

Dominic O'Brien,  
Principal Scrutiny  
Officer

0208 489 5896

dominic.obrien@haringey.gov.uk

19 June 2026

To: All Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Dear Member,

Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Monday, 22nd June, 2026

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. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS (PAGES 1 - 24)**

To receive and note the minutes of the following Scrutiny Panels and to approve any recommendations contained within:

9<sup>th</sup> February 2026 – Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel

23<sup>rd</sup> February 2026 – Culture, Community Safety & Environment Scrutiny Panel

**8. MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE (PAGES 25 - 52)**

To note the membership and terms of reference for the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

Yours sincerely

Dominic O'Brien,  
Principal Scrutiny Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ADULTS & HEALTH  
SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON MONDAY 9<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2026, 6.35  
- 9.35pm**

**PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Pippa Connor (Chair), Cathy Brennan, Thayahlan Iyngkaran,  
Mary Mason, Sean O'Donovan, Felicia Opoku**

**Co-optee: Helena Kania**

**47. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair referred Members present to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted the information contained therein'.

**48. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Iyngkaran.

**49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Pippa Connor declared an interest by virtue of her membership of the Royal College of Nursing.

Cllr Pippa Connor declared an interest by virtue of her sister working as a GP in Tottenham.

**50. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/ PRESENTATIONS/ QUESTIONS**

None.

**51. MINUTES**

Cllr Opoku requested a correction to her declaration of interest from the previous meeting. She had placed on record that she worked closely with the NWL ICB (North West London Integrated Care Board) but this had been incorrectly recorded as NCL ICB (North Central London Integrated Care Board).

Following this amendment, the minutes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record.

**RESOLVED – That the amended minutes of the meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2025 be approved as an accurate record.**

**52. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

Cllr Connor explained that this urgent question was being raised by the Panel following a meeting the previous week with members of the Joint Partnership Board (JPB). At this meeting, concerns were heard from several people about the difficulties in making safeguarding referrals. An example given was an organisation trying to call the relevant numbers but not being able to get through to anyone, then filling out the online referral form but not having received a response over a week later.

The Panel's main concerns were:

- No one answering the Safeguarding phone line.
- If a call was put through, no information provided as to when they would hear back regarding their concerns.
- If they filled out the safeguarding form, there was no recognition from the service that this had been received.
- Long waits to hear if the referral had been accepted.
- No way of finding out who to contact if they didn't hear anything once the form had been submitted.
- No reference number that they could use in a follow up email to track what was happening.
- When contact from the Council was made, no timeframe for when any next steps would happen.

The Panel was therefore keen to understand more about how the process currently operates and are particularly keen to ensure that, once a referral is made, the person who has submitted it should always receive details including a reference number, how long they should expect to wait for a response and how to get in touch if a response was not received within that timeframe.

In response to the concerns raised, Cllr das Neves, Cabinet Member for Social Care & Wellbeing, commented that these concerns were difficult to hear but not taken lightly and did validate the issues that had been previously identified and included in the Improvement Plan.

Jo Baty, Director of Adult Social Care made a number of observations about safeguarding referrals:

- Safeguarding referrals into Adult Social Care were received through ‘front door’ arrangements, the purpose of which was provide a single consistent route into the service. There was no separate, direct safeguarding telephone line. Safeguarding referrals could be made by telephone, an online form or written correspondence from partner agencies. When safeguarding referrals were received, the focus was on consistent triage and having a clear recording and audit.
- It was recognised that callers may experience difficulties in getting through by telephone at peak time. Callers are then queued, directed through callback arrangements or provided with information about how to access information through the website.
- It was also recognised that, while online referrals were screened and processed internally, the visibility of how this was being progressed could be improved.
- Demand was a big issue and was therefore a cornerstone of the Improvement Plan and the work of the independent safeguarding review that had been commissioned to look at the role and function of the Safeguarding Board and how the Council performed its statutory duties.
- A Strategic Programme Lead for Safeguarding had been appointed to manage the transitional phase while the recommendations from the safeguarding review were being established. The new appointment to Deputy DASS would be leading on performance across the service, including in safeguarding. A new Principal Social Worker would be joining in March 2026 who would focus on practise at the front line.
- The digital roadmap was an important part of the improvement journey as some practices in the service were outdated.
- Safeguarding referrals were professionally screened to determine the level of risk, whether the concerns met the Section 42 threshold and whether immediate protective action was required. Safeguarding investigations could be complex with variations in the amount of time required.
- Monthly meetings took place with providers to discuss the responses to their safeguarding enquiries.
- Progress was underway with the transformation of the ‘front door’ to Adult Social Care which was expected to make a huge difference in how responsive and person-centred the service was.

Sara Sutton, Corporate Director of Adults, Housing & Health, emphasised the importance of the Improvement Plan and the recognition of staffing and capacity levels which had been discussed under the Haringey Safeguarding Adults Board (HSAB) agenda item at the previous Scrutiny Panel meeting. An additional £3.6m of staffing investment had been proposed for the 2026/27 Budget. In addition:

- The new Adult Social Care Directory would improve the availability of up-to-date information for signposting.

- The Connected Communities had now been integrated into the Adult Social Care service which would further increase capacity.
- There was scope for complex cases across adults and housing to be supported in a different way to promote early intervention/prevention and meet demand challenges.

Cllr das Neves, Sara Sutton and Jo Baty then responded to questions from the Panel:

- Helena Kania expressed concerns about various aspects of the service including the length of time people waited for a response, the lack of information about when a response could be expected and the difficulties that people experienced in using the website.
- Cllr Brennan referred to the recent evidence from JPB members who had said that phone lines were not answered and commented that this was unacceptable for a safeguarding service. She added that it was not obvious from the website how to find an emergency safeguarding telephone number.
- Cllr Mason reported that she had experienced difficulties in contacting Adult Social Care on behalf of local residents including those who use food banks. She observed that this inhibited opportunities for early intervention and prevention for people who required support which was likely to led to greater demand at a later stage.
- Mark Howe, Deputy DASS, responded to the points above commenting that the feedback was helpful and fit with the challenges that the service was working on improving. He added that safeguarding services were overloaded in local authorities across the country and acknowledged the worry and concern that this caused to people who have having difficulty in accessing services. The Council fully understand that there were system issues and was working to put those right. He highlighted the effective professional judgment and sound integrity that he had seen in the safeguarding team since his recent appointment but that the limitations on the team were due to the volume of the demand.
- Cllr Connor said that the feedback from the JPB meeting had been clear which was that when somebody calls the Council regarding a safeguarding issue, they want the call to be answered, to be told how long the process would take and for a reference number and a future means of contact to be provided so that they could be kept updated.
- Cllr O'Donovan made a number of observations:
  - That the main landing page of the Council website, the most prominent sections linked to areas such as parking or Council Tax. Sections relating to Adult Social Care were much lower down and safeguarding information was not prominently displayed. He suggested that this information needed to be easy for people to find, both on the website and from search engines.

- He queried why residents did not appear to receive an automatic acknowledgement after submitted a safeguarding concern online and suggested that should include useful information such as anticipated timescales for a response and a reference number.
- He noted that residents were required to download a form as a Word document, complete it and then email the document. He queried why this could not simply be done through an online form which would be easier, particularly for those using a mobile device.
- He noted that there was a main number for adult social care (ending 1400) and a separate safeguarding number. He suggested that these numbers should be easy to find and made clear which numbers were appropriate for specific purposes.
- He commented that some residents, particularly older people, did not use the website and that contact information for safeguarding could be included along with the other contact information published in Haringey People magazine.
- Cllr Opoku highlighted a number of concerns:
  - She commented that people using the telephone system, were placed on hold and selected the option for a callback to be made, found that they were often not subsequently contacted. She queried whether there was a problem with the callback system.
  - She said that residents should receive an automated response when completing an online form and that this should be a quick issue for the Council to fix.
  - She highlighted a concern raised by a JPB member who experienced difficulties in completing an online form on the Council website because it would 'time out' after a certain period of time, although the time limit was unclear and not displayed. This led to information being lost and the resident needing to fill all the details out from the beginning.
  - Noting that some community organisations dealt with cases on behalf of residents, she suggested that they could be provided with separate contact details in order to expedite these cases.
- Responding to this wide range of suggestions, Cllr das Neves:
  - Emphasised that some of the issues were being addressed through the Improvement Plan.
  - Expressed disappointment that partners had not raised their concerns with her directly and that many did have escalation routes and direct contact information.
  - She added that she was passionate about prevention, that this was an agenda that the Council had been advancing for some time, including through the neighbourhood health work for example.
  - She noted that a lot of the comments related to how the website was managed and that a broader session with Councillors on this could be worthwhile. She noted that there was data on the routes that people

used to access information (for example, search terms from Google) and so the design of the front page may be informed by that.

- Jo Baty reiterated that the key issues including capacity, workforce development, digital response, information, advice and guidance were all in the process of being addressed. She added that the Council had a strong relationship with the Joint Partnership Board and worked closely with them, with representation on each of the reference groups. Her view was that the routes of escalation and interface with safeguarding would grow from the grassroots up. In the short term, the transitional arrangements for safeguarding could be reviewed in light of the practical points that had been raised and she would also have further discussions with the JPB at forthcoming meetings. This commitment was welcomed by Cllr Connor.

### **53. SAFEGUARDING: GROUP-BASED CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE(CSA DATA)**

Cllr Connor explaining that this item had been scheduled to discuss safeguarding issues arising from recent discussions at meetings of the Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel and the Children & Young People's Scrutiny Panel. The Panel had requested a crime data analysis report from the Metropolitan Police North Area BCU. However, Cllr Connor reported that she had received a message from the Metropolitan Police stating that they would not be able to attend the meeting. She had responded to express her disappointment at this as it was difficult for the Panel to understand how Council services should respond without the information requested. Cllr Connor explained that she had spoken to the chair of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and it had been agreed that this item could be added instead to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee's agenda in March. **(ACTION)**

Cllr Makbule Gunes, Chair of the Culture, Community Safety and Environment Scrutiny Panel and Helena Kania also expressed their disappointment at the postponement of this item. Cllr Mason added that a lot of the information requested was already in the public domain and so it should not have been a problem for the Metropolitan Police to provide this data. Cllr O'Donovan commented that the Metropolitan Police were re-examining up to 9,000 historic cases of abuse across London but the criteria for this were broad-based and not necessarily under the definition of grooming gangs. He suggested that it would be helpful to receive data on how many of these cases related to Haringey. **(ACTION)**

### **54. QUALITY ASSURANCE/CQC OVERVIEW**

The report for this item was presented by Richmond Kessie, Commissioning & Quality Assurance Officer. The report outlined the quality assurance activities across Haringey's adult social care provider market to safeguard quality, support improvement and ensure that residents received safe and person-centred care. Richmond Kessie highlighted some key points:

- The past year had continued to be challenging for care providers with inflation and rising workforce costs, placing pressure on service sustainability. The Council had mitigated these pressures as far as possible through the annual inflation uplift.

- Engagement with the market had been strengthened, including through well-attended monthly provider forums which provided an important space for open dialogue, shared learning and early identification of risk.
- Over the period covered by the report, the Council had commissioned care from more than 220 CQC-registered providers, both in-Borough and out of Borough, and had supported over 5,300 residents.
- Market shifts had included an increase in out-of-Borough placements and a rise in unrated providers. The Council's policy of avoiding new placements with unrated providers remained in place.
- The quality assurance team continued to play a critical role in identifying and supporting providers requiring intervention. This included those with declining CQC ratings, safeguarding concerns or operational risks. Several providers had been supported to make measurable improvements through welfare checks, improvement plans and joint working with the CQC.
- The quality assurance and contract management framework had been embedded across adult social care and this strengthened governance, risk oversight and coordination between commissioning, safeguarding and contract management functions.

Andreas Schwarz, Operation Manager, North West & North Central London ASC Team 2 and Muhammed Koodoruth, Adult Social Care Inspector, both from the Care Quality Commission (CQC) then presented slides to the Panel which included the following details:

- In terms of CQC ratings, services in Haringey had better overall ratings when compared to the London and national averages.
- The CQC had committed to completing 9,000 assessments by the end of September 2026 and to recruit more registration inspectors.
- Current CQC priorities included responding quickly to emerging risk, examining services which had not previously been assessed, had not been assessed for a long time or were flagged as being high risk.
- Long-term plans for improvement included the redesign of the entire regulatory process. This included the use of new technology and looking at how AI could be utilised to speed up the assessment process. The online portal had been improved to make it easier for providers to communicate with the CQC.

The Council and CQC officers then responded to questions from the Panel:

- Asked by Cllr Brennan about the high number of care providers that had not been inspected, Andreas Schwarz responded that this was a national issue with a similar proportion of providers being uninspected in other similar Boroughs. Cllr Mason queried how a service could be opened without being rated. Andreas Schwarz explained that, once a service was registered, it could provide a regulated activity and take on service users. However, this would often be for private service users because local authorities would not typically place residents with unrated services. These providers still had to adhere to regulation and work within statutory requirements. He added that some unrated providers were dormant and no longer offered services.
- Asked by Cllr Connor about the Council's approach to unrated services, Richmond Kessie said that the Council had a policy not to place residents with any provider that did not have a rating of 'Good' or higher.

- Cllr Opoku referred to a table in the report which showed that there were four unrated providers which had been commissioned by Haringey Council. Richmond Kessie explained that providers could sometimes change hands and so residents who had been placed under the previous provider could end up in unrated services. He added that the Council had quarterly meetings with the CQC where there could raise service providers that they felt ought to be prioritised for a future inspection. The Council could also engage with these providers for quality assurance purposes.
- Cllr lyngkaran commented that the number of providers being used by the Council had dropped by around 30 since last year and queried the reasons for this. Richmond Kessie explained that the provider market had been difficult recently and so a number of providers had exited the market and that this was also reflected in the wider national picture. Cllr lyngkaran expressed concern that fewer providers could lead to higher prices in the local market. Cllr das Neves commented that the system was not functioning healthily and that some providers were exiting the market due to financial challenges. Some providers were small and may struggle while others may choose to position themselves in other areas that were more profitable. Her opinion was that these circumstances did not always deliver the best value and so it was an area that she would like to see work differently. Sara Sutton added that there was an annual uplift to providers and that the Council was finalising this for the following year as part of a process that included benchmarking across the North Central London (NCL) area and focusing on what was a sustainable price for providers. At a national level there were ongoing discussions around the Fair Pay Agreement and the implications for the care workforce. Jo Baty commented that the commissioning team had good, strong relationships with providers and that it was particularly important to try to protect the smaller providers that were rated Good or Outstanding and keep them engaged in the market.
- Cllr Connor referred to the report which stated that the quality assurance team had raised concerns about the low inspection frequency for some providers and asked how the CQC could improve this situation. Andreas Schwarz responded that, since November, the CQC had reverted to specialist teams which had increased inspection activity. The team looked at services which had an older rating, no rating or was considered to be high risk and then prioritised them accordingly. There was also ongoing work to streamline the inspection process which should increase inspection activity. Cllr Connor suggested that it would be useful to see the details of how these improvements were working in practice as part of a future report. **(ACTION)**

## 55. FINANCE UPDATE - Q2 2025/26

Rachel Boston, Finance Manager, introduced the report which set out the Council's in-year financial position at the end of Quarter 2 for 2025/26 and included the following key points:

- A favourable movement was reported at Q2 compared to Q1.
- Work had been ongoing with the services to review budgets and it had been possible to identify £1.8m of income that had not been fully accounted for.

- Services for older people had stabilised and the average unit cost was decreasing.
- However, there was growth in services for the 18-64 age group, predominantly within mental health and physical disability. The Council had been working closely with the local NHS Integrated Care Board (ICB) and there was now a better contribution for packages of care from the ICB.

Responses were then provided to questions from the Panel:

- Cllr Opoku commented that the 18-64 age group was broad and that it would be helpful to see a more detailed breakdown to understand which age groups were most impacted. Rachel Boston clarified that a lot of younger people under 35 requiring mental health support were coming through the system, whereas with cases involving physical health this tended to be from people above the age of 50.
- Referring to paragraph 1.2 of the report, Cllr Connor noted that the outturn variance for the General Fund was £23.4m which represented an improvement of £10.7m. She queried whether further improvements could be expected later in the year. Rachel Boston confirmed that further improvements were expected because of factors such as the ICB contributions. It would be necessary to recast the Council's demand modelling and pressures for next year to establish a clear position for the budget going forward.
- Cllr Iyngkaran asked whether the trends in demand for services, such as growth in the 18-64 age bracket could be expected to continue in future years. Sara Sutton commented that it was very difficult to make predictions for demand-led services and that there were many variables to build into the modelling assumptions. The team was working on three different scenarios with detailed analysis to improve modelling and forecasting. However, she added that the position was much improved compared to last year which had a considerably higher overspend position.
- Referring to Table 2 in the report, Cllr Connor noted that the total variance for Quarter 1 for Adult Social Services was around £7.5m and that the movement from Q1 to Q2 was £1.8m, resulting in a variance at Q2 of £5.7m. Rachel Boston explained that the £5.7m was expected to reduce further later in the year due to the formal agreement with the ICB over joint funding arrangements.
- Cllr Mason referred to paragraph 1.2 of the report which stated that there was a forecast overspend of £23.4m in 2025/26 with an additional £37m of budgeted spend from Exceptional Financial Support (EFS). She expressed concern about the likely difficulties with the Budget in 2026/27, including the repayment of funds already borrowed from the Government. Sara Sutton said that the draft Budget report for 2026/27 included these details and it was noted that this report would be discussed at the Cabinet meeting the following day. Dominic O'Brien, Scrutiny Officer, advised the Panel that the Overview & Scrutiny Committee would be receiving a report on the Q3 figures on 11<sup>th</sup> March 2026 and that any queries about this from the Panel could be referred to that meeting.
- Cllr Connor referred to Table 3 in the report which referred to savings and management actions and showed that £2.23m out of the £3.963m savings for

adult social care were currently projected to be fully delivered. She asked for assurances that a greater proportion of the savings would be achieved by the end of the financial year. Jo Baty explained that there had been some delays with bringing in the new commissioning staff who would make a difference as they would be leading on savings delivery next year. The NRS provider failure also held up the service as this became a significant focus of the service for three to four months. The other point to note was that there were interdependencies with other areas of the Council which were also trying to make savings. Any savings not achieved this year would be rolled forward to next year.

Cllr Connor then referred to the 2025/26 savings table on page 43 and commented that it would be useful to have reference numbers next to each saving so that it would be easier to cross-reference these with previous papers. Sara Sutton said that it would not be possible to do this for Q3 as the papers had already been prepared but could refer this suggestion to the finance team as an action for next year. **(ACTION)**

The Panel then asked questions about the specific savings in the table:

### Transitions

- Cllr Connor noted that the expected cost of transitions was now lower than forecast in 2023 and queried the robustness of the data. Jo Baty said that the finance team had done a lot of work on transitions and that there was a good grip of the data in this area with a known cohort. She added that this was underpinned by governance around transitions that had not been in place 18 months previously.
- Cllr Iyngkaran noted the costs of the growth in the number of cases in the 18-64 age bracket, particularly with mental health, and queried whether there could be some underestimation of issues and therefore an underinvestment in services. Rachel Boston said that it had been possible to profile the data and cohort much better over the last few months and that, while there was a reduced number of cases this year, a rise was expected in 2027/28. While some variance was to be expected, the data was now considered to be more stable.
- Cllr Mason raised the issue of legal challenges on behalf of young people going through transitions, including the costs to the Council and the impact on the young people if they did not receive the services that they required. She asked whether the number of legal challenges had increased in recent years. Jo Baty responded that she did not have the data for this but was happy to look into this. **(ACTION)** She added that a particular challenge for parents and carers in this area was that the availability of services for adults was significantly lower than for children and so the wraparound support that children received at school changed when people transitioned to adulthood. It was therefore important to work with schools and colleges to manage expectations from the age of 14 onwards about transition arrangements and to improve the planning for this. Other issues included late diagnosis and the length of time required to obtain an autism diagnosis. Cllr das Neves

highlighted circumstances of children aged 14 or 15 who would be in children's services but about to leave by the time of receiving their diagnosis. She suggested that this could be a useful future topic to discuss at a joint meeting of the Adults & Health and the Children & Young People Scrutiny Panels. Cllr Connor concurred with this and noted that the Chairs of these Panels had previously agreed to conduct further scrutiny of the data around transitions. **(ACTION)** Cllr das Neves added that it was important to make the distinction between, mental health, autism, and learning disabilities.

- Cllr O'Donovan observed that the Panel had previously received information about the Haringey Integrated Transition Service which aimed to reduce costs and queried whether the savings in this area was evidence that the service was now working. Jo Baty responded that the service was working for the people supported by it and noted that the service currently had around 50 cases. She added that there was a lot more to do and the aim was to work with more young people and families in a more integrated way.
- Asked by Cllr Brennan whether private companies could carry out assessments for educational care plans, Jo Baty confirmed that this was the case.

#### Staffing savings for Adult Social Services

- Asked by Cllr Brennan to provide further details of this saving, Sara Sutton explained that this related mainly to agency roles to support the CQC inspection which was not required in the long-term. However, the front-line capacity was being increased. It was also clarified that this did not involve reductions in the capacity of the commissioning team.

#### Integrated Connected Communities

- Asked by Cllr Connor for further details about the delivery of the savings, Sara Sutton explained that the consultation and engagement with the team had been completed and that the savings were on track to be delivered in full. A number of vacancies had been held and a number of people had been able to secure permanent roles at a higher level. There would be one compulsory redundancy as part of the changes but that related to an individual who did not apply for any roles as they were moving out of the area. The new Independence & Early Intervention (IEI) Team would have 17 full-time equivalent roles and would be part of the new 'front-door' to services being implemented from Q1 of 2026/27.

#### Developing Community Support model

- Cllr Connor observed that this saving relied more on a change in behaviour rather than direct budget cuts and asked what would happen if that change in behaviour did not transpire and why the full saving had not been achieved. Jo Baty explained that, while there would be a cultural shift, there would also be efficiencies and more use of digital within the front door redesign. Prior to the change, there were five teams all working differently

and this would be replaced with one team with a consistent offer. She added that the savings would be made through the front-door redesign and would require a consultation with staff. Sara Sutton explained that any shortfall in the savings by the end of the year would need to be mitigated.

- Helena Kania asked how the NHS budget cuts would impact on the saving, given that the service relied on collaboration with the NHS ICB. Sara Sutton acknowledged that the dynamics in the relationship with the ICB had shifted following their structure changes and so the Council would need to work more closely with providers. She suggested that a discussion on the collaborative approach and the neighbourhood health agenda could be a topic for a future Scrutiny Panel meeting. **(ACTION)** She added that another area potentially impacted by this was the Continuing Healthcare (CHC) work where there had recently been a lot of work to improve funding arrangements. Cllr das Neves commented that the forthcoming merger between the North Central London and North West London ICBs was notable as the spending on CHC was considerably higher in North West London. Cllr Connor informed the Panel that the meeting of the Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee would be looking at the NHS 10-year plan which may be relevant to this discussion. Cllr Connor highlighted the risk to the Council receiving fair funding from health partners and recommended that the Panel continued to monitor this issue. **(ACTION)**

### Review of the Council's Reablement model

- Asked by Cllr Connor about the implementation of the saving for patients, Jo Baty observed that the reablement service had fared well in the recent CQC report. She said that it was a good service but expensive because it required improvement and an updated approach so there were huge opportunities for savings. An initial report on this had been drafted by the Head of Integrated Care and brought through internal governance with a more structured discussion with staff expected to follow.

### Supported Living Contract

- Noting that this saving had been delayed, Cllr Connor requested further details about the expected timescales for implementation. Sara Sutton said that a financial analysis on this was expected over the next few days so further details would be available soon, but she expected that some savings could be made in-year with a larger proportion of the savings rolled into delivery for next year. Work was ongoing to identify areas for mitigation based on opportunities in other areas.
- Cllr Connor referred to the Panel's previous concerns about the annual review of supported living contracts and asked about any current backlogs in this area. Sara Sutton clarified that the saving was not predicated on this but acknowledged that there were waiting lists in some areas and there were additional resources available to assist with reducing these. The actual substantive saving would be generated by changing the model of commissioning and the backlogs would be addressed over time by way of

the overall proposals around staffing capacity. Cllr Connor requested data on the current waiting lists for assessments. **(ACTION)**

### 5% Staff saving

- Asked for further details by Cllr Connor on this saving, Sara Sutton explained that this was partly included in the previously discussed saving while there had also been a saving in the public health team following a recent retirement of a staff member.

### Public health

- Cllr Iyngkaran referred to the saving on 0-19 years Public Health Nursing Services efficiencies. He expressed concerns about the recent reductions in the uptake for vaccines and queried whether this saving would have an impact on vaccine delivery to the community. Sara Sutton explained that this saving was achieved through back-office efficiencies rather than staff reductions and therefore would not impact on the vaccination programme. Cllr das Neves spoke about the targeted work with specific representatives to increase vaccination rates in particular communities but noted that falling vaccination rates was a wider national problem.

The Panel then asked questions about the capital forecasts:

### Aids, Adaptations & Assistive Tech – Home Owners (201)

- Cllr Connor noted that the status of this item was that it was on budget but not on time. Jo Baty explained that this related to the procurement of new contractors as part of the improvements necessary with aids and adaptations. Contracts had been signed recently and it was expected that the timescales would have improved by the time of the Q3 report.

### Community Alarm Service (211)

- Asked by Cllr Mason for assurances about the delivery of this service, Jo Baty said that the digital IT platform had just been signed off so this was all in hand. Sara Sutton noted that this item referred only to the capital element of the budget for this service which was combined with a revenue element.

### Canning Crescent Assisted Living (213)

- Cllr das Neves provided an update on this item, informing the Panel that services at the Roger Sylvester Centre - Canning Crescent had started operating in the autumn but that the formal opening had taken place earlier that week. All Councillors would soon receive an invitation to visit the Centre. This was a Council project with support from partners in the NHS and voluntary sector. The service operated as a neighbourhood mental health hub, providing more crisis beds and also hosted the Clarendon Recovery College.

- Asked by Cllr Connor about future income from placements, Sara Sutton explained that income wouldn't come to adult social care but that there would be rental income to Corporate Property. She welcomed the opening of the new facilities and added that this resulted in the overall number of available crisis beds increasing from 7 to 13. This would enable more people to be supported in the community and avoid hospital admissions and out-of-Borough placements.
- Panel Members welcomed the opening of the new facilities, commenting that it was important to have this support available to residents and placing on record their thanks to the officers and Councillors for their hard work on delivering this project.

Locality Hub (225)

- In response to a query from Cllr Connor on why this item was on hold, Sara Sutton explained that this related to the Neighbourhood Resource Centre and that there was a proposal to remove this item from the General Fund capital budget in next year's proposals and move it to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) because it was an HRA asset. This was due to an anomaly in the historical papers.

**56. WORK PROGRAMME**

Cllr Connor advised the Panel that the Scrutiny Review report on discharge from hospital would be approved by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee shortly and was expected to be presented to the Cabinet before the pre-election period. The Scrutiny Review report on communications and adult social care was also nearing completion and was expected to be finished before the pre-election period, although the presentation to Cabinet was not likely to happen until the new administration was in place.

Cllr Connor also advised that dates would be explored for a joint meeting of the Adults & Health and the Children & Young People Scrutiny Panels and that any updates to the Panel's action tracker would be circulated by email.

As this was her last Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel meeting, Cllr Connor also placed on record her thanks to the Panel members and officers and said that it had been a privilege to serve as the Chair of the Panel.

CHAIR: Councillor Pippa Connor

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

## **MINUTES OF THE CULTURE, COMMUNITY SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2026, 6.30pm**

### **IN ATTENDANCE:**

Councillors Makbule Gunes (Chair), Liam Carroll, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Mark Grosskopf and Sue Jameson

Councillor Seema Chandwani, Cabinet Member for Resident Services & Tackling Inequality

Councillor Ibrahim Ali, Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment

Councillor Ajda Ovat, Cabinet Member for Communities

### **ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

- Hannah Hayes, Superintendent, Metropolitan Police
- Naima Ihsan, Principal Transport Planner
- Rob Krzyszowski, Director of Planning & Building Standard
- Mark Wolski, Head of Community Safety
- Fola Irikefe, Principal Scrutiny Officer

The following people attended as part of the panels evidence gathering session for the Scrutiny Review of Cycling Safety:

- Ben House, Coordinator, Haringey Cycling Campaign (HCC)
- Ian Sygrave, Chair of the Ladder Community Safety Partnership (LCSP) and the Ward Police Panel
- Vincent Neff, Healthy Streets North Tottenham
- Michael Poteliakhoff, Chair, Haringey Cycling Campaign (HCC)

### **Attendance Online:**

Amanda Jacobs, Member of Haringey's Joint Partnership Board (JPB) and of the now-defunct Transport Inclusion Group, Chair of City of London Access Group (CoLAG)

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Dunstall, Chief Superintendent Anna McCartney, Barry Francis, Eubert Malcolm and Zoe Robertson.

### **2. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair referred Members present to agenda item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted the information contained therein'.

### **3. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

## **5. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / QUESTIONS**

There were none received.

## **6. MINUTES**

That the minutes of the meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2025 were agreed as an accurate record.

## **7. METROPOLITAN POLICE UPDATE REPORT**

Superintendent Hanah Hayes, Metropolitan Police gave an update, providing an overview of crime statistics over the period of January 2025 to December 2025 and explained there continues to be high rates of crime in respect of theft and violence against the person. The Panel were briefed that there had also been some increases in the area of the possession of drugs, weapons and drug trafficking which could be because of increased police action in these areas. The highest offences were seen in July 2025 and the lowest in February 2025 which correlates with the seasonal variance. Increase in positive outcome rates is also considered as positive as hate crime, sexual offenses are often under-reported.

Superintendent Hayes explained that there has been an increase in vehicle crime but there is yet to be an insight as to what has caused the increase but there is an awareness that in certain wards there is one person carrying out the offence so when that person is arrested the rate goes down significantly.

Once questions opened, Councillor Gunes sought clarity on whether sexual offences include those inside as well as outside in public. Superintendent Hayes confirmed that the sexual offenses were those carried out both in private and in the public domain including a varied range of offences from inappropriate touching to the most extreme. Following further enquiry, it was confirmed that domestic abuse and violence against the person statistics was not just limited to violence and included coercive control, financial abuse etc.

The Chair expressed that Tottenham Hale was a hotspot for crimes such as phone theft and there was also a national trend with this on the increase, she enquired what was being done internally within the council to try and address it. Councillor Ovat, Cabinet Member for Communities explained that a lot of partnership work is carried out with the Police, ward Councillors and during the week of action they consider statistics and the location of which wards need to be prioritised. Once areas are identified, actions are then co-ordinated between partners for example in tackling shop lifting – the council works with local traders and businesses, and this has led to some reductions.

The Chair said that in reference to theft of motor vehicle, at the Ferry Lane estate, numerous cars without number plates are left there and its causing ongoing issues. Superintendent Hayes agreed that there has been an increase in – two main patterns, parcel shelf theft and blue badge holder theft. In respect of parcel shelf, Councillor Cawley-Harrison enquired if there was a team in the

Metropolitan Police looking into patterns that are emerging? Superintendent Hayes explained that a team will do once it becomes a pattern, but intel needs to be built up but only becomes a priority once reported - statistics, pressure and priority is when it becomes a priority.

Councillor Carroll enquired if facial recognition was having an impact on picking up shoplifters? Superintendent Hayes explained that generally live facial recognition has not necessarily had an impact on new perpetrators as it is generally those who are already known and wanted that are picked up through the technology as opposed to unknown criminals.

A follow up question on the progress of extractions and how has it gone over the last 12 months was put to Superintendent Hayes. It was explained that they were previously unable to understand extraction rates, currently unable to mark it up but the response teams are being stretched as a result of the increase in demonstrations. In the event of a murder, the response to that is also extracted from neighbourhood teams. Superintendent Hayes said that following some monitoring, they have found that teams can be extracted by up to 40% on a daily basis and increasing to 80% on the weekends and Haringey is at 78% capacity and Enfield is 82%.

Councillor Cawley-Harrison enquired about what the cost of recovery from covering commercial events like concerts was? Superintendent Hayes explained that Tottenham Football club, have to pay for Police Officers within the footprint of the club but not outside of the stadium. The Police are required to provide policing externally, extractions across the Metropolitan Police are also taken to other clubs regardless of the location. At present they do not get any money back unless they are within the footprint of the stadium.

Councillor Cawley-Harrison followed on from this question, enquiring what control the council has with gigs and the contracts and whether there was any scope to allow events taking demand e.g. funding for the police. The Director of Planning & Building Standard explained that they were looking looked at things that can be done within planning legislation. There are not provisions currently for utilising other methods of funding through e.g. business rates. In terms of managing events, the police and other key stakeholders in the Safety Advisory Group work well together. The Head of Community Safety explained that there have been some contributions in respect of noise and licensing, street trading and anti-social behaviour. Councillor Cawley-Harrison voiced that events were a big expense to the Council and Police without cost recovery and this was something we should be looking into and possibly be lobbying for within legislation as part of granting a licence.

A Councillor voiced that there is a lot happening in Crouch End, Muswell Hill and Highgate and the Neighbourhood Teams order to know who the goods are being sold onto. The Councillor expressed that it would be good if it could be looked into. Superintendent Hayes explained that PC's, Sergeants and inspectors need special permission for extra resources and have put in further bids. There has to be some caution raised around request that has been put in due to disparity in

application and low risk wards that don't get the same resources as the east of the borough.

Councillor Jameson enquired about the process used for stopping shoplifters. The Panel heard that the perpetrator is generally stopped by security who then contacts the unit and then they are arrested, the shop then issues a banning order, the Police will then issue a community warning – either a CPW or CPN which prevents them returning to the shop. Superintendent Hayes also reported that there is a move for judges taking shoplifting more seriously and so charging for multiple offences at once has led to higher prison sentences with some over 12 months.

Councillor Grosskopf enquired why closure orders couldn't be put in place for longer? The Head of Community Safety explained that they made wide use of closure orders in the east of the borough in areas such as Rothbury Walk which was for a three month period that could be extended – he asserted that there is a need to balance between the closure and the interests of the people living in the area.

Councillor Grosskopf enquired about the patrols by mosques as they were not visible Superintendent Hayes responded that there should be visible patrols. FOLLOW UP: Superintendent Hayes to follow up regarding patrols by the mosque.

Michael Poteliakhoff, Chair, Haringey Cycling Campaign (HCC) enquired whether bike theft was included in theft category or robbery category to which Superintendent Hayes explained it was generally theft and was only categorised a robbery where violence is used. Superintendent Hayes also confirmed that year-on-year there is probably an increase in bike theft especially with electric bikes.

**FOLLOW UP** – Details of number of bike theft to be provided. Able to come back with details

The Head of Community Safety concluded the discussions by briefing on the pressing demands at present which included the increased pressure on the Community Safety Partnership including implementing the Anti-Social Behaviour

Policy and protocol, procuring MOPAC funded officers for four years, mental health issues, increasing housing challenges and increase in complex case work.

The Chair thanked everyone present.

## **8. UPDATE ON TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL**

Rob Krzyszowski, Director of Planning & Building Standard opened the discussions on the update on transport and travel as part of the evidence for Panels review of cycling safety with information that the panel had requested.

Naima Ihsan, Principal Transport Planner mapped out the collision data between January 2022 and December 2024 which are detailed below.

Pedestrian collisions are as follows:

- 6 fatal accidents – 5 male, 1 female
- 92 serious collisions, 50 female, 43 male
- 392 slight collisions, 198 male, 195 females
- Key Areas: Green Lanes, Tottenham, Crouch End, Northumberland Park, Archway Road
- Cycling collisions are detailed below:
  - No fatal collisions
  - 58 serious collisions - 42 male, 16 female
  - 309 slight collisions - 244 male, 55 female
  - Key Areas:
    - Green Lanes, Tottenham, Crouch End, Northumberland Park, Archway Road

The top ten issues from the Common Place exercise were also identified through engagement and was presented to the Panel. Amongst the main barriers that were identified through the consultation was lack of cycle infrastructure, safety issues, accessibility Issues (lack of step free access), pavement conditions and congestion amongst some other detailed in the presentation.

The headline outcomes from an additional engagement for the Kerbside Strategy which aims to address issue of safer, healthier and more livable streets showed a high number of respondents agreeing that streets should prioritise walking, wheeling and cycling. The majority of people also agreed with the division of space for walking, access for vehicles and socialising. There was also strong agreement that walking, wheeling, buses and cycling should be prioritised over private cars.

Details of zebra crossing installations, school streets implementations for 44 schools, Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, 20pmh roads and the current motorcycling safety consultation running till mid-March 2026.

The Panel also heard about the imminent procurement of a new dockless bikes provider currently in procurement stage. The new contract would be awarded on the basis of improvements safeguards, stronger management of non-compliantly parked bikes being removed within 3 hours of being reported, increased patrol in hotspot areas of Haringey via consistent monitoring of the user database and campaigns in schools to target those who are using dockless bikes underage. The awarded provider will also have to employ stricter fines on non-compliant users, concessions for lower income groups, contribute to cycle training and a share of profits.

Councillor Grosskopf enquired about data before and after LTN's are installed in terms of collision rates. Councillor Ibrahim Ali, Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment explained that there has been a long period of monitoring LTN's and there has been a 38% reduction in collisions. There has also been a reduction in congestion population so less turn on the periphery. Councillor Grosskopf sought further insight into the impact on the boundary roads. FOLLOW UP: Naima Ihsan to provide exact statistics as part of a Cabinet report. Councillor

Seema Chandwani, Cabinet Member for Resident Services & Tackling Inequality, explained that in trying to understand why the boundary roads have also seen a reduction it is because the majority of LTN's are at junctions and so people are no longer making turns down particular roads because they are LTN's and less likely to collide with another vehicle or cyclists.

Councillor Cawley-Harrison sought clarity on the use of the term collision. The Cabinet Member for Resident Services & Tackling Inequality explained that the term collision was used now rather than 'accident' as 'accident' removed the sense of the person being blameless.

Councillor Cawley-Harrison enquired over when considering road safety interventions, what evaluation is carried out with the collision in itself e.g. does infrastructure come into play in the analysis - do we identify challenges with infrastructure. Councillor Chandwani explained that the Safe Systems response is followed looking at behaviour, speeding and prevention.

Councillor Liam Carroll expressed that he felt some of the worst operators of dockless bikes were currently in the borough and was keen to know how things would be different once the new contract was awarded. The Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment explained that the new dockless bike contract was going to Cabinet on 10 March, and one of the potential operators was actually based in the borough so hopefully responses will improve, there will now be targets and a timeline for issuing fines, funding for cycle training will also be included as well as other stipulations. The Cabinet Member for Resident Services & Tackling Inequality explained that there are various hire bikes that are unregulated and the best thing that can be done is to get into a contract with the winning tender matching the councils' expectations and in doing so tightening enforcement.

Director of Planning & Building Standard added that the trial for dockless bikes provided the council with the opportunity to learn lessons and whoever is awarded the contract, liaison will be built in with operation reports, stronger clauses on event management and contractual controls on dockless bikes.

Councillor Jameson expressed that the 3-hour removal for non-compliant dockless bikes felt too long especially for example wheelchair users. Councillor Chandwani explained that it is currently 24 hours so a clear improvement. Councillor Ali said that the contract had to be realistic and achievable and three hours felt ideal. This objective will be closely monitored with a view to improving.

Councillor Chandwani also informed the Panel that geo-fencing which will be implemented will also be a disincentive for parking in the wrong place as the perpetrator will be charged continuously. A dedicated email address for people to contact where there is a major obstruction will also be provided. Councillor Ali also explained that one operator will have QR code that people can report to.

Councillor Jameson stressed that there is currently no way of telling if a bike is vertical or horizontal and sprawled across the pavement. Councillor Ali and

Chandwani agreed and that it was a point to be taken away when considering the new operator.

**ACTION:** Consideration of whether the bikes will be able to indicate to providers if it is horizontal or vertical should be provided.

Michael Poteliakhoff, Chair, Haringey Cycling Campaign (HCC) enquired about the Kerbside Strategy and whether it was felt there should be stronger rules regarding pavement cross overs along the line of Islington and Westminster. The Director of Planning & Building Standard expressed that the question had been submitted via Planning Policy and a response would be provided through that means.

**ACTION:** Response to be sent to HCC regarding the Kerbside Strategy and pavement cross overs. RK

Amanda Jacobs, Member of Haringey's Joint Partnership Board (JPB) and of the now-defunct Transport Inclusion Group, Chair of City of London Access Group (CoLAG) briefed that she was attending online on behalf of the Chair of the Joint Partnership Board problems regarding accessibility and inclusion posed by dockless bikes and requested an official response to the document submitted. Amanda Jacobs stressed for the Panel to consider accessibility and inclusion at all points including the perspective that disabled and older people also as cyclists themselves as part of their review and not just pedestrians and wheelchair users. There are up to 13, 000 disabled cyclists in the borough.

**ACTION:** Include evidence submitted as part of the Scrutiny Panels review.

## **8 SCRUTINY REVIEW OF CYCLING SAFETY - EVIDENCE GATHERING AT THE MEETING**

The Panel received a presentation from Michael Poteliakhoff, Chair, Haringey Cycling Campaign (HCC) on the various cycle lanes in the borough and the challenges and the problem areas around the borough and **the need to improve infrastructure**. The campaign group also shared details of integrated cycle culture and design in other areas of the country such as Kings Lynn and other countries like Japan.

The HCC briefed on the problems with shared cycle lanes between cyclists and pedestrians as the **signage for cyclists** is often un-clear when they can use the pavements and the increased pavements leaves the road narrower. The Chair of the HCC expressed that Haringey has a patchwork road network and that Hackney has a good cycling network and the issue with cycle lanes in Haringey is that it isn't a joined up, coherent cycling network although there are some good examples in the borough. Michael Poteliakhoff questioned if the objectives in the Walking and Cycling Action Plan, although commendable, currently felt unattainable because it felt like the momentum has stalled despite the fact that more and more people are cycling in the borough.

The Chair of the Panel gave an example of the need for better **planning** having been informed that a cycle lane was to be implemented in her ward as the funding from TfL had to be utilised. Councillor Gunes expressed that there was no communication or consultation about the cycle lane prior to implementation so she agreed that a more cohesive and planned approach was needed. The HCC expressed that **TfL design and consult** but they often follow through with their plans regardless. Ben House also stressed that the London boroughs which do well with regards to their cycling infrastructure are those who push back with TfL.

Councillor Grosskopf expressed that many people cycling on Markfield Road don't feel comfortable and they end up cycling on the pavement, he felt a separate lane would be helpful. Councillor Gunes also added that the lane outside Seven Sisters High Road is too large and it's a detriment to pedestrians.

Councillor Cawley-Harrison voiced that the current conversation and line of enquiry was part of the challenge, he felt people focussed on the small areas and challenges and there is a need to **think more strategically rather** than looking at particular issues. He enquired with the HCC if they felt the problems were because we were trying to make the infrastructure perfect.

Ben House, Coordinator, Haringey Cycling Campaign (HCC) said there needs to be a bigger strategic picture such as the Walking and Cycling Action Plan but **implementation can be gradual and flexible and he cited that in Camden** they have up to 15 miles of protected segregated cycle lanes and they started with plastic wands when testing it out and then and then upgraded to make them permanent as they went along. Camden, Islington, Hackney and Waltham Forest have a good network, the panel was briefed. Councillor Jameson gave her opinion that the West Green Triangle and Turnpike Lane were easy wins in terms of implementing cycle lanes.

The Coordinator for HCC explained that only 1/3 of children are able to cycle on the road and 70% of children are leaving school unable to cycle, TfL funds **cycle training** in London and Haringey should be pushing for this as many young people have no training and jump onto dockless bikes, posing a danger to themselves and to others.

Ian Sygrave, Chair of the Ladder Community Safety Partnership (LCSP) and the Ward Police Panel stressed that he wasn't part of a lobbying group or cycling expert and was in attendance to provide a resident's view. He expressed that Whitman Road was particularly dangerous, and he felt was an intervention of pavement extensions and essentially an obstacle course cyclist and hence many preferred to use Green Lanes. His view was something that started as a traffic calming measure has potentially made cycling more dangerous.

The Chair of the LCSP also briefed that Green Lanes was a preference to Whitmans but now a significant number of cyclists use it and pedestrians feel unsafe crossing Green Lanes. Having asked the local SNT to investigate the problem was, it was found that cyclists were jumping the light. Two officers stood at the same point between 5-5.30, on one occasion in uniform in a high-profile visible position and on another occasion plain clothed. When out of uniform every second bike **jumped the**

**lights** amounting to 17 cyclists in total whereas when in uniform, there wasn't a single occurrence.

Ian Sygrave also briefed on the issue of dockless bikes being abandoned on the road. The Chair of the LCSP also expressed that he felt that Brent was very good at picking up bikes when they were left obstructing spaces and he was opposed to floating bus stops as unfair to cyclists and unfair to pedestrians and could encourage a collision,

Consideration was given to how some local authorities had the ability to **seize bikes** that were obstructing the path of pedestrians. The Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality explained that the challenge with this approach was that authorities needed to have resources to store the bikes. The authority is ensuring that the chosen provider will be able to do this. The Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment expressed that the collection in some boroughs can be very seasonal, focussed on a set area but the issue the boroughs are recognising is that there isn't enough capacity to store the bikes

HCC briefed the Panel that a **London wide agreement on safety objectives** will help with delivery drivers and different levels of enforcement and sentencing, ranging from warning to outright banning for those that flout the rules. In terms of those working in the gig economy such as Deliveroo drivers this could be linked to some form of registration with their employees. London wide agreement for operators to have built in safety objectives that they should achieve re how they are improving pedestrian safety standards which is something that happens in Brussels and would help improve safety as well.

Councillor Cawley-Harrison sought HCC views on whether they saw conflict between powered two wheelers and regular bikes. The group explained that legally, electric bikes are limited to 15mph whilst illegal bikes can go up to 30mph, and the police carry out random spot checks to try and enforce. Chair of the Ladder Community Safety Partnership (LCSP) and the Ward Police Panel informed the panel that older more vulnerable road users don't feel comfortable and the solution is essentially better enforcement.

Ben House, Coordinator, HCC asserted that better infrastructure would ensure that cyclists aren't on the pavement and hence pedestrians are protected and in turn more people walking and cycling safely would lead to better health outcomes.

The Chair thanked the groups and members of the public who were in attendance in person, online and also those who sent in written evidence to support the Panels review. Councillor Gunes sad all the information would be considered as part of the Panels review.

The meeting ended at 9.30pm

CHAIR: Councillor Makbule Gunes

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

**Report for:** Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2026

**Title:** Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Panels - Membership and Terms of Reference

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

**Lead Officer:** Philip Slawther, Principal Scrutiny Officer  
Tel: 020 8489 5896, E-mail: [philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk)

**Ward(s) affected:** N/A

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

**1. Describe the issue under consideration**

- 1.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to establish the Scrutiny Panels and agree their memberships.
- 1.2 The Committee is also asked to consider the appointment of two Haringey representatives to the North Central London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 The Committee is asked to:
- (a) Note the terms of reference (**Appendix A**) and agree the amended OSC Protocol (**Appendix B**) for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and its Panels;
  - (b) Establish the following Scrutiny Panels for 2026/27:
    - Panel 1
    - Panel 2
    - Panel 3
    - Panel 4
  - (c) To note the verbal update from the Scrutiny Officer on the membership for each Scrutiny Panel.
  - (d) Appoint two Haringey representatives to the North Central London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2026/27.

**3. Reasons for decision**

- 3.1 The terms of reference and membership of the scrutiny panels need to

be confirmed at the first meeting of each municipal year.

- 3.2 The power to appoint Haringey's representatives to the North Central London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC) was delegated to the OSC by Council at its meeting on 22 March 2010.

#### **4. Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

- 4.1 As agreed by Annual Council on 20 May, the membership of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2026/27 will be:

- Cllr Lucia Das Neves (Chair);
- Cllr Luke Cawley-Harrison (Vice-Chair);
- Cllr Bethany Anderson;
- Cllr Marc Jenner;
- Cllr Adam Small.

- 4.2 The Committee will also include statutory education representatives, who shall attend and have voting rights solely on education matters when being considered by the main committee.

- 4.3 The terms of reference and role of the OSC is set out in the Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules in Part Four (Section G) of the Council's Constitution. This specifies key responsibilities for the Committee. This information is provided in full at **Appendix A**.

- 4.4 There is also a Protocol, outside the Constitution and provided at **Appendix B**, that sets out how the OSC is to operate. This has been updated following the local government elections that took place in May 2026, to reflect the fact that no political party has an outright majority in Haringey.

#### **5. Scrutiny Panels**

- 5.1 The Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules state that the OSC may establish a number of Scrutiny Review Panels to examine designated Council services.

- 5.2 The specific functions for any Scrutiny Panels established is outlined in Article 6 of the Constitution at 6.3 (b) and 6.3 (c). The procedure by which this operates is detailed in the Scrutiny Protocol:

- The OSC shall establish four standing Scrutiny Panels, to examine designated public services;
- The OSC shall determine the terms of reference for each Scrutiny Panel;
- If there is any overlap between the business of the Panels, it is the responsibility of the OSC to resolve the issue;
- Areas which are not covered by the four standing Scrutiny Panels shall be the responsibility of the main OSC;
- The Chair of each Scrutiny Panel shall be a member of the OSC, as determined by the OSC at its first meeting;

- It is intended that each Scrutiny Panel shall be comprised of between 3 and 7 backbench or opposition members, and be politically propionate as far as possible;
- Each Scrutiny Panel shall be entitled to appoint up to three non-voting co-optees. The Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Panel membership will include the statutory education representatives of OSC.

5.3 During initial discussions, the Chair and Vice-Chair of OSC have expressed an interest in looking at the remit of each of the four panels to ensure that they are broadly equal in terms of their areas of responsibility, and to ensure that they reflect the current priorities of the organisation. A further report will be brought back to the OSC meeting in July, which will set out the respective role and responsibilities for each Scrutiny Panel.

5.4 The proposed 2026/27 membership for the four Scrutiny Panels is listed below.

<b>Scrutiny Panel</b>	<b>Membership</b>
Panel 1	To be advised
Panel 2	To be advised
Panel 3	To be advised
Panel 4	To be advised
All Councillors (except Members of the Cabinet) may be members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Scrutiny Review Panels. However, no Member may be involved in scrutinising a decision in which he/she has been directly involved.	

5.5 The policy areas to be covered by the four existing Scrutiny Panels, together with the relevant portfolio holders for each scrutiny body, will be included in a further report to OSC in July.

## **6. North Central London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

6.1 Haringey is a member of the North Central London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC), along with Barnet, Camden, Enfield, and Islington.

6.2 The revised terms of reference, agreed by the JHOSC at its meeting on 29 January 2016, and by Haringey Council on 16 May 2016, are as follows:

- To engage with relevant NHS bodies on strategic area wide issues in respect of the co-ordination, commissioning and provision of NHS health services across the whole of the area of North Central London.
- To respond, where appropriate, to any proposals for change to specialised NHS services that are commissioned on a cross borough basis and where there are comparatively small numbers of patients in each of the participating boroughs;

- To respond to any formal consultations on proposals for substantial developments or variations in health services across affecting the area of North Central London;
- The joint committee will work independently of both the Cabinet and health overview and scrutiny committees (HOSCs) of its parent authorities, although evidence collected by individual HOSCs may be submitted as evidence to the joint committee and considered at its discretion;
- The joint committee will seek to promote joint working where it may provide more effective use of health scrutiny and NHS resources and will endeavour to avoid duplicating the work of individual HOSCs. As part of this, the joint committee may establish sub and working groups as appropriate to consider issues of mutual concern provided that this does not duplicate work by individual HOSCs; and
- The joint committee will aim work together in a spirit of co-operation, striving to work to a consensual view to the benefit of local people.

6.3 Haringey's OSC is entitled to appoint two representatives to the JHOSC. The power to make this appointment was delegated to OSC by Council at its meeting on 22 March 2010. This should usually include the Chair of Haringey's designated health scrutiny committee or panel, in order to ensure continuity between local and sub-regional scrutiny work.

## **7. Contribution to strategic outcomes**

7.1 The contribution scrutiny can make to strategic outcomes will be considered as part of its routine work.

## **8. Statutory Officers Comments**

### **Finance and Procurement**

8.1 The Chief Finance Officer has confirmed the Haringey representatives on the JHOSC are not entitled to any remuneration. As a result, there are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations set out in this report.

8.2 Should any of the work undertaken by Overview and Scrutiny generate recommendations with financial implications then these will be highlighted at that time.

### **Legal**

8.3 The Assistant Director for Corporate Governance has been consulted on the contents of this report.

8.4 Under Section 21 (6) of the Local Government Act 2000, an Overview and Scrutiny Committee has the power to appoint one or more sub-committee to discharge any of its functions. The establishment of Scrutiny Panels by the Committee falls within this power and is in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution.

8.5 Scrutiny Panels are non-decision-making bodies and the work programme and any subsequent reports and recommendations that each scrutiny panel produces must be approved by the OSC. Such reports can then be referred to Cabinet or Council under agreed protocols.

8.6 The OSC can appoint two representatives to the North Central London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This is in accordance with the decision made by full Council on 22 March 2010 that the making of nominations to the Joint Health Committee be delegated to the Committee.

### **Equality**

8.7 The Council has a public sector equality duty under the Equalities Act (2010) to have due regard to:

- Tackle discrimination and victimisation of persons that share the characteristics protected under S4 of the Act. These include the characteristics of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex (formerly gender) and sexual orientation;
- 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.

8.8 The proposals outlined in this report relate to the membership and terms of reference for the OSC and carry no direct implications for the Council's general equality duty. However, the Committee should ensure that it addresses these duties by considering them within its work programme and those of its panels, as well as individual pieces of work. This should include considering and clearly stating;

- How 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.

8.9 The Committee should ensure that equalities comments are based on evidence. Wherever possible this should include demographic and service level data and evidence of residents/service-users views gathered through consultation.

### **9. Use of Appendices**

Appendix A - Part Four (Section G) of the Constitution of the London Borough of Haringey.

Appendix B - Scrutiny Protocol

**10. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

N/A

# Part Four, Section G

## Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules

---

### OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES

#### 1. The arrangements for Overview and Scrutiny

1.1 The Council will have one Overview and Scrutiny Committee, which will have responsibility for all overview and scrutiny functions on behalf of the Council.

1.2 The terms of reference of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be:

- (i) The performance of all overview and scrutiny functions on behalf of the Council.
- (ii) The appointment of Scrutiny Review Panels, with membership that reflects the political balance of the Council.
- (iii) To determine the terms of reference of all Scrutiny Review Panels.
- (iv) To receive reports from local National Health Service bodies on the state of health services and public health in the borough area.
- (v) To enter into or appoint such joint overview and scrutiny committees that include the London Borough of Haringey and other boroughs for the purpose of responding to consultation by NHS bodies on proposals for substantial variation or development in the provision of health services as required by The Local Authority (Public Health, Health and Wellbeing Boards and Health Scrutiny) Regulations 2013.
- (vi) To monitor the effectiveness of the Council's Forward Plan.
- (vii) To receive all appropriate performance management and budget monitoring information.
- (viii) To approve a programme of future overview and scrutiny work so as to ensure that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's and Scrutiny Review Panels' time is effectively and efficiently utilised;

PART FOUR – RULES OF PROCEDURE

Section G – Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules

- (ix) To consider all requests for call-in and decide whether to call-in a key decision, how it should be considered and whether to refer the decision to the Cabinet or to Council.
- (x) To monitor the effectiveness of the Call-in procedure.
- (xi) To review and scrutinise action taken by partner authorities in discharge of crime and disorder functions and to make reports and recommendations to Cabinet and Council on these.
- (xii) To make arrangements which enable any Councillor who is not a Committee Member to refer any local government matter, or any crime and disorder matter, to the Committee under the Councillor Call for Action Procedure.
- (xiii) To ensure that referrals from Overview and Scrutiny Committee to the Cabinet either by way of report or call-in are managed efficiently, and
- (xiv) To ensure community and voluntary sector organisations, users of services and others are appropriately involved in giving evidence to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or relevant Scrutiny Review Panel.

1.3 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee may establish a number of Scrutiny Review Panels:

- (i) Scrutiny Reviews Panels are appointed to examine designated Council services. Scrutiny Review Panels will refer their findings/ recommendations in the form of a written report, with the approval of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to the Cabinet and/or the Council as appropriate.
- (ii) Scrutiny Review Panels will analyse submissions, request and analyse any additional information, and question the Cabinet Member(s), relevant Council officers, local stakeholders, and where relevant officers and/or board members of local NHS bodies or NHS funded bodies.
- (iii) Subject to the approval of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Scrutiny Review Panels will be able to appoint external advisors and/or to commission specific pieces of research if this is deemed necessary.
- (iv) Scrutiny Review Panels should make every effort to work by consensus; however, in exceptional circumstances Members may submit minority reports.

PART FOUR – RULES OF PROCEDURE

Section G – Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules

- (v) Prior to publication, draft reports will be sent to the relevant chief officers or where relevant officers of the National Health Service for checking for inaccuracies and the presence of exempt and/or confidential information; Scrutiny Review Panel members will revisit any conclusions drawn from disputed information;
  - (vi) Following approval by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, final reports and recommendations will be presented to the next available Cabinet meeting together with an officer report where appropriate. The Cabinet will consider the reports and formally agree their decisions.
  - (vii) Following approval by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, reports on NHS, non-executive or regulatory matters will be copied to the Cabinet for information.
  - (viii) At the Cabinet meeting to receive the final report and recommendations, the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or the Chair of the Scrutiny Review Panel may attend and speak.
  - (ix) After an appropriate period, post implementation, Overview and Scrutiny Committee will carry out a follow up review to determine if the recommendations had the intended outcomes and to measure any improvements.
- 1.4 When Scrutiny Review Panels report on non-executive or regulatory functions the above rules apply, except the references to The Cabinet shall be taken as reference to the relevant non-executive body.
- 1.5 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall 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.
- 1.6 All Overview and Scrutiny meetings shall take place in public (except where exempt or confidential matters are considered).
- 1.7 The Overview and Scrutiny function should not be seen as an alternative to established disciplinary, audit or complaints mechanisms and should not interfere with or pre-empt their work.
- 2. Membership of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Review Panels**
- 2.1 All Councillors (except Members of the Cabinet) may be members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Scrutiny Review Panels. However, no Member may be involved in scrutinising a decision in which he/she has been directly involved.

PART FOUR – RULES OF PROCEDURE  
Section G – Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules

2.2 The membership of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Review Panels shall, as far as is practicable, be in proportion to the representation of different political groups on the Council.

**3. Co-optees**

3.1 Each Scrutiny Review Panel shall be entitled to have up to three people as non-voting co-optees, who will be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on an annual basis.

3.2 Statutory voting non-Councillor members of Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be paid an allowance in accordance with the Members' Allowances Scheme in Part 6 of this Constitution.

**4. Education representatives**

4.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Scrutiny Review Panel whose terms of reference relate to education functions that are the responsibility of the Cabinet, shall include in its membership the following representatives:

- (i) At least one Church of England diocesan representative (voting).
- (ii) At least one Roman Catholic diocesan representative (voting).
- (iii) 2 parent governor representatives (voting).

These voting representatives will be entitled to vote where the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or the Scrutiny Review Panel is considering matters that relate to relevant education functions. If the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Review Panel is dealing with other matters, these representatives shall not vote on those matters though they may stay in the meeting and speak at the discretion of the Chair. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Review Panel will attempt to organise its meetings so that relevant education matters are grouped together.

**5. Meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Review Panels**

5.1 In addition to ordinary meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, extraordinary meetings may be called from time to time as and when appropriate. An Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting may be called by the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee after consultation with the Chief Executive, by any two Members of the Committee or by the proper officer if he/she considers it necessary or appropriate.

PART FOUR – RULES OF PROCEDURE

Section G – Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules

5.2 In addition to ordinary meetings of the Scrutiny Review Panels, extraordinary meetings may be called from time to time as and when appropriate. A Scrutiny Review Panel meeting may be called by the Chair of the Panel after consultation with the Chief Executive, by any two Members of the Committee or by the proper officer if he/she considers it necessary or appropriate.

**6. Quorum**

The quorum for the Overview Scrutiny Committee and for each Scrutiny Review Panel shall be at least one quarter of its membership and not less than 3 voting members.

**7. Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Review Panels**

7.1 The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be appointed by the Council.

7.2 The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall resign with immediate effect if a vote of no confidence is passed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

7.3 Chairs of Scrutiny Review Panels will be drawn from among the Councillors sitting on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Subject to this requirement, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee may appoint any person as it considers appropriate as Chair having regard to the objective of cross-party chairing in proportion to the political balance of the Council. The Scrutiny Review Panels shall not be able to change the appointed Chair unless there is a vote of no confidence as outlined in Article 6.5 in this Constitution.

7.4 The Chair of the Budget Scrutiny Review process will be drawn from among the opposition party Councillors sitting on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall not be able to change the appointed Chair unless there is a vote of no confidence as outlined in Article 6.5 in this Constitution.

**8. Work programme**

Overview and Scrutiny Committee will determine the future scrutiny work programme and will establish Scrutiny Review Panels to assist it to perform its functions. The Committee will appoint a Chair for each Scrutiny Review Panel.

**9. Agenda items for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

9.1 Any member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall be entitled to give notice to the proper officer that he/she wishes an item relevant to

PART FOUR – RULES OF PROCEDURE

Section G – Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules

the functions of the Committee to be included on the agenda for the next available meeting of the Committee. On receipt of such a request the proper officer will ensure that it is included on the next available agenda.

- 9.2 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall also respond, as soon as its work programme permits, to requests from the Council and, if it considers it appropriate, from the Cabinet to review particular areas of Council activity. Where they do so, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall report their findings and any recommendations back to the Cabinet within an agreed timescale.

**10. Policy review and development**

- 10.1 The role of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in relation to the development of the Council's budget and policy framework is set out in the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules in Part 4 of this constitution.

- 10.2 In relation to the development of the Council's approach to other matters not forming part of its policy and budget framework, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and its Scrutiny Review Panels may make proposals to the Cabinet for developments insofar as they relate to matters within their terms of reference. The Scrutiny Review Panels must do so via the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**11. Reports from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Following endorsement by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, final reports and recommendations will be presented to the next available Cabinet meeting. The procedure to be followed is set out in paragraphs 1.3 or 1.4 above.

**12. Making sure that overview and scrutiny reports are considered by the Cabinet**

- 12.1 The agenda for Cabinet meetings shall include an item entitled 'Issues arising from Scrutiny'. Reports of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee referred to the Cabinet shall be included at this point in the agenda unless either they have been considered in the context of the Cabinet's deliberations on a substantive item on the agenda or the Cabinet gives reasons why they cannot be included and states when they will be considered.

- 12.2 Where the Overview and Scrutiny Committee prepares a report for consideration by the Cabinet in relation to a matter where decision making power has been delegated to an individual Cabinet Member, a Committee of the Cabinet or an Officer, or under Joint Arrangements, then the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will also submit a copy of their report to that body or individual for consideration, and a copy to the

PART FOUR – RULES OF PROCEDURE

Section G – Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules

proper officer. If the Member, committee, or officer with delegated decision making power does not accept the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, then the body/he/she must then refer the matter to the next appropriate meeting of the Cabinet for debate before making a decision.

**13. Rights and powers of Overview and Scrutiny Committee members**

**13.1 Rights to documents**

- (i) In addition to their rights as Councillors, members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Review Panels have the additional right to documents, and to notice of meetings as set out in the Access to Information Procedure Rules in Part 4 of this Constitution.
- (ii) Nothing in this paragraph prevents more detailed liaison between the Cabinet and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Review Panels as appropriate depending on the particular matter under consideration.

**13.2 Powers to conduct enquiries**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Review Panels may hold enquiries into past performance and investigate the available options for future direction in policy development and may appoint advisers and assessors to assist them in these processes. They may go on site visits, conduct public surveys, hold public meetings, commission research and do all other things that they reasonably consider necessary to inform their deliberations, within available resources. They may ask witnesses to attend to address them on any matter under consideration and may pay any advisers, assessors and witnesses a reasonable fee and expenses for doing so. Scrutiny Review Panels require the support of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to do so.

**13.3 Power to require Members and officers to give account**

- (i) The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Review Panels may scrutinise and review decisions made or actions taken in connection with the discharge of any Council functions (Scrutiny Review Panels will keep to issues that fall within their terms of reference). As well as reviewing documentation, in fulfilling the scrutiny role, it may require any Member of the Cabinet, the Head of Paid Service and/or any senior officer (at second or third tier), and chief officers of the local National Health Service to attend before it to explain in relation to matters within their remit:
  - (a) any particular decision or series of decisions;

PART FOUR – RULES OF PROCEDURE

Section G – Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules

- (b) the extent to which the actions taken implement Council policy (or NHS policy, where appropriate); and
- (c) their performance.

It is the duty of those persons to attend if so required. At the discretion of their Director, council officers below third tier may attend, usually accompanied by a senior manager. At the discretion of the relevant Chief Executive, other NHS officers may also attend overview and scrutiny meetings.

- (ii) Where any Member or officer is required to attend the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Review Panel under this provision, the Chair of that body will inform the Member or proper officer. The proper officer shall inform the Member or officer in writing giving at least 10 working days notice of the meeting at which he/she is required to attend. The notice will state the nature of the item on which he/she is required to attend to give account and whether any papers are required to be produced for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Review Panel. Where the account to be given to Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Review Panel will require the production of a report, then the Member or officer concerned will be given sufficient notice to allow for preparation of that documentation.
- (iii) Where, in exceptional circumstances, the Member or officer is unable to attend on the required date, then the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Review Panel shall in consultation with the Member or officer arrange an alternative date for attendance, to take place within a maximum of 10 days from the date of the original request.

**14. Attendance by others**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Review Panel may invite people other than those people referred to in paragraph 13 above to address it, discuss issues of local concern and/or answer questions. It may for example wish to hear from residents, stakeholders and Members and officers in other parts of the public sector and may invite such people to attend. Attendance is optional.

**15. Call-in**

The call-in procedure is dealt with separately at Part 4 Section H of the Constitution, immediately following these Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules.

**16. Councillor Call for Action (CCfA)**

PART FOUR – RULES OF PROCEDURE

Section G – Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules

The Council has adopted a Protocol for handling requests by non-Committee Members that the Committee should consider any local government matter which is a matter of significant community concern. This procedure should only be a last resort once the other usual methods for resolving local concerns have failed. Certain matters such as individual complaints and planning or licensing decisions are excluded.

Requests for a CCfA referral should be made to the Democratic Services Manager who will check with the Monitoring Officer that the request falls within the Protocol. The Councillor making the referral will be able to attend the relevant meeting of the Committee to explain the matter. Among other actions, the Committee may: (i) make recommendations to the Cabinet, Directors or partner agencies, (ii) ask officers for a further report, (iii) ask for further evidence from the Councillor making the referral, or (iv) decide to take no further action on the referral.

The Protocol is not included within this Constitution but will be subject to regular review by the Committee.

**17. Procedure at Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings and meetings of the Scrutiny Review Panels.**

(a) The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall consider the following business as appropriate:

- (i) apologies for absence;
- (ii) urgent business;
- (iii) declarations of interest;
- (iv) minutes of the last meeting;
- (v) deputations and petitions;
- (vi) consideration of any matter referred to the Committee for a decision in relation to call-in of a key decision;
- (vii) responses of the Cabinet to reports of the Committee;
- (viii) the business otherwise set out on the agenda for the meeting.

(b) A Scrutiny Review Panel shall consider the following business as appropriate:

- (i) minutes of the last meeting;

PART FOUR – RULES OF PROCEDURE  
Section G – Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules

- (ii) declarations of interest;
  - (iii) the business otherwise set out on the agenda for the meeting.
- (c) Where the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Review Panel has asked people to attend to give evidence at meetings, these are to be conducted in accordance with the following principles:
- (i) that the investigation be conducted fairly and all members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Review Panels be given the opportunity to ask questions of attendees, to contribute and to speak;
  - (ii) that those assisting the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Review Panel by giving evidence be treated with respect and courtesy;
  - (iii) that the investigation be conducted so as to maximise the efficiency of the investigation or analysis; and
  - (iv) that reasonable effort be made to provide appropriate assistance with translation or alternative methods of communication to assist those giving evidence.
- (d) Following any investigation or review, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Review Panel shall prepare a report, for submission to the Cabinet and shall make its report and findings public.

**17A. Declarations Of Interest Of Members**

- (a) If a member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Review Panel has a disclosable pecuniary interest or a prejudicial interest as referred to in Members' Code of Conduct in any matter under consideration, then the member shall declare his or her interest at the start of the meeting or as soon as the interest becomes apparent. The member may not participate or participate further in any discussion of the matter or participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting and must withdraw from the meeting until discussion of the relevant matter is concluded unless that member has obtained a dispensation from the Council's Standards Committee.
- (b) If a member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Review Panel has a personal interest which is not a disclosable pecuniary interest nor a prejudicial interest, the member is under

PART FOUR – RULES OF PROCEDURE  
Section G – Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules

no obligation to make a disclosure at the meeting but may do so if he/she wishes.

**18. The Party Whip**

Scrutiny is intended to operate outside the party whip system. However, when considering any matter in respect of which a Member of scrutiny is subject to a party whip the Member must declare the existence of the whip and the nature of it before the commencement of the Committee/Panel's deliberations on the matter. The Declaration, and the detail of the whipping arrangements, shall be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

The expression "party whip" can be taken to mean: "Any instruction given by or on behalf of a political group to any Councillor who is a Member of that group as to how that Councillor shall speak or vote on any matter before the Council or any committee or sub-committee, or the application or threat to apply any sanction by the group in respect of that Councillor should he/she speak or vote in any particular manner."

**19. Matters within the remit of more than one Scrutiny Review Panel**

Should there be any overlap between the business of any Scrutiny Review Panels, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is empowered to resolve the issue.

This page is intentionally left blank

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (OSC) PROTOCOL 2026**

**1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Overview and Scrutiny plays a fundamental role in the Council’s governance arrangements through holding decision makers to account, policy review and development, acting as a community voice and ensuring the efficient delivery of public services. Effective scrutiny requires the commitment of the whole Council and partners, as well as creating the right culture, behaviours and attitude that sees scrutiny as a valuable contributor to the business of the Council.
- 1.2 This updated protocol is a welcome opportunity for the whole Council to re-affirm its commitment to effective scrutiny, foster an effective and constructive working relationship with all stakeholders in the scrutiny process and refresh relevant policies and procedures so that they reflect best practice. It takes into account learning from recent Haringey scrutiny work as well as the Statutory Guidance on Overview and Scrutiny in Local and Combined Authorities that was published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) in May 2019.
- 1.3 The Protocol is intended to give effect to the provisions in the Constitution relating to Overview and Scrutiny. In the event of any apparent conflict that may arise between the provisions in the Protocol and the Constitution, the Constitution shall take precedence.

**2 ROLE OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

- 2.1 The Council is committed to creating an environment conducive to effective scrutiny. It is a statutory function and a requirement for all authorities operating executive arrangements. It is also an integral part of the Council’s decision-making structure and provides essential checks and balances to the Council’s Cabinet to ensure that its powers are used wisely. Whilst its legitimacy is beyond question, scrutiny should nonetheless be able to demonstrate clearly to the Council and its Cabinet, senior management team, partners and the public the value that it adds in its work and seek to make recommendations that improve the lives of local residents.
- 2.2 Effective Overview and Scrutiny should:
- Provide constructive challenge;
  - Amplify the voices and concerns of the public;
  - Be led by independent minded Members who take responsibility for their role; and
  - Drive improvement in public services.

*Challenge*

- 2.3 For challenge to be effective, it needs to be sufficiently robust. It should nevertheless be constructive and focused on matters of timely relevance to the Council and the wider community. The role of scrutiny as a ‘Critical Friend’ should be undertaken in a courteous and professional manner, reflecting the Member’s Code of Conduct. The aim of scrutiny should be to improve decision making and outcomes for residents, not scoring political points or providing a political opposition to those who make decisions.

*Public and Community Involvement*

- 2.4 Overview and Scrutiny has an important role in articulating the concerns of residents and community organisations. It will therefore strive to facilitate their involvement in its work and, in particular, the development of its work plan, providing evidence and asking questions.
- 2.5 Overview and scrutiny will seek to ensure that the feedback that it receives is representative of the local community. It will be proactive in seeking input and seek to involve individuals and groups within it that are best placed to inform specific pieces of work. It will use a range of methods and, where possible, locations in order to best to engage with diverse stakeholders and listen to their views and experience.

### *Independence*

- 2.6 Overview and scrutiny shall be independent in both outlook and operation. The Cabinet should not seek to direct the areas that it focusses upon, although suggestions can be made for the work programme. Overview and scrutiny shall not be subject to undue party political influence, such as whipping. Members on scrutiny bodies shall also undertake their work with an open mind and make recommendations that are based on the evidence that they receive rather than pre-conceived ideas or pressure from within the political group. It should seek to be strategic and focused on the Council and its communities of interest.

### *Driving Improvement*

- 2.7 It is important that scrutiny not only provides challenge, but delivers outcomes. These should aim to make a difference to the lives of residents through improving public services. This should be achieved by the making of evidence-based recommendations to the Council's Cabinet and other organisations responsible for the commissioning and delivery of public services.

## **3 RESPONSIBILITIES**

- 3.1 Overview and scrutiny can scrutinise any matter which affects the authority's area or its residents' wellbeing. The powers of Overview and Scrutiny were contained in the Local Government Act 2000 and consolidated by the Localism Act 2011. It can:
- Review decisions taken by the Cabinet or the Council;
  - Investigate matters affecting the borough of Haringey and its residents;
  - Contribute to policy development for the Council;
  - Make reports and recommendations to the Cabinet or the Council;
  - Review decisions made by the Cabinet but not yet implemented ("call-in");
  - Appoint sub-committees and arrange for them to discharge any of its functions;
  - Review matters relating to the health service and crime and disorder and make reports and recommendations;
  - Require members of the Cabinet and officers to attend to provide information and answer questions;
  - Invite other persons to attend meetings as part of its evidence gathering;
  - Give notice in writing to a relevant partner authority requiring that it has regard to a report or recommendations relating to its functions; and
  - Request information from a relevant partner authority that is required for Overview and Scrutiny to discharge its functions.

## 4 STRUCTURE

- 4.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall comprise five members and be politically proportionate as far as possible. The membership shall be appointed each year at the Annual Council Meeting. The chair of the Committee is appointed by Full Council. In the event that the chair of the Committee is from the main group, the Vice-Chair will usually be a member of an opposition group. The Committee will also include statutory education co-optees, who have voting rights on education matters.
- 4.2 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall establish four standing Scrutiny Panels to examine designated public services. The Committee shall determine the terms of reference for each Panel. If there is any overlap between the business of the Panels, it is the responsibility of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to resolve the issue. Areas which are not covered by the four standing Panels shall be the responsibility of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 4.3 The chair of each standing Scrutiny Panel shall be a member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and shall be determined by the Committee, usually at its first meeting of the year. It is intended that each Panel shall be comprised of between 3 and 7 members and be politically proportionate as far as possible. The membership of each Scrutiny Panel shall be appointed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It is intended that, other than the Chair, the other members will be non-executive members who do not sit on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 4.4 Should one of the Panels be responsible for education issues, the membership shall include the statutory education co-optees. It is intended that the education co-optees will also attend the Overview and Scrutiny Committee when reports from a relevant Scrutiny Panel are considered.
- 4.5 Each Scrutiny Panel shall be entitled to have up to three non-voting co-optees, who will be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on an annual basis. Non-voting co-optees are expected to add value to scrutiny by performing the following roles:
- To bring a diverse spectrum of experience and adding a different perspective to any items;
  - To act as a non-party political voice for those who live and/or work in Haringey; and
  - To bring specialist knowledge and/or skills to the Overview and Scrutiny process and an element of external challenge by representing the public.
- 4.6 Nominations for non-voting co-optees will be sought primarily from established community groups that have a working relationship with the Council but consideration can be given to specific individuals where particular expertise/experience is required that would not be otherwise available<sup>1</sup>.
- 4.7 Overview and Scrutiny bodies shall seek to work by consensus. Votes should only take place when as a last resort and when all efforts to achieve a consensus have been unsuccessful.

## 5 MEETING FREQUENCY AND FORMAT

- 5.1 The Committee shall hold between six and nine scheduled meetings each year. One meeting shall include agreement of the annual work programme for Overview and Scrutiny, this will usually be in the Autumn. One meeting, in January, shall consider the budget scrutiny recommendations from each Scrutiny Panel. In addition, the Committee may also hold evidence gathering meetings as part of in-depth scrutiny reviews on a specific issue as and when required. An extraordinary meeting of the OSC may be called in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Part 4 Section G).

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a separate and detailed Protocol regarding the process for appointment of non-voting co-optees.

- 5.2 Members of the Council may Call In a decision of the Cabinet, or any Key Decision made under delegated powers, within five working days of the decision being made. The full procedure is given in the Council's Constitution (Part 4 Section H).
- 5.3 Pre-decision scrutiny on forthcoming Cabinet decisions shall only be undertaken at scheduled Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings, in adherence with the Council's Forward Plan.
- 5.4 It is intended that each Scrutiny Panel shall hold four scheduled meetings each year. An extraordinary meeting of a Panel may be called in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Part 4 Section G). In addition, Scrutiny Panels may also hold evidence gathering meetings as part of in-depth scrutiny reviews on a specific issue as and when required.
- 5.5 The choice of venue for meetings may have regard to the business to be transacted and the circumstances of the time. This may include meeting online for remote working or to improve access to those providing evidence to the Committee or a Panel.

## **6 ENGAGING WITH THE CABINET**

- 6.1 Legislation relating to local authority governance provides for the separation of the Executive and Non-executive Members of a Council in order to provide a check and balance on decision-making. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee therefore shall engage regularly with Cabinet, particularly regarding its future work programme and the Forward Plan. The first of such meetings should be arranged with Cabinet prior to the first meeting of the Committee. The Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Scrutiny Panels shall seek to liaise on a regular basis with the relevant Cabinet Members covering relevant portfolios regarding the progress of the work programme, agenda setting and requests for reports, attendance and updates.
- 6.2 The Leader of the Council and Chief Executive shall be invited to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as required, based upon the agenda of a meeting, but at least once a year at the meeting when the Overview and Scrutiny work programme is considered. This shall be an opportunity to discuss jointly, amongst other matters, the Council's priorities for the next year. Meetings between the Cabinet and scrutiny should focus on outcomes and be respectful and constructive, respecting the different but complementary nature of the roles and the value of scrutiny to the Council and its residents.
- 6.3 All Cabinet Members will be expected to attend either the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and/or Scrutiny Panels as required and with reasonable notice, based upon the agenda of a meeting, but at least twice a year. Cabinet Members will be expected to provide information specific to an agenda item, to provide updates on key areas within their portfolios and to answer questions.
- 6.4 The Leader and Cabinet Members attending an Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Panel meeting may be accompanied and assisted by any service officers they consider necessary. The Member may invite an officer attending to answer a question and provide information on their behalf.
- 6.5 Cabinet Members and senior officers attending formal meetings of scrutiny bodies shall strive to provide full answers to questions that are put to them. Where this is not possible due to the necessary information not being accessible at the meeting, a written answer will be provided within 7 working days of the date of the meeting. To better meet requests for information, members of the Committee

and its Panels will seek to provide advance notice of questions so that Cabinet Members and senior officers may prepare for their participation in the meeting.

### **7 RESPONDING TO SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.1 Overview and Scrutiny may make recommendations to the Cabinet or any other public service providers. Recommendations to Cabinet shall be introduced by either the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or the relevant Scrutiny Panel. They shall be responded to by the appropriate body within two months of their receipt. Responses shall be circulated to Members of the relevant scrutiny body before the Cabinet meeting to approve the response. Where recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny are not accepted by Cabinet, an explanation will be given of the reasons why. Where a response is requested from NHS funded bodies, the response shall be made within 28 days.

### **8 THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME**

- 8.1 Overview and Scrutiny will agree its own annual work programme and keep it under review over the course of a municipal year. It will have regard to corporate and strategic priorities and consult widely to inform the focus for scrutiny activity.
- 8.2 The Council's Democratic Services Team shall coordinate the development of the work programme for Overview and Scrutiny, covering the work of the Committee and of the Scrutiny Panels. The development process for this should include engagement with Members, Cabinet, senior officers, partners, voluntary and community organisations and residents, with specific opportunities provided for each of them to submit suggestions. Whilst safeguarding the independence of the scrutiny process, the Committee shall have regard to all such suggestions when they decide their work programme.
- 8.3 Decision makers should seek to involve scrutiny in the development of new policy at an early stage when proposals are being developed so that account can be taken of it when developing its work plan.
- 8.4 As part of the development of the work programme, the Committee will determine how external partners and public service providers shall be scrutinised and engage with key personnel to build the necessary relationships and awareness for this purpose.
- 8.5 The scrutiny work programme should reflect a balance of activities, including:
- Holding the Executive to account;
  - Policy review and development;
  - Performance management;
  - External scrutiny; and
  - Public and community engagement.
- 8.6 The work programme should;
- Reflect local needs and priorities. Issues should be of community concern as well as Borough Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy priorities;
  - Prioritise issues that have most impact or benefit to residents;
  - Involve local stakeholders; and
  - Be flexible enough to respond to new or urgent issues.
- 8.7 Scrutiny work will be carried out in a variety of ways and use whatever format that is best suited to the issue being considered. This can include a variety of "one-off" reports as well as in-depth scrutiny

review projects that provide opportunities to thoroughly investigate a topic and recommend improvements.

- 8.8 In deciding its work programme, the Committee shall be mindful of the need to achieve meaningful outcomes by ensuring that plans are deliverable within the timescale set and with the resources available.
- 8.9 A template shall be maintained and shared by the Democratic Services Team to provide criteria to assist with the preparation and updating of the work programme. The Team also will assist the Committee and its Panels in tracking their decisions and requesting updates on progress from time to time, following which the Chair and officer will consider whether such matters need to form an agenda item.
- 8.10 A template shall be maintained for the use of the Chairs and Officers of the OSC and Panels to assist the Cabinet and senior officers in understanding the purpose of scrutiny activity relating to specific topics and to justify requests for information or reports. Agenda planning meetings shall be arranged between Chairs and senior officers ahead of scheduled meetings to ensure clarity on any reports that are requested. A detailed scope, terms of reference and project plan shall also be prepared for each in-depth scrutiny review project prior to it starting. This shall include consideration of resources, timescale for completion and aspired outcomes.

## 9 BUDGET SCRUTINY

- 9.1 The Council's budget shall be scrutinised by both the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and each of the Scrutiny Panels. The role of the Committee shall be to scrutinise the overall budgetary position and direction of the Council and strategic issues relating to this, whilst each Scrutiny Panel will scrutinise areas that come within their terms of reference. Any individual areas of the budget that are not covered by the Panels shall be considered by the Committee.
- 9.2 A Committee member from an opposition group shall be responsible for chairing the Budget Scrutiny process and co-ordinating recommendations made by respective Scrutiny Panels and the Committee relating to the budget.
- 9.3 To allow effective scrutiny of the budget in advance of it formally being set, the following timescale is suggested:
- **Scrutiny Panel Meetings: May to November**  
The Overview and Scrutiny Committee will receive regular budget monitoring reports budget whilst each Scrutiny Panel shall monitor budgets within their respective areas. Between May and November, this shall involve scrutinising progress with the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) approved at the budget setting full Council meeting in February.
  - **Scrutiny Panel Meetings: December/January**  
Each Scrutiny Panel shall hold a meeting following the release of the December Cabinet report on the new MTFS. The Committee will also meet to consider proposals relating to any areas within the MTFS that are not covered by individual scrutiny panels. Each Panel and the Committee shall consider the proposals in this report for their respective areas, in addition to their budget scrutiny already carried out. Relevant Cabinet Members will be expected to attend these meetings to answer questions relating to proposals affecting their portfolios as well as senior service officers.

Scrutiny Panels and the Committee may also request that the Cabinet Member for Finance and/or senior officers attend these meetings to answer questions.

▪ **Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting: January**

The Committee will consider and make recommendations on the overall budgetary position and direction of the Council and the MTFs. Each Scrutiny Panel and the Committee shall also submit their final budget scrutiny report to the meeting for ratification, containing their recommendations/proposals in respect of the budget for the areas within their terms of reference.

▪ **Cabinet Meeting: February**

The recommendations from the Budget Scrutiny process that have been approved by the Committee shall be referred to the Cabinet. As part of the budget setting process, the Cabinet will clearly set out its response to the recommendations/proposals.

## 10 HEALTH SCRUTINY

10.1 On matters relating to health, Overview and Scrutiny has a formal role in the scrutiny of local health services. The Department of Health & Social Care's (DHSC) guidance<sup>2</sup> in this area states that the primary aim of health scrutiny is to strengthen the voice of local people, ensuring that their needs and experiences are considered an integral part of the commissioning and delivery of health services and that those services are effective and safe. Health scrutiny also has a strategic role in taking an overview of how well integration of health, public health and social care is working.

10.2 Under the Local Authority (Public Health, Health and Wellbeing Boards and Health Scrutiny) Regulations 2013, local authorities in England have the power to:

- review and scrutinise matters relating to the planning, provision and operation of the health service in the area - this may include scrutinising the finances of local health services;
- require information to be provided by certain NHS bodies about the planning, provision and operation of health services that is reasonably needed to carry out health scrutiny;
- require employees, including non-executive directors of certain NHS bodies, to attend before them to answer questions;
- make reports and recommendations to certain NHS bodies and expect a response within 28 days.

10.3 The DHSC guidance states that health scrutiny is a fundamental way by which democratically elected local councillors are able to voice the views of their constituents and hold relevant NHS bodies and health service providers to account. The guidance defines relevant NHS bodies as NHS England, Integrated Care Boards (ICBs) and NHS Trusts/Foundation Trusts. It defines relevant providers as providers of NHS services and public health services commissioned by NHS England, ICBs and local authorities.

10.4 The DHSC guidance refers to Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees (HOSCs) as the committees set up by local authorities to discharge their health scrutiny functions but does not define the precise structure for this, noting that health scrutiny functions are exercised by a variety of committees or

---

<sup>2</sup> The full DHSC guidance on Local Authority Health Scrutiny is available at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/advice-to-local-authorities-on-scrutinising-health-services/local-authority-health-scrutiny#requirements-under-the-2013-regulations>

sub-committees with different names and remits. It is therefore for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to determine how to discharge this function, which may involve delegating this function to a Scrutiny Review Panel.

### Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny

- 10.5 Local authorities also have the power to establish a joint health and scrutiny committee with Councillors from two or more local authorities to carry out all or specified health scrutiny functions, particularly in areas where local authority boundaries and Integrated Care Board (ICB) boundaries do not align. The DHSC guidance makes clear that establishing a joint committee of this kind does not prevent the appointing local authorities from separately scrutinising health issues.
- 10.6 Haringey Council participates in a Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee for the North Central London area (NCL JHOSC) which also includes the London Boroughs of Barnet, Camden, Enfield and Islington. The five-Borough joint committee scrutinises the work of the North Central London Integrated Care Board (NCL ICB). North Central London Integrated Care Board and North West London Integrated Care Board (NWL ICB) merged in April 2026 into NHS West and North London ICB. It is anticipated that the JHOSCs for North Central London and North West London will maintain their current separate structures in the interim.
- 10.7 Two Councillors from each Borough are appointed to the NCL JHOSC. This should usually include the Chair of Haringey's designated health scrutiny committee or panel in order to ensure continuity between local and sub-regional scrutiny work.

## **11 ACCESS TO INFORMATION**

- 11.1 Legislation and the Council's own Standing Orders provide for all Members to have access to information based upon their membership of Committees and on a need to know basis.
- 11.2 For Overview and Scrutiny to be effective, it needs access to relevant information and in a timely manner. In particular, it is imperative that it has the information necessary to provide effective challenge about the provision, quality and resourcing of services. It has a legal right to information and this includes enhanced power to access exempt or confidential information. This is in addition to existing rights that Councillors have to access information.
- 11.3 Overview and Scrutiny Members need access to key information about the management of the Council, particularly on performance, management, funding and risk. Members should also be given the support necessary to ensure that they understand such information. In seeking this information, they should be mindful of the capacity of the Council to resource activity and the value and outcomes likely to be gained through it.
- 11.4 Overview and Scrutiny should not rely purely on those who are directly responsible for services for information and should seek to supplement the evidence at its disposal from within the Council from other sources, including service users, other residents and partners.
- 11.5 A template shall be maintained for the use of the Chairs and Officers of the OSC and Panels to explain the basis for the request for information and to detail the information that is required and the purpose to which it will be put. Requests will be responded to positively and in a timely manner. To ensure

that the information provided is relevant, officers should ensure that they have a clear understanding of the reasons why information is needed by seeking clarification if necessary.

- 11.6 It is recognised that there may be rare occasions when it may be legitimate for information to be withheld and a written statement setting out the reasons for this will be provided to the OSC and its lead officer should this occur. Cabinet Members and senior officers will nevertheless seek to avoid refusing requests or limiting the information they provide. Before a decision exceptionally is made not to share information, serious consideration will be given to whether the information can instead be shared in closed session and the reason for this stated.
- 11.7 Where a Cabinet Member or senior officer determine that information requested by the OSC should be withheld, the OSC may refer the matter to the Monitoring Officer for adjudication if it wishes to challenge the decision. In considering the matter, the Monitoring Officer should have regard to the legitimacy of Overview and Scrutiny, the reason(s) given for withholding the information and the value to the Council and residents of scrutiny activity on this matter.

### **12 TRANSPARENCY AND OPENNESS**

- 12.1 One of the key roles of Overview and Scrutiny is to promote transparency and openness. The presumption therefore will be that its meetings will take place in public and the need to hold closed sessions will be avoided. Meetings that take place as part of the evidence gathering process for in-depth scrutiny reviews will also take place in public.
- 12.2 However, it is accepted that there will be limited occasions when it will be appropriate to meet in closed session because of the nature of the business or the position of the witness giving evidence. Evidence gathering activities may therefore take place outside of formal meetings if necessary or appropriate.
- 12.3 The status of meetings in terms of public or closed sessions, recording and documentation should be made clear in advance to all individuals attending to provide evidence.

### **13 OFFICER ADVICE**

- 13.1 The Code of Conduct for Officers is clear that all Members are entitled to receive impartial advice and have access to information by virtue of their membership of committees and on a need-to-know basis.
- 13.2 There is therefore an expectation that all Senior Officers will provide impartial advice to scrutiny bodies as and when required. The Statutory Scrutiny Officer and the Monitoring Officer have particular roles in ensuring that timely, relevant and high quality advice is provided.
- 13.3 There is a specific statutory requirement for the Council to designate a Statutory Scrutiny Officer. The role of this officer is:
- To promote the role of the authority's overview and scrutiny committee(s);
  - To provide support to the authority's overview and scrutiny function and to local Councillors;
  - To provide guidance to members and officers of the council in relation to overview and scrutiny's functions.
- 13.4 The Statutory Scrutiny Officer cannot be the Council's Head of Paid Service, the Monitoring Officer or the Chief Finance Officer.

13.5 The Monitoring Officer has three principal responsibilities:

- To report on matters they believe are, or may be, illegal or amount of maladministration;
- To be responsible for the conduct of councillors and officers; and
- To be responsible for the operation, review and updating of the constitution.

13.6 Where there are disagreements about Overview and Scrutiny's powers, role and remit, the role of the Statutory Scrutiny Officer will be to advocate on behalf of it and protect its independence. The role of the Monitoring Officer will be to adjudicate on such matters and, if need be, report to Full Council on any issues that may need addressing.