

Philip Slawther,  
Principal Committee  
Co-ordinator

020 8489 2957

philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

15 January 2021

To: All Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Dear Member,

Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Monday, 18th January, 2021

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:

- 7. SCRUTINY OF THE 2021/22 DRAFT BUDGET/5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (2022/22-2025/26) - RECOMMENDATIONS (PAGES 1 - 24).**
- Adults & Health Panel Recommendations
  - Housing & Regeneration Panel Recommendations
  - 'Your Council' Budget Scrutiny Recommendations

Yours sincerely

Philip Slawther, Principal Committee Co-ordinator  
Principal Committee Co-Ordinator

This page is intentionally left blank

| Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel |                                  |  |                |                                    |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------|------------------------------------|
| Ref                              | MTFS Proposal                    | Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)   | Recommendation | Cabinet Response Required (Yes/No) |
| AS101                            | Fast Track Financial Assessments | Equality Impact Assessment for these proposals to be provided.   |                |                                    |
| AS102                            | Client Contributions             | <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> An EqlA Screening Tool was completed on 30 November 2020 (see Appendix 3)</p> <p><b>Scrutiny officer note:</b> The pro forma for this proposal states that <i>“the income opportunities presented here are working with existing policies and approvals.”</i></p> <p>Full EqlAs on various aspects of these policies were carried out in previous years, e.g. <a href="#">Charges for Managed Accounts (June 2019)</a></p> <p>All published EqlAs are available <a href="#">here</a></p> |                |                                    |
| Capital - 221                    | Mosaic System Implementation     | <p>To provide a response to the Panel’s query on whether an operational budget had been allocated in order to run any new system provided under this item.</p> <p>To provide additional information on the large variance in the cost</p>  |                |                                    |

|   |  |  |  |     |
|---|--|--|--|-----|
|   |  | <p>between the possible options of £650k and £2.5m.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> Currently the Council is in a procurement process for a new social care system for Adults and Children's Services. If the current supplier is awarded the contract, it is likely that costs will be at the lower end of cost range. However, if a new supplier is awarded the contract, costs are likely to be higher, in order to make provision for costs attached to the implement the new system to all staff.</p> |  |     |
| Capital - 209                                     | Assistive Technology                     | <p>More details to be provided on how the £1m allocated for this item is expected to be spent and what the expected results of this would be. (e.g. would residents provided with assistive technology have fewer care visits?)</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> See briefing note in Appendix 1.</p>   | The Panel requested that the Cabinet recognises the concerns raised around this savings proposal as any reduction in care visits could have an unforeseen risk of increasing loneliness and would therefore have a real impact on our residents wellbeing. | Yes |
| Capital – B2.7 (Cabinet Decision Date - Feb 2018) | Haringey Learning Disability Partnership | <p>To provide the slide (referred to by officers at the Panel meeting) outlining the three approaches to making savings on this item.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> See slide in Appendix 2.</p>   | The Panel noted that less than a third of this year's savings had been achieved and recommended that the Cabinet reassess to see if these savings were realistic considering there is a recognised growth in demand.                                       | Yes |

|   |                          |  |  |     |
|---|--------------------------|--|--|-----|
|   |                          |  |  |     |
| Mental Health – B2.8 (Cabinet Decision Date - Feb 2018) |                          |  | The Panel noted that this item was RAG rated red on the Savings Tracker. The Panel wished to highlight the risk around making savings within the mental health care setting, particularly in a time of increased need. The Panel recommended that the Cabinet re-examines these new commissioning proposals to ensure that they are viable, will not compromise people’s well-being, and will provide best care for residents. | Yes |
| N/A   | General                  |  | To ask Cabinet to clarify if unachieved savings are due to the pressure of Covid-19, or for another reason. For example, because staff had to be redeployed; or because specific service demand increased where savings couldn’t be safely made, or for any other reason.  | Yes |
| N/A   | Savings with mitigations |  | The Panel recommended to Cabinet that the proposals on savings with mitigations be made clearer. The Panel was unable to comment due to the limited information provided.  | Yes |

|     |         |   |  |  |
|-----|---------|---|--|--|
| N/A | General | <p>To clarify which of the reserve funds are being used to cover any overspend in the Adults budget.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> The Council's expectation is that the forecast overspend due to Covid-19 will be covered by additional government support. Regarding any non Covid-19 base budget pressures, the assumption is that Directors will identify measures to mitigate this as far as possible; any residual pressure will be met from utilisation of the budget contingency.</p>  |  |  |
| N/A | General | <p>To provide a table setting out the pressures on the Adults budget caused by the Covid pandemic and specifically where that pressure is in the budget.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> Pressures arising through additional clients, care complexity, increased hours and carer breakdown. Main areas affected include supported living, additional transition clients and continuing health care influx. Furthermore, there has been expenditure on honorarium for all homecare social workers and 5% provider uplifts to cover PPE and voids during the emergency period.</p> |  |  |

|     |         |   |  |  |
|-----|---------|---|--|--|
|     |         | <p>Projected slippage in savings has been caused by delays associated with responding to the pandemic, e.g. mobilisation of projects to take forward as staff were redirected to support the COVID-19 response.</p>   |  |  |
| N/A | General | <p>To provide a breakdown of the services that have moved between Directorates (either in or out of Adults) and how this has affected the size of the Adults budget.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> No changes to services within Adults and therefore no impact on budget.</p>  |  |  |
| N/A | General | <p>To provide details of the work that had been carried out on future demand pressures and what provision had been made in the budget for this.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> Future demand trajectory is modelled on historical trends to establish a baseline of clients and unit costs. After which inflation and demographic growth are two main variables used to model movements of the baseline. COVID-19 which represents a shock to demand is modelled with expertise from heads of service and commissioners based on scenario projections.</p> |  |  |

|     |         |   |  |  |
|-----|---------|---|--|--|
|     |         | £3.3m provision has been made to meet additional demand pressures in 21/22.   |  |  |
| N/A | General | <p>To provide an explanation on how the impact of unexpected major events are built into budget plans, given the impact of the Covid pandemic.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> The Council has a statutory responsibility to assess the robustness of the Council's budget and to ensure that the Council has sufficient contingency/reserves to provide against known risks in respect of both expenditure and income. A number of these risks are referred to in the budget report including the impacts of Brexit, the funding regime for the sector, demographic change, inflation as well as the ongoing effects of the pandemic. The Council must take a balanced approach in assessing these various risks, and the potential impact they could have on the Council's finances. The number of uncertainties underlines the need to maintain both a budgeted resilience contingency and to keep general and earmarked reserves (including the budget resilience reserve) at current levels.</p> |  |  |



|     |         |   |  |  |
|-----|---------|---|--|--|
|     |         |   |  |  |
| N/A | General | <p>To provide an explanation on the management of risk around capital budgets, how that is tracked and which personnel have sight of this.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b></p> <p>In the management of capital projects, robust risk and issue management is important to ensure that projects are delivered on time and on budget. Risks and issues are tracked throughout the entire project lifecycle from initiation through to closure, and are reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weekly by the Project Managers in project team meetings</li> <li>• Monthly in project reporting</li> <li>• In Steering Groups (both project and programme level)</li> <li>• During Project delivery Gateway Reviews</li> <li>• In Lessons Learnt and Project Closure</li> </ul> <p>The budgets for all schemes are also monitored by Capital Finance at a project level on a monthly basis and reported to Cabinet on a quarterly</p> |  |  |

|  |                        |  |  |           |
|--|------------------------|--|--|-----------|
|  |                        | <p>basis. Where schemes or budgets vary significantly from planned, they are examined in detail and corrective action taken.</p> <p>Project / Programme Managers must price risks early in the project, and these should be mitigated as the project develops and has more design and cost certainty. There is an officer process for reviewing capital delivery, and at various stages major capital projects are reported to Cabinet, as well as the regular capital budget monitoring reports to Cabinet.</p> |  |           |
| <p>Future budget scrutiny meetings – presentation of information</p> | <p>Savings Tracker</p> |  | <p>The Panel considered that the information presented in the Savings Tracker was insufficiently clear, noting that different versions were provided in the Cabinet papers and in the Panel’s papers. In particular the “Savings with Mitigations” section was omitted from the Panel’s papers. The Panel recommended that the same version of the savings should be provided in both sets of papers from next year and that the Savings with Mitigations section be more clearly defined and explained as the Panel were unable to comment on the limited information provided.</p> <p>The Panel also recommended that the savings tracker should clearly set out</p> | <p>No</p> |

|   |     |  |   |    |
|---|-----|--|---|----|
|   |     |  | the position of each saving in the current financial year, what overspends will be carried forward to the next year, commentary as to whether savings could realistically be achieved and full implications.  |    |
| Future budget scrutiny meetings – presentation of information | N/A |  | The Panel suggested that it would assist them if, from next year, it could be made clearer in budget scrutiny papers whether the savings can realistically be achieved, perhaps by setting out practical examples or case studies to illustrate how these would work in practice. | No |
| Future budget scrutiny meetings – presentation of information | N/A |  | The Panel recommended that, from next year, the reporting on the capital budget should include information on the progress made against key milestones and deadlines.   | No |
| Future budget scrutiny meetings – presentation of information | N/A |  | The Panel recommended that, from next year, if any jobs losses (or posts not being filled) are involved in any budget changes then this should be clearly highlighted in the documentation provided to the Panel along with an explanation of implications.                       | No |
| Future budget scrutiny meetings –                             | N/A |  | The Panel noted that the Cabinet papers contained additional information about the Adults budget that had not been included in the Panel's papers   | No |

|   |     |  |  |    |
|---|-----|--|--|----|
| presentation of information                                   |     |  | <p>(e.g. Service Growth Budget Adjustment Proposals, Delayed and Undeliverable Savings Proposals).</p> <p>The Panel recommended that, from next year, the papers provided to the Panel should include all information directly related to the Adults budget that had been provided in the Cabinet papers and should correlate with the Cabinet papers so that there is consistency and transparency.</p> |    |
| Future budget scrutiny meetings – presentation of information | N/A |  | <p>The Panel recommended that, from next year, information should be provided on progress made towards the amount of additional income generation that had been previously built into the plans. This would enable the Panel track whether this was being achieved as intended.</p>  | No |

## Appendix 1 Briefing Note: MTFS Proposal - Assistive Technology (Ref: Capital – 209)

The funding supports a variety of key enablers for the programme including equipment, data cleansing of systems, and a call monitoring platform.

The expected results include:

### Residents, businesses and partners:

- Improved outcomes for service users and carers.
- Improved Responding Service to include lifting capability, helping to reduce potential hospital stays, improving outcomes.
- Wider range of products to better meet individual needs and therefore improving outcomes.
- Improved understanding of care needs so that appropriate wrap around care can be identified and put in place, and suitable interventions identified.
- Improved stability of the system to ensure service provision, minimise risk of downtime, keeping users safe.
- Clear service offer and service agreements, with easier access for partners to encourage referrals.
- Ability to remain in own home for longer and retain independence, proved to deliver improved outcomes.
- Improved service performance (*i.e. installations timelines*) in accordance with Industry Best Practice Standards.
- Reduction in risk as equipment operational issues will be identified automatically

### Staff:

- Clearer definition of roles and responsibilities, enabling staff to develop expertise.
- Improved infrastructure to undertake their duties and perform tasks, providing efficiencies and improved satisfaction.
- Greater efficiencies of time through reduction in administration and remote real time updating, ability to provide more value-added service.
- Improved / redesigned end to end processes enabling quality experience
- Reorganised teams that have the right skills to deliver and enabled with the appropriate systems, leading to improved practice to drive performance, behaviours and operational standards
- Improved information to better inform package development.

## Appendix 2: Adults and Health Savings Strategy



We have a clear budget strategy that we have developed as the basis for sound financial management. This is evidence based and we are confident that it sets out the primary levers for managing the main sources of financial pressure across Adults and Health.

This approach has enabled delivery of ambitious savings in 2019/20 of the MTFs, with £4m savings delivered (90% of target).

| <b>DEMAND MANAGEMENT</b><br>Preventing, reducing and delaying demand for social care | <b>MARKET MANAGEMENT</b><br>Commissioning packages of care that meet needs in the most cost-effective way        | <b>OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT</b><br>Reducing the cost base of delivering Adult Social Services |
|--|--|---|
| 1.1 Strengthening preventative support in the community                              | 2.1. Improve information and access to community alternatives  | 3.1. Improving the resilience and permanence of the workforce                               |
| 1.2. Diversion at the Community Front Door   | 2.2. Increase the sufficiency and value for money of community-based provisions including PAs, Day Opportunities | 3.2. Strengthen management oversight and decision-making on performance and finance         |
| 1.3. Managing demand from acute hospitals  | 2.3. Increase the local availability and utilisation of a range of Supported Living options                      | 3.3. Implementing operational integration with health and other LAs                         |
| 1.4. Managing transitions from CYPS  | 2.4. Strengthen the Homecare market and improve quality and outcomes   | 3.4. Establishing fairer contributions – income and subsidies                               |
| 1.5. Expanding the use of assistive technology                                       | 2.5. Contain the cost of residential and nursing placements working across NCL to develop capacity               | 3.5. Revising contracts for services (non-care packages)                                    |
| 1.6. Promoting independence through care planning & reviews                          | 2.6. Develop capital assets to deliver commissioning intentions  |   |

**Appendix 3: Equality Impact Assessment – Fast Track Financial Assessments and Client Contributions**

| Equality Impact Assessment Screening Tool |   |     |    |   |
|---|---|-----|----|---|
| 1   | Lead officer contact details: <b>Farzad Fazilat</b>   |     |    |   |
| 2   | Date: 30/11/2020  |     |    |   |
| 3   | Summary of the proposal: <b>Client contributions income opportunities</b>   |     |    |   |
| Response to Screening Questions           |   | Yes | No | Please explain your answer.   |
| <b>a) Type of proposal</b>                |   |     |    |   |
| 4.  | Is this a new proposal or a significant change to a policy or service, including commissioned service?  |     | No | <b>The policy and service have not been affected. This is an extension to the delivery of the current policy by starting the process earlier.</b>   |
| 5.  | Does the proposal remove, reduce or alter a service or policy?  |     | No | <b>No changes to policy or service.</b>   |
| 6.  | Will there be a restructure or significant changes in staffing arrangements? Please see the restructure pages for guidance for <a href="#">restructure EqIAs</a> .  |     | No | <b>There will be additional temporary staffing to assist in the delivery of the savings proposal and to generate income.</b>  |
| 7.  | If the service or policy is not changing, have there been any known equality issues or concerns with current provision. For example, cases of discrimination or failure to tackle inequalities in outcomes in the past? |     | No | <b>There are no known equality issues or concerns with the current provision. All cases coming forward for financial assessment are Care Act eligible and are subject to the same process.</b>  |
| <b>b) Known inequalities</b>              |   |     |    |   |
| 8.  | Could the proposal disproportionately impact on any particular communities, disadvantaged or vulnerable residents?  |     | No | <b>Only residents with care needs are Care Act eligible and so are more likely to be disabled or older. However, there is no differential approach for any protected groups envisaged in this proposal. All assessments are conducted in accordance with the Care Act 2014.</b> |

|     |   |  |    |  |
|-----|---|--|----|--|
| 9.  | <p>Is the service targeted towards particular disadvantaged or vulnerable residents?</p> <p><i>This can be a service specifically for a group, such as services for people with Learning Disabilities. It can also be a universal service but has specific measures to tackle inequalities, such as encouraging men to take up substance misuse services.</i></p> |  | No | <p><b>As noted above, Care Act eligible clients are likely to be disabled or older people and therefore automatically the proposal will be more likely to affect groups with protected characteristics. Consistent assessments are conducted on all eligible client groups within the guidelines of the Care Act 2014.</b></p> |
| 10. | <p>Are there any known inequalities? For example, particular groups are not currently accessing services that they need or are more likely to suffer inequalities in outcomes, such as health outcomes.</p>   |  | No | <p><b>Assessments are conducted on all eligible client groups within the guidelines of the Care Act 2014.</b></p>  |
| 11  | <p>If you have answered yes to at least one question in both sections a) and b), Please complete an EqIA.</p>   |  | No |  |



| Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel |   |  |  |                                    |
|---|---|--|--|------------------------------------|
| Ref                                     | MTFS Proposal   | Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)   | Recommendation   | Cabinet Response Required (Yes/No) |
| HO101                                   | Housing Team Salaries – Increase HRA contribution           |  | The Panel expressed concerns about the decision to increase charges to the HRA for officer salaries, and about the potential impact on the long-term viability of the HRA of loaded extra costs. The Panel highlighted issues of tenants' rents being used to subsidise posts through the General Fund and requests confirmation that there are sufficient funds available within the HRA budget for maintaining Haringey housing estates in the future. The Panel recommended that Cabinet clarifies how HRA funds are to be apportioned in relation to officer time, especially when Council developments may include homes for market sale. | Yes                                |
| EC101                                   | Additional Recharge to Housing Services                     |  |  |                                    |
| HO102                                   | HfH taking over the lease of PSL properties on their expiry | <p>To provide a written response explaining why additional incentives for landlords are necessary. (As stated in the savings tracker on page 118 of the Panel's agenda pack)</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> The Council currently holds just over 800 homes which are held under 'Private Sector Leases (PSLs)' of between 3 and 5 years and which are used to provide longer term temporary accommodation. The</p> | <p>The Panel reiterated their concerns raised in previous years about the need to reduce the amount spent on consultancy staff and noted that senior staff administering this scheme are interim posts.</p> <p>The Panel questioned why the issue of expenditure on consultancy staff had not been included in the budget proposals and wished to flag their</p>   | Yes                                |

|               |  |  |  |    |
|---------------|--|--|--|----|
|               |  | <p>rent for these homes is negotiated at the start of the lease and landlords thus ask for the rent to be updated before they will renew the lease.</p> <p>The PSL initiative involves Homes for Haringey becoming the leaseholder of these properties when the Council's lease expires, and so has incorporated increases in the landlord payments into the budgeting so that negotiators have flexibility to help ensure that landlords take up a new lease with Homes for Haringey. 'Incentives for landlords' refer to these possible rent increases. There are considerable financial advantages to the leases being held by Homes for Haringey, rather than the Council.</p> | <p>concerns about this with the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>The Panel recommended that a review be initiated immediately into the number of consultants and interims employed in the Housing, Regeneration and Planning Directorate including and itemising all associated costs. The review should include details of the consultancy expenditure projected for 2021/22 compared with the previous three years and proposals as to how a reduction of dependency on consultancies and interims will be achieved within the next municipal year.</p> |    |
| Housing (509) | CPO – Empty Homes                                | Further written information be provided to show the breakdown of the empty homes (in terms of new-build and existing housing stock) and what kind of remedial action (such as increased Council Tax rates) was possible and had been taking place before reaching the CPO stage.   | Awaiting response.   |    |
| Economy (453) | New workspace scheme at Stoneleigh Road car park |  | The Panel expressed reservations about this proposal and suggested that it required further examination, noting that it related to several car parks and that parking would be necessary to  | No |

|                           |   |  |  |    |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|----|
|                           |   |  | <p>support any future improvements to Tottenham High Road.</p> <p>The Panel noted its intention to monitor this issue going forward.</p>   |    |
| PL1 (from 2019/20 budget) | Additional HMO Licensing Scheme for HMO | <p>A Panel Member asked why the proportion of HMOs brought under licence was still low (as stated in the savings tracker of page 117 of the Panel's agenda pack). The Panel was advised that this query would need to be referred to Environment and Neighbourhoods team for a written response.</p>   | Awaiting response.   |    |
| N/A                       | Unachieved savings                      | <p>The Panel commented that more clarity was needed on the impact of the unachieved savings from 2020/21 on the budget for 2021/22 and beyond, specifically by providing details on the shortfalls and the plans to mitigate these.</p> <p>The Panel made particular reference to the Temporary Accommodation Reduction Plan (Item HO1) which had a reported shortfall of £326k (according to page 242 of the Cabinet) and requested an update on this point.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> The unachieved savings for 2020-2021 were largely due to delays in Capital Letters and</p> | <p>The Panel recommended that for budget scrutiny reports in future years, the impact of the unachieved savings from the current year on the budget for subsequent years should be clearly set out and made transparent. The provision of mitigation plans should also be included in the papers to the Panel.</p> | No |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | CBS delivery during COVID and will be mitigated by the use of Flexible Homelessness Support Grant. In future years it is hoped that Capital Letters and CBS improved performance will be able to deliver the required savings. |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

## Budget Scrutiny Recommendations

| <b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee – Your Council Priority</b> |                      |  |   |  |
|--|----------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Ref</b>   | <b>MTFS Proposal</b> | <b>Further info requested if appropriate)</b>  | <b>Comments/Recommendation</b>  | <b>Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)</b> |
| <b><u>General Recommendation</u></b>                             |                      |  |   |  |
| N/A  | General Point        | <p>That the next year's budget papers separate out each individual area so that, for example, the Your Council section is separated out from the main body of information on the budget when OSC consider the Your Council savings (likewise for the other priorities when they go to the relevant scrutiny panel). This should be placed into Revenue and Capital sections with the MTFS table including the RAG ratings and the savings slippage (as is provided to Cabinet).</p> <p>We would also like to see the revenue budget section have an introduction into how the budget for Your Council sits within the main council budget and any specific risks within this area. The capital</p> | As there is a much greater spend within the capital budget this year, we would like a commitment from Cabinet that the progress of these projects will be rigorously monitored and that OSC will receive ongoing information around progress of these as well as any new proposals in future budget scrutiny reports. | Yes                                    |

|                               |                                     |   |   |     |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----|
|                               |                                     | budget should include a table with the new capital programmes which includes the slippage, as is already provided in the Cabinet papers.  |   |     |
| <b><u>Revenue Savings</u></b> |                                     |   |   |     |
| YC106                         | Reduction in legal support Services |   | That Cabinet reconsider this saving as there is a significant risk to our ability as an organisation to effectively provide legal support to statutory services such as safeguarding. | Yes |
| YC109                         | HR Savings                          | Request for further information to be provided to OSC on the breakdown of the initial investment by the council of £400,000. What proportion of this was on consultant costs and how much was allocated for new technology? Also, what is the per-day rate of these consultancy staff?<br><br>Assurance is sought around how officers are managing and monitoring the use of agency and |   |     |

|                                  |                            |  |   |     |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|-----|
|                                  |                            | <p>interim staff across the organisation.</p> <p>Further assurance is sought around how this proposal will change the reliance of the council on agency or temporary staff, especially in key areas such as social workers.</p>                                  |   |     |
| N/A                              | Digital Together Programme | <p>The saving from this proposal is £3M but this requires an initial investment cost of £3.3M.</p> <p>Further information is requested around what these micro projects are and how realistic it is for this programme to achieve its stated savings target.</p> | <p>OSC noted that the risks in the report were identified as high.</p> <p>The Cabinet ensure that quarterly reviews of the Digital Together Programme were brought back to the Committee to provide ongoing monitoring of the programme and the savings being made.</p> <p>Further consideration should be given as to whether this could be adapted into a rolling programme of reporting, with a live spreadsheet of projects and their implementation maintained in order to help facilitate effective scrutiny.</p> | Yes |
| <b><u>Pre-Agreed Savings</u></b> |                            |  |   |     |

|                       |   |  |  |     |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|-----|
| YC06                  | Libraries - Re-imaging our Libraries offer for a better future. | Further assurance is sought around the feasibility of making a £365k saving from libraries, especially in the current climate where libraries have been heavily impacted by Covid-19.  | That Cabinet reconsider this savings proposal, especially in relation to the loss of around 7 staff posts and the feasibility of achieving the stated savings given the impact of Covid on libraries. It is felt that this proposal is out of kilter with the recent capital spend on the council's libraries. | Yes |
| <b>Capital Budget</b> |   |  |  |     |
| N/A                   | General point.  | That OSC receive quarterly monitoring reports on the Your Council revenue and capital savings.<br><br>It is envisaged that this will include a regular tracker that shows project milestones with reasons and mitigations for slippage |  | No  |
| N/A                   | General point.  | That projects within the capital programme table are explained more fully in future budget scrutiny reports and the risk of slippage identified. (as per table on page 248 in December Cabinet papers)                                 |  | No  |



|     |                                       |   |  |    |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---|--|----|
|     | General Point                         | The Committee requested further information within the capital budget around which projects are being funded by the Council and which were self-financing, as these would have different risks attached to them which should be clearly identified. If they are funded by the Council they will have a revenue implication, so the amount of revenue spend on paying for the borrowing on these projects should also be clearly identified. |  | No |
| 316 | Asset Management of Council Buildings | That Asset Management is explained in greater detail in future Your Council budget reports and projects are clearly identified. This is a large area of allocated capital budget spend but the lack of information made scrutinising this difficult.  |  | No |
| 316 | Asset Management of Council Buildings | The Committee requested a breakdown of the £33m allocated in the capital budget to schools.   |  | No |
| 330 | Civic Centre Works                    | That further information is provided about the level of contingency set aside within the £21.3m capital   |  | No |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | allocation for the Civic Centre Works.<br><br>The Committee is concerned that projects of this size are often over budget. |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|