b>

**DRAFT SCRUTINY PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

	<p>health and social care they would have liked the opportunity to ask questions on the proposed savings.</p> <p>Questions which the Panel wished to be asked at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What support is being given to support the voluntary and community organisations who will be impacted by these cuts?</li> <li>▪ The Panel would like assurances that any changes to voluntary and community organisations due to these cuts would not have a negative impact on client safety.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>A16</b></p>	<p>The Panel welcomes the move to enable more people with learning disabilities to live independently in the community and looks forward to hearing further updates on progress.</p> <p>The Panel <b>RECOMMENDS</b> that the Campsbourne model, which the Panel considered at its meeting in September, should be used as a model for other supported housing schemes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This saving is about helping people with learning disabilities to live in the community as opposed to large institutions.</li> <li>• Savings achieved average a third less care costs.</li> <li>• The National policy direction is also about moving away from large institutions.</li> <li>• The Panel asked whether it was possible to bring this saving forward from 15/16 as it is a positive saving. The Panel were informed that this would be dependent on the availability of housing.</li> <li>• The service is currently working on 3 more possible schemes with housing where families would like their relatives to move out of institutional care. Options are being explored for housing, but this housing needs to be within Haringey.</li> <li>• The Panel asked who would provide care in these homes and was informed that, as with Campsbourne, there would be a high level of input from families on what care services would be</li> </ul>

**DRAFT SCRUTINY PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

	<p>Whilst the Panel notes that some of these posts have been vacant for some time it has concerns that the extra burden on existing staff will not be sustainable and that this will have an adverse effect on the service provided to service users.</p> <p><b>The Panel therefore RECOMMENDS that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The impact of the reduction of posts is monitored at 3 and 6 months and that steps are taken where it is found that there is an adverse effect on the service being provided.</li> </ul>	<p>commissioned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel were informed that out of the total £400k savings, £184k had been identified (as per circulated document). The remaining £215k would be delivered in 14/15.</li> <li>• The Mental Health posts due for deletion have been vacant for months.</li> <li>• Adults have discussed the deletion of these posts with BEH MHT who are aware that savings need to be made whilst being aware of the possible implications.</li> <li>• The service aims to minimise the impact as much as possible.</li> <li>• Mental Health social worker posts have not been cut over recent years, when other services have had posts cut. If the savings are not made from these, vacant posts, then they will need to come from elsewhere.</li> <li>• There are approximately 21 remaining Mental Health social worker posts. The vacant posts work has been taken up by existing social workers and management is ensuring that the service is still responding appropriately to demand.</li> <li>• In terms of local comparators, Haringey is better resourced in Mental Health social workers. A national CIPFA audit shows Haringey to be about average.</li> <li>• The posts due for deletion are the “As Is” position as they are mainly vacant. However, the service is looking strategically with Managers and Partners.</li> <li>• Savings are being made with consideration to how vulnerable people can best be protected.</li> <li>• The Panel noted that the Principal Policy Officer post is joint funded by Public Health and that should Public Health wish, they can fully fund the post.</li> </ul>
	<p>The Panel has concerns that a Principal Policy Officer post in the Adult Commissioning service is being cut at a time of transition when these skills may be needed.</p> <p><b>The Panel therefore RECOMMENDS that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Public Health consider picking up the full funding of the post, at least during the forthcoming transitional period.</li> </ul>	

**DRAFT SCRUTINY PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

	<p><b>NHS Grant to Support Care and Benefit Health</b> The Panel welcomes the NHS Grant and recognises that the service needs an injection of funding in order to manage the demographic changes and an increase in demand.</p> <p>The Panel therefore <b>RECOMMENDS</b> that the full amount of money is given to Adults in all of the remaining years of the grant.</p> <p>The Panel also strongly supports making a further business case to ensure that the level of the NHS grant continues to keep pace with the increased pressures on the service.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a grant which has been given to the NHS for social care, and will continue in 2013/14 and 2014/15.</li> <li>• The Grant is not ring-fenced, hence a growth bid has been submitted by Adult Services (as per Appendix 3).</li> <li>• The Panel noted that the Acute sector is getting better at getting people out of hospital quicker so they can be treated within the community and that this has an impact on social care services in terms of increased demand.</li> <li>• Investment A2 reflects the projected increase in learning disability and mental health service users and also that that people have a higher life expectancy with more complex needs.</li> <li>• There are difficulties in managing the increase demand of people coming into the social care system, for example where the BEH MHT believe that someone in well enough to be treated in the community and social care is responsible for these services.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Health and social care integration</b> The Panel is encouraged by the number of health and social care integrated services and <b>RECOMMENDS</b> acceleration in the move to greater integration in order to improve outcomes for service users and improved financial efficiency.</p>	
	<p><b>Public Health</b> The Panel understands that the Public Health budget is not yet available and looks forward to receiving the Public Health budget when it becomes available in order to allow the Panel to scrutinise the proposals as per its constitutional duty.</p>	

**DRAFT SCRUTINY PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Communities Scrutiny Panel	
<p><b>P7</b></p> <p>That the possibility of obtaining external funding to mitigate the increase in school swimming charges be explored.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional cost would be borne by schools.</li> <li>• The new charge was likely to be £2.60 - £3 per session per child. This would be looked at together with the new service provider.</li> <li>• The charges had remained static for a number of years.</li> <li>• It was acknowledged that there was a risk that schools would stop using the service but swimming was part of the national curriculum and this was therefore viewed as unlikely.</li> <li>• The increased charges were considered as not being out of line with those made by comparable authorities.</li> <li>• The Panel were of the view that it was important to ensure that the proposed changes did not impact negatively on children but that it was unlikely that the increase would deter schools from using the service.</li> </ul>
<p><b>P9</b></p> <p>That the options of developing a joint mobile library service with Barnet and Enfield and developing an integrated service with another service provider be explored fully.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel were concerned at the potential impact on housebound and other vulnerable people.</li> <li>• The Cabinet Member reported that the service had 712 users who took out approximately 150,000 items per year. The figure for housebound people was approximately 14,000 items borrowed per year. The service covered streets, sheltered accommodation, housebound people, schools and children's centres. However, the number of users had been going down.</li> <li>• The 180 housebound people who used the service all had a number of other service providers visiting them in their homes every day.</li> <li>• It was not feasible to just run the service for housebound as the numbers were too small.</li> <li>• It was noted that a review that was planned and engagement with users would be arranged as part of the review.</li> </ul>

**DRAFT SCRUTINY PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partners would be closely involved and that this would include Age Concern.</li> <li>The Panel were of the view that it was important that that partner agencies such as the London Fire Brigade, Police Service, the Clinical Commissioning Group and the Mental Health Trust and any other relevant partners were also involved and that the option of integrating with health and safety services be fully explored.</li> </ul>
<p><b>P12</b></p>	<p>That the proposed budget reduction to support for area forums/committees be considered further by the Panel following the receipt of feedback from area forum/committee Chairs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was noted that the enablement team in Front Line services currently had 4 staff – 3 full time and 1 part time.</li> <li>It was proposed that all of the posts would be deleted. The posts had been created as part of the development of Front Line Services.</li> <li>Part of the reason for their creation had been to sort out the distribution lists for area forums/committees and this had now been done. In addition, they also had a role in assisting with the development of area plans and attending meetings of area forums/committees. The remainder of their time had been used on other functions. The work that they had been doing on area forums/committees would need to be picked up elsewhere within the Council.</li> <li>The Panel commented that progress on area plans had been slow. This was acknowledged by Cabinet Member for Communities.</li> <li>In addition, a number of the actions that had been included within some area plans were things that were already being done or planned. It was open to question whether work on them represented value for money.</li> <li>Panel Members questioned whether there was the capacity to effectively support area plans. Although money had been</li> </ul>

**DRAFT SCRUTINY PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

		<p>committed to facilitate this, progress still needed to be made. The Cabinet Member was of the view that the role of area forum/committee chairs was important. It was not solely about chairing meetings and there were other ways of engaging with residents.</p>
<p><b>Environment and Housing Scrutiny Panel</b></p>		
	<p>TO FOLLOW</p>	
<p><b>Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel</b></p>		
	<p>TO FOLLOW</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank