

Philip Slawther,  
Principal Committee  
Co-ordinator

020 8489 2957

philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

16 January 2023

To: All Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Dear Member,

Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Thursday, 19th January, 2023

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:

**9. SCRUTINY OF THE 2023/24 DRAFT BUDGET AND 5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2023/2028 - (PAGES 1 - 32)**

List of Documents:

Appendix I – Budget Scrutiny Recommendations Cover Report

Appendix J - Budget Scrutiny Recommendations

Yours sincerely

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

This page is intentionally left blank

**Report for:** Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 19 January 2023

**Title:** Scrutiny of the 2023/24 Draft Budget/5 Year Medium Term Financial Strategy (2023/24-2027/28) - Recommendations

**Report authorised by:** Ayshe Simsek, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager

**Lead Officer:** Dominic O'Brien, Principal Scrutiny Officer  
Tel: 020 8489 5896 or Email: [dominic.obrien@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:dominic.obrien@haringey.gov.uk)

**Ward(s) affected:** All

**Report for Key/  
Non-Key Decision:** N/A

## 1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 This report sets out how budget proposals detailed in the draft 5-year Medium Term Financial Strategy (2023/24-2027/28) have been scrutinised and the draft recommendations that have been reached by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) and Scrutiny Review Panels.
- 1.2 Members of the Committee are asked to consider and agree recommendations contained within this report so that these can be considered by Cabinet on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2023, when they will also agree the final MTFS proposals that will be put to Council on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2023.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:
- (a) Approves the final budget recommendations to be put to Cabinet on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2023, as outlined in **Appendix J**.
- (b) Notes the 2023/24 Draft Budget & 2023/28 Medium Term Financial Strategy Report, as presented to Cabinet 6<sup>th</sup> December 2022 (**included in the main agenda pack**) and the proposals therein, as considered by the Scrutiny Panels and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in December 2022/January 2023.

## 3. Reasons for Decision

- 3.1 As laid out in the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules (Constitution, Part 4, Section G) the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is required to undertake scrutiny of the Council's budget through a Budget Scrutiny process. The procedure by which this operates is detailed in the Protocol covering the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

## 4. Alternative Options Considered

4.1 N/A

## 5. Budget Scrutiny Process

5.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Protocol lays out the process for Budget Scrutiny. This includes the following points:

- a. The budget shall be scrutinised by each Scrutiny Review Panel, in their respective areas. Their reports shall go to the OSC for approval. The areas of the budget which are not covered by the Scrutiny Review Panels shall be considered by the main OSC.
- b. A lead OSC member from the largest opposition group shall be responsible for the co-ordination of the Budget Scrutiny process and recommendations made by respective Scrutiny Review Panels relating to the budget.
- c. Overseen by the lead member referred to above, each Scrutiny Review Panel shall hold a meeting following the release of the December Cabinet report on the new Medium Term Financial Strategy. Each Panel shall consider the proposals in this report, for their respective areas. The Scrutiny Review Panels may request that Cabinet Members and/or Senior Officers attend these meetings to answer questions.
- d. Each Scrutiny Review Panel shall submit their final budget scrutiny report to the OSC meeting in January containing their recommendations/proposal in respect of the budget for ratification by the OSC.
- e. The recommendations from the Budget Scrutiny process, ratified by the OSC, shall be fed back to Cabinet. As part of the budget setting process, the Cabinet will clearly set out its response to the recommendations/ proposals made by the OSC in relation to the budget.

## 6. Budget Scrutiny to Date

6.1 Following consideration by Cabinet, the four Scrutiny Panels met in December 2022/January 2023 to scrutinise the draft budget proposals that fall within their portfolio areas. In addition, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee met on 12 January 2023 to consider proposals relating to Culture, Strategy & Engagement.

6.2 Cabinet Members, senior service officers and finance leads were in attendance at each meeting to present proposals and to respond to questions from members. A list of draft recommendations arising from the meetings referred to above, is provided at **Appendix A**. The detailed report on the MTFS that was submitted to Cabinet on 6 December 2022 is included in the main agenda pack. A link to further detail on the individual revenue growth proposals is included at the end of this report.

## 7. Next Steps

7.1 The table below sets out the remaining steps in the budget scrutiny process:

Date	Meeting	Comments
19 January 2023	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Recommendations agreed and formally referred to Cabinet
7 February 2023	Cabinet	Cabinet will set out its response to recommendations made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
2 March 2023	Full Council	Final budget setting

## 8. Contribution to Strategic Outcomes

- 8.1 The budget scrutiny process has contributed to each of strategic outcomes relating arising from the Borough Plan 2019-23.

## 9. Statutory Officers Comments

### Finance

- 9.1 There are no specific financial implications as a result of the scrutiny process but there may be an impact on the overall Council budget if recommendations are made for change. Any such implications would be considered as part of February's Cabinet MTFS report.

### Legal

- 9.2 There are no immediate legal implications arising from this report. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is exercising its budget scrutiny function. This is part of the constitutional arrangements for setting the Council's budget, as laid out in Part 4, Section G of the Haringey Constitution.

### Equality

- 9.3 The Council has a Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act;
  - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not;
  - Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

- 9.4 The three parts of the duty applies to the following protected characteristics: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy/maternity; race; religion/faith; sex and sexual orientation. In addition, marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty.
- 9.5 The proposals in the draft Medium Term Financial Strategy are currently at a high level and will be developed further as service changes and policy changes are progressed. Equality impact assessments will be developed as part of this process.
- 9.6 The Committee should ensure it addresses these equality duties by considering them within its work. This should include considering and clearly stating;
- How specific savings / policy issues impact on different groups within the community, particularly those that share the nine protected characteristics;
  - Whether the impact on particular groups is fair and proportionate;
  - Whether there is equality of access to services and fair representation of all groups within Haringey;
  - Whether any positive opportunities to advance equality of opportunity and/or good relations between people, are being realised.

## **10. Use of Appendices**

Appendix J – List of Comments and Recommendations from Budget Scrutiny Process

## **11. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

11.1 N/A

## Budget Scrutiny Recommendations

Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel – Economy Priority																															
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)																											
<b><u>New Savings Proposals</u></b>																															
AHC_SAV_008	Housing Demand - Targeted 1 bedroom move on project	The Panel requested a written breakdown of the £10m spend on Temporary Accommodation and how many families were expected to be moved on as part of the £80k saving.	<p>Response to adjacent column:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Summary of Housing Demand's projected EOY spend as at P8 - 2022/23</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Area of expenditure</th> <th>£k</th> <th>Detail</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Staffing</td> <td>4,552</td> <td>Total staff &amp; other costs</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Direct costs of TA</td> <td>11,145</td> <td>cost of NPA/PSL/Lodges/AST etc. Includes BDP and HB subsidy</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indirect TA costs</td> <td>477</td> <td>Legal and other client costs</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Corporate OHDS</td> <td>1,401</td> <td>Corporate overheads</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Hsg initiatives outside HD</td> <td>907</td> <td>Various Homelessness Initiatives.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HPG contribution</td> <td>-8,394</td> <td>Homelessness prevention grant received</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>P8 EOY projection</b></td> <td><b>10,088</b></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Number of families expected to be moved as part of the project = 100 households</p>	Summary of Housing Demand's projected EOY spend as at P8 - 2022/23			Area of expenditure	£k	Detail	Staffing	4,552	Total staff & other costs	Direct costs of TA	11,145	cost of NPA/PSL/Lodges/AST etc. Includes BDP and HB subsidy	Indirect TA costs	477	Legal and other client costs	Corporate OHDS	1,401	Corporate overheads	Other Hsg initiatives outside HD	907	Various Homelessness Initiatives.	HPG contribution	-8,394	Homelessness prevention grant received	<b>P8 EOY projection</b>	<b>10,088</b>		
Summary of Housing Demand's projected EOY spend as at P8 - 2022/23																															
Area of expenditure	£k	Detail																													
Staffing	4,552	Total staff & other costs																													
Direct costs of TA	11,145	cost of NPA/PSL/Lodges/AST etc. Includes BDP and HB subsidy																													
Indirect TA costs	477	Legal and other client costs																													
Corporate OHDS	1,401	Corporate overheads																													
Other Hsg initiatives outside HD	907	Various Homelessness Initiatives.																													
HPG contribution	-8,394	Homelessness prevention grant received																													
<b>P8 EOY projection</b>	<b>10,088</b>																														

AHC_ SAV_008	Housing Demand - Targeted 1 bedroom move on project	<p>The Panel noted a seeming discrepancy in the figures of the 103 people in TA who required one-bedroom properties, the breakdown of the figures only added up to 100. Are you saying that only 100 of the 103 people identified are targeted for a move or is this a typographical error.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> There are currently (3/1/22) 100 approved households with a 1 bed need in TA.</p>		
AHC_ SAV_007	Use of 1 bed social housing as Temporary Accommodation	Clarification requested on whether a review of suitability of TA accommodation was carried out and the	Given the propensity of young families to grow, and given the length of average stay in Temporary Accommodation, the Panel recommends that the suitability of accommodation used for Temporary Accommodation should be reviewed annually, on family by family basis	Yes



		<p>frequency with which this was done.</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  Our aim is to assess or review households every 18 months and include changes in household composition. If it becomes clear the customer's family has naturally increased in size whereby they are classed as severely overcrowded (i.e. by 2 rooms or more) then we would list them for a transfer in addition to providing advice on their settled housing options.</p> <p>The speed at which a family may be able to move when severely</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>overcrowded is dependent on a large number of factors. Generally, our reporting allows us to quickly ascertain who may be classed as severely overcrowded. Customers also keep us informed if they have a change in their circumstances and the importance of highlighting this is detailed in the correspondence, they're provided with throughout their homelessness application.</p>		
AHC_SAV_007	Use of 1 bed social housing as Temporary Accommodation	The Panel requested a written clarification on the maximum number of adults and the maximum	That Cabinet agree that the placing of families into one-bedroom accommodation should be limited to families with one child.	Yes

		<p>number of children, and the ages of the children, that would be placed in a one-bedroom property.</p> <p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The TA placements policy passed by Cabinet on 18 October 2016 sets out that:</p> <p>Accommodation must provide adequate space and room standards for the household and be fit to inhabit. Households in temporary accommodation will often be placed into units with 1 bedroom less than they would be entitled to on a permanent basis, with the</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>expectation that the living room provides dual purpose as a living and sleeping area. The following minimum size criteria will apply:</p> <p>...</p> <p>One bedroom accommodation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lone parents or couples with 1 child over the age of 1 year (no upper age limit)</li> <li>• Lone parents or couples with 2 children of the same sex (no upper age limit)</li> <li>• Lone parents or couples with 2 children of opposite sexes where both children are under the age of 10 years.</li> </ul>		
<p><b><u>HRA Budget</u></b></p>				

N/A	London Affordable Rent Model	<p>Further information requested on whether any of the 840 new homes scheduled to be allocated to the London Affordable Rent model had not yet received Planning Permission.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> 68 have not yet received planning permission.</p>		
N/A	London Affordable Rent Model	<p>It was commented that the gap in affordability to the cap from LAR to formula rent seemed to be slightly larger than was presented in the report.</p> <p>The Chair requested some clarity and reassurance of the relative</p>		

		<p>affordability of LAR against formula rent, based on the actual formulas used, rather than their relative proximity to the cap.</p> <p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Formula rents charged for the same bed size varies due to several factors including property values. Hence the gap between formula rent and LAR also varies depending on the location of the property in the borough.</p> <p>The gap between the average actual 2022/23 formula rent, and average LAR (£32.36) is slightly higher</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>than that between average formula rent cap and average LAR (£13.73).</p> <p>However, LAR is significantly less than the Local Housing Allowance rate. This means that any tenant entitled to Housing Benefit, or the housing element of Universal Credit would have their housing costs covered.</p>		
N/A	General point.	<p>Clarification requested on the number of people in Council and Temporary accommodation who were working and not in receipt of benefits.</p> <p><b>Response to follow.</b></p>		

N/A	London Affordable Rent Model	None	<p>When producing reports in future, that Cabinet commit to the Council being clear, when it talked about different rent levels, about exactly what it was referring to.</p> <p>Rather than using terms like social rents or council rents seemingly interchangeably, the term formula rent should be used when formula rents were meant and similarly London Affordable Rent should be used when that was meant.</p> <p>The Council should also be clear that if a proposal was slightly vaguer on what model should be used, then it should also be clear about this.</p>	Yes
N/A	London Affordable Rent Model	None	<p>That the Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel be kept informed of which individual schemes used London Affordable Rent and Formula rent going forwards, and that this be reported regularly to the panel as an update.</p>	Yes



**Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Panel – Environment & Neighbourhoods**

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)
PL20/9	Full Cost Recovery of Services for Match Day Cleansing Costs.	None	That Cabinet give assurances that it intends to engage robustly with Tottenham Hotspur F.C. to ensure that THFC pays its fair share of the clean-up costs from match days and other event days. The cost should not be borne by local tax Council Taxpayers.	Yes
ENV_ SAV_00 4	Not recruiting to existing vacancies within the Parks Service (Net £45k)	None	The Panel would like Cabinet to reconsider this saving. The Panel would like to see the weed control operative post within the Parks service retained and recruited to, and the net saving found from elsewhere.	Yes

<b>Children and Young People's Panel – Children's Services</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>MTFS Proposal</b>	<b>Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)</b>	<b>Comments/Recommendation</b>	<b>Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)</b>
N/A		None	The Panel recommends that, in future years, consultation with residents and stakeholders on the MTFS should aim to be more meaningful, reach a wider range of people and provide a greater opportunity for them to influence proposals.	Yes
N/A		None	<p>The Panel emphasised the importance of rigorous monitoring and reviewing of external risk and measures to mitigate it so that any changes can be responded to in a timely manner.</p> <p>It recommends that, in particular, the budgetary impact of the Safety Valve programme be closely monitored and requests that this be included in the regular quarterly finance updates to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p>	Yes
N/A		None	The Panel recommends that, in future years, the equalities impact of specific proposals in the MTFS be outlined more clearly in order to provide Members with a clearer understanding of them.	Yes

<b>Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel – People 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>New Revenue Savings Proposals</u></b>				
AHC_SAV_001 & AHC_SAV_005	Improved processes & practices/Improved commissioning & efficiencies	None	<p>Officers explained to the Panel that much of the previously agreed savings proposals, based on demand management approaches had not been possible to achieve (proposals PA9 &amp; C19 on the MTFS Savings Tracker) and so they had been scrapped in favour of alternative savings proposals based on commissioning efficiencies.</p> <p>The Panel observed that the bulk of the new revenue savings for 2023/24 were based on just two proposals and expressed concerns about the risk to the budget if these savings were also not achieved.</p>	Yes
N/A	Winter discharge funding	Breakdown to be provided on the distribution of the additional winter discharge funding across the 5 NCL Boroughs.		

		<b>Response:</b> * See full breakdown at bottom of this document.		
<b><u>New Revenue Growth Proposals</u></b>				
AHC_GR_001	Acuity/complexity in adult social care clients	None	<p>This proposal related to an additional £2m of funding over and above the £2.8m provided in the existing MTFS due to the increased level of acuity and complexity observed in adult social care clients since the pandemic.</p> <p>The Panel observed that this was an ongoing risk to the Budget in the medium/long term and requested further information which showed that a further £3.1m had already been allocated to the 2024/25 adult social care budget due to anticipated growth pressures.</p> <p>The Panel acknowledged the current challenging financial circumstances for adult social care services and sought reassurance from the Cabinet that further anticipated increases in demand on services had been adequately factored into the MTFS going forward.</p>	Yes
AHC_GR_002	Inflationary Pressures	None	<p>This proposal related to an additional £4m of funding to meet additional costs to adult care purchasing budgets resulting from increased costs to providers. The Panel heard that an expected inflation rate of 5% had been used to calculate the additional funds</p>	Yes

			<p>required. The Panel noted that other projected inflation figures were considerably higher than this. The Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) for example had recently predicted the inflation rate for 2023 to be 7.4%.*</p> <p>The Panel expressed concerns about the risk of a budget shortfall in 2023/24 should the actual rate of inflation prove to be higher than 5%.</p> <p>(* Based on the Consumer Price Index – see p.19, Economic &amp; Fiscal Outlook – November 2022, OBR <a href="https://obr.uk/efo/economic-and-fiscal-outlook-november-2022/">https://obr.uk/efo/economic-and-fiscal-outlook-november-2022/</a>)</p>	
N/A	Additional funding – 2024/25	<p>Details to be provided on the additional funding that had already been allocated for 2024/25.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The net demographic / inflation growth allocation for Adults Social Care (above current MTFS) for 2024/25 is £3.1m.</p>		

<b>Draft Capital Programme – 2023/24 to 2027/28</b>				
201	Aids & Adaptations	<p>It was agreed that further data would be provided to the Panel on what the DFG (Disabled Facilities Grant) was currently funding in Haringey and the revised grant position which would be available in early 2023.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> As of 13<sup>th</sup> Jan 2023, the 2023/24 grant allocation is yet to be confirmed.</p>		
214	Osborne Grove Nursing Home	The Panel discussed the inflationary pressures on capital projects		

		<p>with a particular focus on Osborne Grove Nursing Home given the significant levels of investment in this project. The Panel was informed that there had been continuous business case reprofiling on Osborne Grove over the past 12 months and that the project remained financially viable.</p> <p>It was agreed that a more detailed update report would be brought to a meeting of the Panel in 2023. This has been added to the Panel's Work Programme.</p>		
<p><b><u>General issues</u></b></p>				

N/A	Estimated Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP)	<p>The Panel queried whether capital expenditure was sustainable at the projected levels given the costs incurred by rising interest rates - noting that paragraph 8.35 (Table 8.4) of the Cabinet report on the Budget &amp; MTFS (6<sup>th</sup> Dec 2022) illustrated a rise in the estimated MPR from £13.3m in 2022/23 to £37.9m by 2027/28.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The overall level of capital spending and resultant borrowing must be affordable and prudent, and the assessment of this forms part of the MTFS</p>		
-----	---	---	--	--



		<p>process and the report, including the Treasury Management Strategy. The capital programme schemes serve a number of purposes as is stated in the report and the inclusion of a scheme in the capital programme is not in itself permission to spend, as a variety of approvals are required before a scheme can proceed. The capital programme is also an enabling mechanism so that the Council can respond to</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>changes in the environment whilst staying within the budget and policy framework.</p> <p>A significant number of schemes in the programme are assumed to be self-financing and the MTFS assumes that those schemes will produce savings and/or income that at least meets the cost of the borrowing. Whether they will proceed is dependent on their subsequent business case covering the cost of the investment and being approved, and it</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>was noted in the Cabinet report that the current cost and interest rate environment is making it increasingly difficult for business cases to meet this hurdle. Nevertheless, the capital programme must facilitate the possible progression of these schemes and hence their inclusion.</p> <p>The estimated MRP charges (not interest charges) arising from the capital programme are expressed in that table as gross to ensure that there is clarity over the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>financial effect of the capital programme.</p> <p>Table 8.8 (of the Cabinet report on the budget – 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 2022) shows the effect of the compensatory savings that are assumed as arising from the self-financing programme that offset the costs set out in table 8.4.</p>		
N/A	Council Tax	<p>The Panel asked for an estimate to be provided on the funds that would be raised by a 1% increase in Council Tax.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> A 1% rise in Council Tax would raise an estimated sum of approximately £1.2m</p>		

N/A	Future reports on the Budget/MTFS to Scrutiny Panels	None	The Panel recommended that future savings proposals provided to Scrutiny should include some short bullet points on any risks that had been identified.	Yes
<b>Culture, Strategy &amp; Engagement</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>New Revenue Savings Proposals</u></b>				
CSE_SAV_002	Additional commercial advertising opportunities	Clarification to be provided on the definition of "carbon purifying technology".		
CSE_SAV_002	Additional commercial advertising opportunities	The Committee raised concerns about the commercialisation of the Council vehicle fleet, given their high profile. The Committee requested a briefing note which provided		

		<p>assurances about how realistic the assumptions were, and a breakdown of how much income was expected to be raised through this proposal. The Committee also requested information about the oversight of fleet advertising and for example, how the Council could prevent its vehicles being used to advertise a company or organisation that it may not be comfortable with associating itself.</p>		
<p><b><u>Draft Capital Programme – 2023/24 to 2027/28</u></b></p>				
330 & 464	Civic Centre Works/Bruce Castle	The Committee requested further reassurances on		

		the impact on the revenue budget from the borrowing costs and the ability of the Council to meet those costs, given the economic climate and the significant sums involved. Further details were required on the self-financing nature of these schemes and what this meant in practice.		
<b><u>General issues</u></b>				
N/A	Updated budget figures	It was agreed that any updated figures for the overall proposed 2023/24 budget, given that new information may be now available that was not available at the time that the original finance reports were		

		provided to the Cabinet and Scrutiny Panels in Dec 2022, should be provided to the OSC ahead of its meeting on 19 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2023.		
--	--	---	--	--



**\* Adults & Health Panel - Breakdown on the distribution of the additional winter discharge funding across the 5 NCL Boroughs**

North Central London						
Borough	LA Allocation	ICB Allocation		TOTAL	% of London Total	% of England
		Weighted ICB population Allocation	Discharge Performance Allocation			
Barnet	1.21	2.02	4.46	11.87	18%	2%
Camden	1.07					
Enfield	1.08					
Haringey	0.96					
Islington	1.07					
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.39</b>	<b>6.48</b>				

This page is intentionally left blank